The motion picture is America's favorite entertainment. Where can you find films treated on the same level as books, music and theatre?

The motion picture is America's greatest cultural medium. Where can you read serious discussion on it?

The motion picture's role in America's society is enormous. Where can you find appraisals of its position?

The motion picture as an art form in America has long been recognized. Where can you read evaluations of its achievements and failures?

The motion picture is international. Where can you find information on film activities in other countries?

CINEMA HOPES TO PROVIDE YOU, THE INTELLIGENT MOVIE-GOER, WITH THE ANSWERS.

The Editors
ON THE COVER

When John Ford went to Mexico last winter to film Dudley Nichols', 'The Fugitive' (an adaptation of Graham Greene's novel, "The Labyrinthine Ways"), he left Hollywood behind in more ways than one. Taking only a handful of Hollywood actors and technicians, he relied instead on Mexican personnel for his crews and players. More important, early indications show that John Ford, freed for the first time from studio restrictions, has attempted to make a film that will surpass his classic, "The Informer."

In this scene from the film, Henry Fonda, the hunted priest, returns to his closed church, and finds one of his parishioners, Dolores Del Rio.

CONTRIBUTORS

MAX KNEPPER, author of two books, has written widely in critical and literary journals including Forum, Current History and The New Republic.

JEAN COCTEAU - artist, poet, author - is best known in film circles for his two movies: "The Blood of a Poet," a surrealist film still shown regularly in art theatres, and the Cannes Award winner, "Beauty and the Beast," due to open in New York this fall. His statement, which we have titled "Entertainment and Magic," is reprinted from "Le Bulletin de L'Institute des Hautes Etudes Cinématographiques" with their kind permission.

INGOLF DAHL, a close friend and collaborator of Stravinsky, teaches at the University of Southern California where he has a class on film music. His article, "Stravinsky on Film Music," first appeared in Musical Digest, with whose kind permission it is reprinted.

HAROLD J. SALEMSON has spent the last 16 years in Hollywood as correspondent for leading film publications in France. Last year he was director of publications on The Screen Writer, the monthly magazine of the Screen Writers Guild.

HERMAN G. WEINBERG adapted, edited, and edited for American audiences over 100 foreign films; currently running are his "Open City" (Italian), and "The Well Digger's Daughter" (French). As American correspondent for the British Sight and Sound, he is editing a series of Indexes on leading film directors, and is also at work on a book, "Sin and Cinema."

LEWIS JACOBS, screen writer, is author of the authoritative film history: "The Rise of the American Film." He has two film books in preparation: "American Documentary Film Makers," and "Film Structure."

ROGER MANVELL, our British correspondent, is a leading English film critic and author of the excellent Penguin Book, "Film," not yet printed in the U.S. He is currently editor of the National Cinema Series of books of which "Twenty Years of British Film" (reviewed in this issue) is the first.

ROBERT JOSEPH was Film Officer in Berlin and assistant editor of Beaver's Hollywood Spectator. He's now at work on his third novel: "Rifles for Watauga."
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What Makes A Box-Office Hit?

Since Hollywood claims it operates by the box-office, we asked some leading film people, "What makes a movie a box-office hit?"

*TERRY RAMSAYE
Well known critic and Editor of Motion Picture Herald

The picture which is to be a box office hit will in important degree serve an audience of persons of both principal sexes in the age bracket between the later teens and earlier twenties. It will supply them with some basic satisfactions through vicarious experience, and with some eagerly sought information on the processes of loving and living. In that sense, and that chiefly, the motion picture of the entertainment screen is educational. That is enough, and all the customers want.

No matter what the top-lofty persiflage and dressing of the merchandise may profess, the hit picture must be concerned with the service of human concerns which arise from sensory mechanisms and controls south of the navel, all done with both decor and decorum but with precise accuracy. That is decent, proper, fitting. No discoverable challenges to thought or intellectual processes may be profitably involved. Psychology is nothing, physiology is everything. That is because intellectual capacities and interest in abstractions, even though slight, are rare indeed, while nearly all of the customers have acute biological interests and attributes. The motion picture is far too expensive for the service of the minds of the few, while the instincts of the many are yearning. That is not at all depreciatory, but plain business sense—economic determinism is the word for it.

The pabulum delivered on the screen is properly to be as elaborately decorated as the bridge club's luncheon salad, or the wedding cake, but the stuff inside must be the time proved McCoy. It is proved because it is both right and correct. That is inevitable because the typical human organism, which is to say the customer, is born so soon and dies so young, having commonly little capacity and never ever time enough for concerns much beyond the requirements of the reproduction cycle.

The hit picture must achieve the indicated approach despite the frosting on the cake, by simple devices of narration. The bad characters must be bad, the good must be good. The writing is to be done in black and white, even if the rendition is in color. It is almost impossible to make the picture too simple, or too obvious, and that is most proper. The persons of that great buying-power-majority do not go to the theatre to reflect and study, to concern themselves with anything save their immediate personal interests, which are even more plainly defined by the content of the newspapers' cartoon pages.

All this is normal, healthy, adequate. A picture which adequately and gracefully serves the indicated audience and its wishes is a genuine work of art. The best producers do it that way with conscious skill, or, in some instances, with unconscious skill. Anyway it is skill.

If you would rather read a book and dream your own pictures, that's your business. Pictures are made for customers and they have the authority.

*EMMET LAVERY
Distinguished Screen Writer and President of The Screen Writers Guild

I am naive enough to believe that two simple but rather rare ingredients are responsible for the biggest box office hits... a little thing called taste and a bigger thing called faith... faith in one's self... faith in one's associates... and faith above all in the audience which is to be served.

The truth is—though few people in Hollywood are ready to admit it—the film audiences are far ahead of most of the people who make the pictures and the people who sell the pictures. If we were really prepared to "give the public what it wants," films would be vastly better than they are at the present time.

Now, as in years past, we are inclined to take the easy way... to look on films as a glorified peep show... and rationalize away our own lazy thinking and our own uninspired salesmanship with some slandering reflections on the mental age of our audiences and the particular range of their emotional interests.

The truth is the making of pictures is all too often a salesmen's game. Fortunately for us, most people go to films as a habit. There isn't the same element of personal selection that there is in the theatre. Yet precisely because of this habit of picture going, films could easily be as fine as we could make them. Since we have the salesmanship to sell nearly anything, why not sell the good instead of the mediocre?


Not too bad, is it? Not too inspired in spots but not too discouraging either. And you'll find about the same general range if you take the ten biggest grossers of any year or the ten biggest grossers of all time. From all of which I reach one conclusion: the limitations we face are in ourselves not in our audiences.

Oh, I know—some people will reach at once for the figures on "Duel in the Sun" and I will not deny
that here and there through the years we can find films which seem to justify a more cynical approach to the tastes of the average audience. But the record also shows that, when something is offered that is new and exciting and dramatically sound, the audience will respond to it just as easily as they do to the old routines of “Duel in the Sun.” Need one mention “Going My Way” or “The Bells of St. Mary” by way of reminder?

Surely now, of all times, is a poor time to sell our audiences short. In the face of a dwindling box office, it behooves us to think how we might attract to the films those discriminating millions which Dr. Gallup assures us seldom if ever set foot inside our cinema palaces. Obviously, these new audiences want something more than a glorified peep show. So too the present audiences who are starting to stay away—in droves.

*SAMUEL GOLDWYN

Thalberg Award Producer of “The Best Years of Our Lives”

A fine picture makes a box-office hit. It must be produced in good taste, and have a story that holds people’s interest—one in which they find a resemblance to their own lives. That is the only formula for a box-office hit I know.

*LEO McCAREY

Eminent Director of “Going My Way”

Fancy budgets, color processes, huge casts, and even star names—except, of course, that you have fine acting—are all attractive but fussy superstructure compared to the really vital ingredient in every outstanding box-office hit: a warm, human story projected in emotional dimensions which are universally comprehensible.

Other things help, but an appealing story line is indispensable. No picture, no matter how flashy or sensational its introduction or how topical its theme, ever hobbles over into the class with the box-office giants on a weak or trite story.

Sound, color and all the other technological advances of the motion picture screen soon become taken for granted but the great stories live on, pulling in theatre patrons all over the world for years after their initial release.

*WALTER WANGER

Prominent Independent Producer of “Smash Up”

I would like to know.

MOVIES AND DELINQUENCY

by MAX KNEPPER

The American motion picture industry faces the most serious threat of legal censorship in its existence with perhaps the exception of the early twenties when the Hays Office came into being. In addition to the various religious groups which sporadically attack films, the current censorship wave has been swollen by support of parent-teacher organizations, some prominent social workers, certain government officers, and one or two powerful newspaper chains.

What has given the impetus for federal censorship special drive is the belief by many movie goers that films are a primary cause of juvenile delinquency. This belief has been created by statements from juvenile authorities, a few educators, and one or two highly-placed law enforcement officers attributing to movies a baneful influence on the minds of the immature. Since the increase in crime, especially among the young, has become a frightening reality, many people otherwise cool to the idea of government censorship of films now accept it as a necessary evil.

Recently the International News Service carried a story in which John S. Cowgill, Probation Officer of San Mateo County, was quoted to this effect: “Hollywood’s glamorous spell cast over America’s young and the nationwide increase in divorces are cited as major causes of mounting juvenile delinquency.”

If Hollywood is really responsible for the current moral breakdown, then any responsible person should have to concede, reluctantly or otherwise, that some measure of social control must be exercised over both themes and treatment of movies.

But are films actually a measureable influence as a crime inciter? Before we place one of our leading art mediums—one that is potentially great—in the strait jacket of censorship, we owe it to ourselves to make sure that the sacrifice will be worthwhile.

Eric Johnston, President of the Motion Pictures Producers Association, in his defense of the industry warns: “Both honest and dishonest critics are heading toward the same peril in advocating new barriers.” Mr. Johnston’s division of Hollywood’s critics is worth noting. Some of the most zealous advocates of a federal or state-wide censorship of films are organizations to whom the delinquency issue is only a means to an end. Their ends are legal power to coerce producers to suppress ideas and ways of life with which they do not agree. Such groups, whether religious or political, should be resisted to the bitter end.

There is no denying, however, that many honest parents and group leaders have come to believe that motion pictures exercise a pernicious moral influence on youthful spectators and weak-minded adults. A serious study of thousands of recent delinquency cases would be very valuable. Unfortunately, no such study has been made. As a result, the observer has
only the opinions of authorities—responsible or other-
wise—to guide him.

Probation Officer Cowgill, for instance, is quoted
as castigating the movies’ modes of conduct in these
terms: “the semi-nudity and marriage with a second
or third spouse are perverting the hero worship of
American youngsters.”

Unfortunately, Mr. Cowgill, or the reporter who
quoted him, did not see fit to elaborate on his accusa-
tion What movies contributed to whose delinquency?
In an effort to find out, we addressed several questions
to this official. Assuming that in his capacity as pro-
bation officer of a populous California county he must
have had a number of case histories on which to base
his criticisms of a popular entertainment, we inquired
if he would name even one motion picture directly
responsible for one criminal act by one of his cases.
Mr. Cowgill was either too busy or too indifferent to
acknowledge our communication.

Opposed to his quoted remarks, however, are the
statements of equally prominent officers, Dr. Carlton
Simon and Dr. George Kirchway. Dr. Simon, some-
time psychiatrist of the New York Police Department,
denies that films exercise a sinister influence on
their spectators. Dr. Kirchway, former warden of
Sing Sing, declares that in no instance has he been
able to blame motion pictures as the real cause of a
criminal career.

In the absence of definite proof, it is difficult to
accept the belief that motion pictures incite even im-
mature human beings to acts of violence or moral
decadence. Is there really any basis for believing that
such pictures as “Scarface,” “High Sierra,” “Dead
End,” or any of the hundreds of crime-gangster-tough
pictures of the last fifteen years have influenced any
youth to take revolver in hand and embark upon a
career of crime?

Motion picture plots, like those of most novels and
short stories, involve crime or anti-social acts. Gener-
ally speaking, fiction and drama depend upon the
conflict between good and evil for their interest. With-
out evil—whether in the form of a gangster, a

seducer, a conscienceless money-lender, or an un-
scrupulous siren—there would be no action. If plots
are developed in such a manner as to represent a
triumph of evil over the forces which society has
determined as ‘good,’ and if this triumph is presented as
desirable, then such dramas might properly be termed
anti-social and dangerous. But in Hollywood’s case the
opposite is invariably true. The villain—except in those
rare instances when the villain is Death—is always
crushed. Righteousness, whether in the form of an
honest husband, a pure wife, a crusading reporter, an
American airforce captain, a refugee from the Gestapo,
who is a strong cowboy, or even John Law, attains victory. If
worsted temporarily by Evil, it is only to provide sus-
pense and fall in 90 minutes of entertainment before the
climactic triumph.

The same formula prevails in such divergent maga-
azines as Saturday Evening Post and Cosmopolitan.
More realistic fiction which doubts whether God’s
in his heaven and all’s right with the world never
finds its way to the American screen.

The study of Shakespeare is required in all Ameri-
can high schools and most university English courses.
Yet when we analyze Shakespeare what do we find?
In Macbeth the motivating forces are treachery, mur-
der, and even infanticide. Hamlet treats of murder,
incest, and adultery. The plot of Othello involves envy,
malice, lying, jealousy, murder, and suicide. King
Lear, comparatively wholesome, is the story of filial
ingratitude with a few side glimpses of adultery.
None of these great tragedies could appear on the
American screen unexpurgated.

A small percentage of fiction and drama can depend
upon nature or superficial conflicts of personality to
provide plot motivation, but in main literature and the
theatre require a struggle between the good and evil
in human beings for their appeal.

There is room for argument that motion pictures
do violate some theological precepts. Devout Cath-
lids can scarcely help but be offended by the free and
easy divorce portrayed on the screen. Methodists are

(continued on page 21)

## Entertainment and Magic

by JEAN COCTEAU

translated by Jeremy Ice

I am categorically opposed to popular entertain-
ment (as such), because I believe that all good enter-
tainment is popular entertainment. For proof of this,
notice how the public overflows the movie houses
answering the magic touch of the film projector.

The most important public has no preconceptions.
It takes its opinions neither from the author nor from
the actors. It believes. By the most important public
I mean children—the best of all audiences.

A film, created without the slightest moral or soc-
ial idea, but created passionately, runs the risk of
being inadequately seen through distorted lenses,
by an exclusive audience. Once over that hurdle, the
film can breath, walk, live.

Our role will be to construct a solid table, not to
make it revolve. A carver of ebony cannot possibly be
a spiritualist medium, and vica versa.

The collective hypnotism fostered by the movie hous-
es, with their audiances plunged into darkness and
light, very closely resembles that of a spiritualist
seance. Thus, a film releases other forces than might
appear. No one can possibly foretell in what degree.
The dose of love contained in a film will work more
effectively on the masses than the substles of magic
potions.

To summarize myself: I know of no elite, no trib-
unal, that can presume to say what forces a film may
release in its unmeasurable travels. The only possible
judgement of a film must concern its style, its expan-
sive power. The remainder is a mystery, and will al-
ways remain so.
As Igor Stravinsky is eminently a “contemporary” composer and decidedly a “modernist,” it is sometimes difficult to remember that this Russian innovator in tone, born in 1882, was already 15 years old when Brahms died. It is almost as hard to realize today that the “Firebird,” “Petrushka” and “Rite of Spring” ballets were composed prior to the outbreak of World War I, while “Histoire du Soldat” was created before that war ended. Even much later “Symphony of Psalms,” which had been composed for the fiftieth anniversary of the Boston Symphony, dates as far back as 1930. Such biographical details are worth mention, not only for the record but as collateral tribute to the vitality and verve of the composer and his creations. As for the man himself, his opinions on the relation of music to moving pictures set forth in this article acquire additional weight and momentum, of course, because Stravinsky’s “Sacre du Printemps” (“Rite of Spring”) reached the celluloid in Walt Disney’s “Fantasia.”

Some of the Russian’s views may startle some readers; hardly one reader will be shocked into anything less profitable than a fresh examination of his own opinions.

Igor Stravinsky

on

FILM MUSIC

as told to INGOHOF DAHL

What is the function of music in moving pictures? What, you ask, are the particular problems involved in music for the screen? I can answer both questions briefly. And I must answer them bluntly. There are no musical problems in the film. And there is only one real function of film music—namely, to feed the composer! In all frankness I find it impossible to talk to film people about music because we have no common meeting ground; their primitive and childish concept of music is not my concept. They have the mistaken notion that music, in “helping” and “explaining” the cinematic shadowplay, could be regarded under artistic considerations. It cannot be.

Do not misunderstand me. I realize that music is an indespensable adjunct to the sound film. It has got to bridge holes; it has got to fill the emptiness of the screen and supply the loudspeakers with more or less pleasant sounds. The film could not get along without it, just as I myself could not get along without having the empty spaces of my living room walls covered with wall paper. But you would not ask me, would you, to regard my wall paper as I would regard painting, or apply aesthetic standards to it?

Misconceptions arise at the very outset of such a discussion when it is asserted that music will help the drama by underlining and describing the characters and the action. Well, that is precisely the same fallacy which has so disastrously affected the true opera through the “Musikdrama.” Music explains nothing; music underlines nothing. When it attempts to explain, to narrate, or to underline something, the effect is both embarrassing and harmful.

What, for example, is “sad” music? There is no sad music, there are only conventions to which part of the western world has unthinkingly become accustomed through repeated associations. These conventions tell us that Allegro stands for rushing action, Adagio for tragedy, suspension harmonies for sentimental feeling, etc. I do not like to base premises on wrong deductions, and these conventions are far removed from the essential core of music.

And—to ask a question myself—why take film music seriously? The film people admit themselves that at its most satisfactory it should not be heard as
such. Here I agree. I believe that it should not hinder
or hurt the action and that it should fill its wallpaper
function by having the same relationship to the drama
that restaurant music has to the conversation at the
individual restaurant table. Or that somebody's piano
playing in my living room has to the book I am read-
ing.

The orchestral sounds in films, then, would be
like a perfume which is indefinable there. But let it be
clearly understood that such perfume "explains" no-
thing and "narrates" nothing; and, moreover, I can
not accept is as music. Mozart once said: "Music is
there to delight us, that is its calling." In other words,
music is too high an art to be a servant to other arts;
it is too high to be absorbed only by the subconscious
of the spectator, if it still wants to be considered as
music.

Furthermore, the fact that some good composers
have composed for the screen does not alter these
basic considerations. Decent composers will offer the
films decent pages of background score; they will
supply more "listenable" sounds than other compos-
ers; but even they are subject to the basic rules of
the film which, of course, are primarily commercial.
The film makers know that they need music, but they
prefer music which is not very new. When, for com-
cmercial reasons, they employ a composer of repute,
they want him to write this kind of "not very new"
music—which, of course, results in nothing but musical
disaster.

I have been asked whether my own music, writ-
ten for the ballet and the stage, would not be compara-
ble in its dramatic connotation to music in the films.
It cannot be compared at all. The days of "Petrov-
ka" are long past, and whatever few elements of
realistic description can be found in its pages fail to
be representative of my thinking now. My music ex-
presses nothing of realistic character, and neither
does the dance. The ballet consists of movements
which have their own aesthetic and logic, and if one
of those movements should happen to be a visual-
ization of the words "I Love You," then this refer-
cence to the external world would play the same role
in the dance (and in my music) that a guitar in a
Picasso still-life would play: something of the world
is caught as pretext or clothing for the inherent ab-
straction. Dancers have nothing to narrate and neither
has my music. Even in older ballets like "Giselle,"
descriptiveness has been removed—by virtue of its
naiveté, its unpretentious traditionalism and its simp-
licity—to a level of objectivity and pure art-play.

My music for the stage, then, never tries to
"explain" the action, but rather it lives side by side
with the visual movement, happily married to it, as
one individual to another. In "Scenes de Ballet" the
dramatic action was given by an evolution of plastic
problems, and both dance and music had to be con-
structed on the architectural feeling for contrast and
similarity.

The danger in the visualization of music on the
screen—and a very real danger it is—is that the film
has always tried to "describe" the music. That is
absurd. When Balanchine did a choreography to my
"Danses Concertantes" (originally written as a piece
of concert music) he approached the problem archi-
tecturally and not descriptively. And his success was
extraordinary for one great reason: he went to the
roots of the musical form, of the jeu musical, and re-
created it in forms of movements. Only if the films
should ever adopt an attitude of this kind is it pos-
sible that a satisfying and interesting art form would
result.

The dramatic impact of my "Histoire du Soldat"
has been cited by various critics. There, too, the re-
sult was achieved, not by trying to write music
which, in the background, tried to explain the dra-
matic action, or to carry the action forward descriptively,
the procedure followed in the cinema. Rather was it
the simultaneity of stage, narration, and music which
was the object, resulting in the dramatic power of the
whole. Put music and drama together as individual
entities, put them together and let them alone, without
compelling one to try to "explain" and to react to the
other. To borrow a term from chemistry: my ideal is
the chemical reaction, where a new entity, a third
body, results from uniting two different but equally
important elements, music and drama; it is not the
chemical mixture where, as in the films, to the preor-
dained whole just the ingredient of music is added,
resulting in nothing either new or creative. The entire
working methods of the dramatic film exemplify this.

All these reflections are not to be taken as a point-
blank refusal on my part ever to work for the film. I
do not work for money, but I need it, as everybody
does. Chesterton tells about Charles Dickens' visit to
America. The people who had invited him to lecture
here were astonished, it seems, about his interest in
fees and contracts. "Money is not a shocking thing to
an artist," Dickens insisted. Likewise there will be
nothing shocking to me in offering my professional
capacities to a film studio for remuneration.

If I am asked whether the dissemination of good
concert music in the cinema will help to create a more
understanding mass audience, I can only answer that
here again we must beware of dangerous misconcep-
tions. My first premise is that good music must be
heard by and for itself, and not with the crutch of any
visual medium. If you start to explain the "meaning"
of music you are on the wrong path. Such absurd
"meanings" will invariably be established by the im-
age, if only through automatic association. That is
an extreme disservice to music. Listeners will never
be able to hear music by and for itself, but only for
what it represents under given circumstances and gi-
ven instructions. Music can be useful, I repeat, only
when it is taken for itself. It has to play its own role
if it is to be understood at all. And for music to be use-
ful to the individual we must above all teach the self-
sufficiency of music, and you will agree that the cine-
ma is a poor place for that! Even under the best con-
ditions it is impossible for the human brain to follow
the ear and the eye at the same time.

And even listening is itself not enough, granted
that it be understood in its best sense: the training of
the ear. To listen only is too passive and creates a
taste and judgment which are too general, too indis-
criminate. Only in limited degree can music be helped
through increased listening: much more important is
the making of music. The playing of an instrument,
actual production of some kind or other, will make
music accessible and helpful to the individual, not the
passive consumption in the darkness of a neighbor-
hood theatre.

And it is the individual that matters, never the
mass. The "mass," in relationship to art, is a quantita-
tive term which has never once entered into my consi-
(Continued on page 21)
THE ROLE OF THE DIRECTOR

by HAROLD J. SALEMSON

Under the Hollywood set-up, it is almost impossible to determine the director's responsibility for a film he signs, just as it is impossible to evaluate the contribution of the film's producer or writer, unless one has been intimately associated with the work during its production. Yet, by tradition and, to a large extent, with justification, the director has been regarded throughout the history of films as the key man of the industry.

Jean Benoit-Levy, film director of UNESCO, in his recent book, "The Art of the Film," gives a chart in which the director (or film author as he is referred to in France) is the keystone, with the producer and writer indicated as making minor contributions, administratively and creatively, to his work.

For France, this graph is correct except in those big companies which have American assembly-line methods. There, generally speaking, the director in an independent venture (as the majority of good French films are) is really what we in Hollywood would call a producer-writer-director. The nominal producer is simply the man that the director gets to put up the money, or the representative of the money-bags. The writers contribute, at most, the original idea (whether in book, play or scenario form) plus some collaboration with the director in the actual writing which he himself does in the preparatory stages—that is, the elaboration of his shooting script as a guide to the remainder of his work, which will be done on the sound stages, in the cutting room, and on the scoring stage.

In England, a similar set-up prevails in most of the independent units that exist within the Rank Organization. There, however, the responsibility may devolve more completely on a producer-director or a producer-writer with whom, under any circumstances, the additional writer or director works in the closest kind of teamwork. This teamwork obtains in the U.S. S.R. (as pointed out in Konstantin Simonov's analysis of writer-director relations in The Screen Writer for June, 1946), in Czechoslovakia, in Italy and in other countries where motion picture organization has not followed the Hollywood pattern.

Only the mechanics and economics of Hollywood have brought about the sharp and arbitrary differentiation between producer, director, and writer: which exists here. The reasons for the differentiation are a subject in themselves. But a brief historical glance may illuminate the role which the director has played, does play, and should play in Hollywood.

In the early silent days, the Hollywood director held much the same position that his counterpart still holds in France today. He got the idea for the story (original or from his own reading), usually wrote the adaptation (often from scene to scene as he shot it), and was responsible for the overall quality of the finished product.

As the industry grew and, particularly, as sound came in, an artificial divorcement arose between the functions of the writer and the director. Film making took on assembly-line methods and the characteristics of B pictures put in their appearance.

In many a Hollywood studio today, directors have been known to be called by a producer a (Darryl Zanuck habit when at Warners, notably) on a few hours notice and told to shoot such and such a script. A famous European director was handed a script by Hal Wallis some years ago and told to shoot it, even though, a newcomer to this country he felt that he could not handle a subject with an American locale. When he finally agreed to do it he was expected to shoot the script as written for him even though it became apparent on the set that certain lines should be changed for naturalness of expression and that it was impossible to furnish close-ups, called for in the script, of the aging star who was supposed to be playing an 18 year old boy.

The justification for this (if any were given) was that movies were more and more like stageplays, of which the director (a minor character at best) is expected to stage them as the playwright wrote them, making only such changes as physical properties might require. The argument was, of course, false. And in the theatre, even though the director is there so patiently less important, a very similar dichotomy exists: a playwright like the late Emjo Basshe considered his job had only started when he finished the writing and that the directing which he did himself was the real creative work. He looked with scorn on "non-theatrical" playwrights who only write scripts and let others stage them. (Since then, an increasing number of first-line playwrights—Lillian Hellman, George S. Kaufman, Moss Hart, and others - have been doubling as directors of their own plays and even the plays of others.)

Yet, in the theatre, the mechanical apparatus is much less important and the script is an end in itself— a play often can be enjoyed as much in the reading as in the watching. In films, the complexity of the camera work, the lighting effects, the angles selected, the rhythm of the cutting, the score, and so on, are such that until now there has hardly been a movie script that makes sense as literature to be read. No writer (knowing the film craft as intimately as a good director does) has yet created the literary form in which to make the reader appreciate what all these technical aspects of the film would be if he saw it on the screen.

Films should not be assembled as are automobiles or mechanical orange squeezers. There are intangibles of mood, inspiration, and subtlety of characterization which can scarcely be expressed. It would take tremendous technical skill on the part of the screen writer to write a script complete with such detail of shading and feeling that a director who had not been in on its preparation could understand exactly what was being aimed at.

However, at the risk of sounding contradictory, I still believe that 90 per cent of the value of most (Continued on page 21)
NEW FILMS FROM ABROAD

by HERMAN G. WEINBERG

As contenders for "inclusion among the ten best films of 1946, foreign films breathed hotly on the necks of their Hollywood cousins in the finals of the race. "Henry V," "Brief Encounter," "Open City," "The Well Digger's Daughter," etc., left almost every American film, with a few notable exceptions, of course, at the post. Here, then, is the first batch of contenders for the 1947 honors from England, Italy, France, Denmark, Sweden and Czechoslovakia that have arrived in the first months of this year and which are currently being prepared for release this Summer and Autumn:

From England, "This Happy Breed," another Noel Coward cavalcade of English family life, this time between two wars, and in Technicolor. Every quality that distinguished Coward's "Brief Encounter" is again present in all departments—scenario, acting, dialogue, direction, "The Captive Heart," a sort of "Grand Illusion" in miniature without the latter's profundity and haunting morbiditas but quietly moving in its own way—a story of German prison camp life, actually shot in one such prison shortly after the war's end. The closing scenes of cross-cutting a fireworks celebration with scenes of felicity are nostalgically reminiscent of the sort of thing the German director Pommer used to do in the pre-Hitler Ufa days. I have not seen "Great Expectations," but advance reports are very promising.

From Italy have come two of major stature—Rosselini's "Paisan" (an episodic picture of G.I. life in Italy by the director of "Open City"), also preceded by most favorable advance reports, and "Shoe Shine." The latter is an almost terrifying study of the war orphaned waifs who roamed the streets of any large Italian city shortly after the liberation. A sort of Italian "Road to Life," it lacks only the marvelous rehabilitative scenes of the Soviet film to equal it in stature. Otherwise, its study of boys wavering between childhood and a too quickly reached maturity achieved moments of excruciating catharsis. Most of the action takes place in a juvenile prison—an apt setting against which to throw into sharp relief the ills of modern society. There are touches of superb humor, nevertheless, amid its ferocity, anger and tears—attesting to the incredible recuperative powers of that which always remains essentially decent in the human psyche, no matter what.

France has sent "La Cage aux Rossignols" (A Cage of Nightingales), a similar film but much lighter and played for comedy with the ever ingratiating Noel-Noel. Again the setting is a sort of juvenile prison; but, as in "Road to Life," the scenes of rehabilitating the "errant" children (through teaching them to sing, a cappella) lifts the film and gives it wings. Charming is the word for it. To have made so lighthearted a film under the occupation is a testament to the indomitable French spirit. Another Noel-Noel comedy, "Le Pere Tranquil," dealing with the resistance, is pervaded with dry humor plus natural suspense in its story of a quiet, little horticulturist who is a leader of the underground. This film was made after the liberation, yet the spirit of both "La Cage aux Rossignols" and "Le Pere Tranquil" are the same. How hollow must the Nazi boots have sounded on the cobblestones of the French streets!

Jean Cocteau's "Beauty and the Beast" is here, too, far less surrealistic than his Melanie of blood and froth, "Blood of a Poet" (and perhaps just as well), but with just enough to give the average spectator the titillation he expects from Cocteau. Jean Marais is handsome as Beauty's beau and later the Prince as he is frightening as the Beast, and Josette Day is very pretty, indeed, as Beauty. Her two wicked sisters are wicked as they can be; the photography, especially of the exteriors, is lovely; the compositions smiting; the settings and costumes of Christian Berard highly decorative—like the more recherche perfume ads—and, indeed, it is that rara avis among French films, a picture that will please both children and adults for the same reasons. It is less poetic than it promises to be but it always glitters even though all its glitter is not always gold.

"Sortileges" is a fine study of superstition among the farmers of some mountain regions in France, also made during the occupation (when the French film makers bided their time with "escapist" themes). "The Honorable Catherine" gives Edwige Feuillere a workout in a very strenuous comedy which, in its early reels, harks back to the director Lubitsch of "Kiss Me Again." "Etoile Sans Lumiere" satirizes the coming of sound to the movies and, though no great shakes as a comedy, gives one an opportunity to see and hear the deservedly famous music-hall soubrette, Edith Piaff. "Panique," Julian Duvivier's first French film since the war, wastes the talents of two fine players, Michel Simon and Viviane Romance, in a lurid story relieved only by a slick production and unusually luxurious black and white photography. "Vautrin" is a good version of a Balzac story with Michel Simon and "Colonel Chabert" is an equally good version of another Balzac story with the late Raimu—the former being slightly the better film. Raimu will also be seen in his last film, "The Man in the Round Hat," from Dostoevsky's "The Eternal Husband," again proving how felicitous the French are at adapting Dostoevsky for the screen, as vide the memorable pre-war "Crime et Chatiment." As additional proof there is "The Idiot," acutely directed and played, retaining a modicum of the gloomy Russian's compassion for the human race. (One recalls, also, such fine adaptations from Gorky and Pushkin in the French film versions of "The Lower Depths," directed by Renoir, and "La Dame de Pique," directed by Ozep.)

Others include another wonderful comedy from the pen of that seemingly inexhaustible fountain of Provencal humor—Marcel Pagnol—in the film, "Nais," elaborated by Pagnol from a story by Zola, with the great Fernandel in the role of a hunchback bitter at (continued on page 22)
“MONSIEUR VERDOUX”


reviewed by LEWIS JACOBS

Chaplin's newest comedy, “Monsieur Verdoux”—his first in more than six years—is his most serious and totally successful. In its social purpose it is bolder and more incisive than anything he has yet made. Furthermore, it signals a sharp break with the Chaplin of the past—the traditional romantic who moves uncertain and helpless in a world he does not understand. In this new film Chaplin shows he understands the world only too well. In this sense, “Monsieur Verdoux” is a new coming-of-age of a significant film maker and a solid contribution to the American screen.

In the past, Chaplin’s films were nearly all variations on one theme: protest against the crushing of the individual by social forces. His comedy emphasized the human against regimentation and pleaded for the rights of the individual. In these pictures—except for the role of Hitler in “The Great Dictator”—Chaplin was a ‘little’ man, the butt of jests and harassed by poverty, the law, and social forces he can neither understand nor resist. Always this protagonist was confused, bewildered, slapped-about, a poignant symbol of the common man. But in “Monsieur Verdoux” the protagonist is no longer the fumbling, pathetic little man in baggy pants. That sartorial symbol has been discarded for the natty waistcoat, ascot tie and striped trousers of the new Chaplin character, the modern business man. Verdoux is no “Charlie,” the dreamer thinking of pie-in-the-sky, but a hardboiled cynic, an executive, who, as stated by Chaplin himself, is wise to the ways of the world based on a business immorality and acts accordingly. The metamorphosis is evidence of a new intellectual development.

The plot of “Monsieur Verdoux” is simple and ingenious, but sharp and eloquent in its social commentary. The depression of 1930 has cost Verdoux, a bank clerk, his job. Since he has a wife and child whom he loves and must support, he resorts to the business of marrying women and killing them for their money. “I am in business,” says Verdoux, “and I must do my duty after the classic heroic mode.” Nevertheless he considers himself a very moral man; he never lets these women touch him. He hates his work; he hates the women.

Though the story is laid in pre-war France it has meaning to people all over the world today. For, it is obvious from the satirical way Chaplin tells it, the motion picture is not just a funny story of a murderer but a witty travesty on an unethical business-minded society.

A free-flowing cartoon alive with clowning and gags, its humor reaches wild caprice, rowdy slapstick and low burlesque. In a desperate attempt to get fifty thousand francs before morning, Verdoux makes passionate love to a rich victim, who has come to lease the house of a wealthy widow he has just finished off, by playing ring around the trunk with her. Again, later in the film, Verdoux takes one of his wives for a boat ride in order to drown her, having failed to kill her in bed. His ludicrous attempts to throw her overboard, tied to a heavy rock, fail. He then tries to chloroform her only to succeed in chloroforming himself. When she revives him, he attempts to push her overboard again but instead falls into the lake himself and she has to rescue him! During another sequence Verdoux reproves one of his wives for buying a phoney diamond. Angrily he shouts: “It’s glass you ass!”

Underneath the film’s broad gayety can be dis-
cerned a deeper intention, Daumier-like in its irony. Scenes of charm and sentiment around the family hearth, gardening, polite after-dinner conversation with neighbors, succinctly capture the desultory, half-satisfied life of the middle class. Bombastic and extravagant dialogue of wooing victims for their belongings and nothing else glaringly reveals the 'Bluebeard's' life as one of spiritless conflicts and drives, of nerve racking fears of business ruin, of frightened infidelities and forced enthusiasms. Merciless and unceasing attempts at liquidation, none the less ruthless for operating with fine clothes, wide smiles and flattering phrases, exposes the heartlessness and lack of ethics at the core of business.

With the pungent broad strokes of a crusading caricaturist, Chaplin directs each of the six women in the film as pursuing personal ambitions, unaware of the materialistic forces which shape their lives. Lena Gouvaix, the spinster sister of Verdoux's first victim is a self-centered, grasping woman, head of the selfish Gouvix clan. Marie Grosnay, the wealthy loveless widow who comes to buy Verdoux's house, is a vain, inhibited social snob. Lydia Foray, a wife living alone in a provincial town, is an untrusting greedy woman torn between aviance and fear. Annabella Bonheur, another wife is a lusty, pleasure seeking, insatiable animal. In contrast to the harshness of these women are the soft, sentimentalized etchings of the other two, Mona. Verdoux's first wife and mother of his child, is a cripple forced to get around on a wheel chair. The Girl, an orphan, is a street waif.

To each of these women, Verdoux is a different man, always mysteriously appearing and mysteriously rushing away. To the spinster Lena, he is a scoundrel who married her rich sister instead of her. To the widow Marie, he is an explorer passionately breaking down the barriers of convention and opening up the dark continent of love. To the lonely Lydia, he is an engineer constructing dream castles which someday she hopes to inherit. To good-time Annabella, he is a ship's captain, the proverbial sailor coming into port only to give her a good time. To his wife Mona, he is the husband returning from business trips to dole out sentiment and support. To The Girl, he is the father offering advice and protection.

Through his relations with these women we discover in Verdoux a complex character, two men at war with each other. One is a heartless materialist, a 'business' man intent on murder and rushing across the countryside in a mad effort to secure enough money to prevent the liquidation of his falling stock. The other is a tender husband and father revealing himself in speeches of warmth and little intimations of love. Acted by Chaplin in consummate style, the two sided portrait lays bare the conflict between good and evil in the heart of a business-minded society.

The two forces come to a climax in the scene between Verdoux and The Girl. At first his intention is to murder her. Not from any motives of immediate cash—she is penniless. But simply to try out his new product, a painless poison that leaves no trace, which if successful will prove very profitable in his 'business.' But when he learns that the girl has lost her lover in the war, that she has just been released from jail and that she bears no bitterness against the world, that in fact she still retains all the illusions and faith of a sensitive child, Verdoux is reminded of his own lost illusions as a poor struggling bank clerk, and, moved, he spares her life. He becomes fatherly, telling her the facts of life and even giving her some money to go to a hotel. The moral is obvious: the evil in man can be conquered by a return to the ideals and faith of childhood.

A later twist in the story becomes a brilliant touch of irony. Verdoux meets The Girl again, but he is now penniless. She rides in a luxurious car and wears fine clothes. But he does not recognize her. She tells him she was the waif he once befriended and that she is now the mistress of a munitions magnate. An ironic smile is his answer. Here too the moral is apparent. His failure to recognize her is due to the fact that she is no longer the same girl. No longer the child with illusions, but a business woman who has become successful by embracing the 'classic code' of the business-minded world. And though she may not be a murderer like Verdoux, it is evident that by living with a munitions maker she has joined herself to one who is.

The Girl takes him to a fine hotel restaurant. There he is immediately recognized by Lena, the sister of his first victim who has been searching unsuccessfully for him until now. And now she is able to apprehend him. It is as though Chaplin were saying: in a world based on business ethics, the business man who falls from grace is damned. The two episodes following one upon the other also accents the conclusion inherent in Chaplin's theme: that for the victor as well as for the victim there is no final escape.

Throughout the film, Chaplin makes clear that on the battle-field of business one is likely to lose all at any moment: Verdoux's frantic calls to his stockbroker to give him one day, one hour, ten minutes to get additional thousands with which to bolster his sinking securities: Verdoux counting the stolen spoils of his victims with tightening speed, machine-like, inhuman: Verdoux losing everything, his wife and child, his paper fortune in the economic crash: people big and little, not really knowing what hit them, committing suicide.

The crux of the picture's theme is given by direct reference, through the use of actual newseels, to the rise of Hitler and Mussolini in the period following the economic collapse. People who have lost everything and have no morality to fall back upon, Chaplin points out, will follow 'leaders' who offer them uniforms (fine clothes), promises (false smiles), slogans (flattering phrases) to sterility, slavery, and even war. This is the 'tragedy' as Chaplin himself classifies the picture—a 'tragedy' which serves as a warning.

The very end of the film, in the nature of an epilogue, contains perhaps some of the most forthright dialogue to come out of the American screen. Verdoux, sentenced to die by the guillotine, accepts his fate calmly.

A reporter interviews him:

Reporter
You'll have to admit crime doesn't pay.
Verdoux
No sir. Not in a small way.
Reporter
What do you mean?
Verdoux
To be successful in anything one must be organized.
Reporter
You're not leaving the world with that cynical remark?

(continued on page 23)
"ODD MAN OUT"

reviewed by
ROGER MANVELL
in London

Undoubtedly the best British film since "Brief Encounter" moved the critics to unusual demonstrations of appreciation has been Carol Reed's "Odd Man Out," made for Two Cities Films, a company within the Rank Organization. "Odd Man Out" is the story of the last eight hours of a man's life. He is Johnny McQueen, the leader of an illegal political organization, who early on a winter's evening in Belfast leads a raid on a linen mill to get money for his cause. He unintentionally kills a man, and is severely wounded himself, while his young supporters panic and lose him. He is left to follow a strange odyssey of his own as he seeks shelter and weakens to half-consciousness in the snowy streets at night. The odyssey is beyond his control. The police are after him, while his friends, especially Kathleen, the girl who loves him, are trying to find and succour him, and the whole community is disturbed by the presence of a man whose strength is gone and who for most of those few hours is delirious or unconscious. He passes from hand to hand, startled into delirium by a small, silent child with a roller-skate who finds him lying in an air-raid shelter, helped by the kindness of two suburban women who cannot bring themselves to betray him, and finally, as the night grows thicker and colder, driven into the macabre under-world of a mad artist and a terrified informer.

The energy and beauty of this film place it among the rarer works which have come onto the screen. The camera is used with an intimacy which reveals the inner qualities of human character, and Carol Reed is served by a distinguished cast of players, most of whom are Irish, and most of whom survive the great test of acting in almost continuous close-shot. The sense of locality, the streets, the suburbs, the docks, the narrow tenement studio give both actuality and symbolic reference to the theme of the film. For Carol Reed is not content to limit his film to the pursuit and hunting-down of a wounded and dangerous man. He is concerned to show the cruelty and selfishness, the courage and kindliness, the pity and the terror of human life seen in the perspective of the poet. For this reason the chase becomes an odyssey, and the delirious cry of the dying man on the artist's throne is the last emphasis on the inner theme of the film: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." "Odd Man Out" is a film to shake our complacent assumption that most British cinema is good: its qualities of theme and style make too many of our better films look merely pale and well-meaning.

JUNE 1947
reviewed by ROBERT JOSEPH

This is a prime example of what a reviewer means when he writes that audiences should be thankful for this kind of picture. In a season which has seen a plethora of indifferent pictures, "The Farmer's Daughter" stands out as a gem of a comedy, and the kind of picture which can be recommended for its story, its direction and its acting.

"The Farmer's Daughter" has a simple plot: a pot-boiler, if you like. A country lass comes to the big city, gets a job as a downstairs maid, falls in love with the son of the house, a reputable politician, and after a series of minor complications runs for office herself against his party. Of course, everything is nicely laundered and ironed in the end, and the right guy gets the right gal.

But what lifts the picture above its plot, is its theme. It tells the audience not only to get out and vote, but to check the records of the candidates.

The script writers have infused the picture with some good, solid and bright dialogue. Allen Rivkin and Laura Kerr have made their people natural and human in his fantasy-politico-satire, and have contrived a series of comedy-laden situations. The notion of Charles Bickford as the family butler and family tyrant is a good one, and is played by the actor for most of this film's robust comedy. His mock rivalry with Ethel Barrymore, matriarch of the clan and matriarch of The Party of which her son is a member, is played to the hilt and played for comedy.

Loretta Young plays the Swedish-accented maid with the proper amount of feeling for the role of Katie who eventually runs for Congress. She is played as an unsophisticated and shrewdly naive country girl who outwits the city politicians by an honest platform and a pounding, political sincerity. The role is not overplayed and to these untrained ears her slight Swedish accent was a good comedy delight. Joseph Cotton completes the acting cast of principles and handles himself with his usual clan and presence.

"The Farmer's Daughter" as a satire on politics is a welcome relief from a surfeit of indifferent pictures of this season and seasons past. The best scenes in the film are those which are devoted to the political campaigners and to Katie (Loretta Young) being taught how to deliver a political speech sincerely. The election parades and fanfare are deliciously re-captured, and some members of the audience will undoubtedly squirm a little when they see this travesty on the political life of their own community.

The film is not an answer to those who will seek an 'issue' in the political content of the film. Its satire is directed at those who neglect to vote and those who vote without considering the records of the respective candidates.

It is in this sense, then, that one should be grateful for "The Farmer's Daughter."
"THE BEST YEARS OF OUR LIVES"

as London sees it

by ROGER MANVELL

"The Best Years of our Lives" had an extremely interesting press. The film became the centre for a deal of international discussion. The British critics were first of all greatly moved by it, with the exception of a few writers (mostly ex-service) who found it altogether too emotional. Miss Dilya Powell (Sunday Times) is a sensitive and serious writer, with a great feeling for the emotional values in a film. After claiming that the film in its plot does not differ greatly from many similar Hollywood movies on the same subject, she says:

"Even now, even with the expected pattern taking shape, 'The Best Years of Our Lives' might still have been the outstanding film it is claimed to be. Poignant to the American public who sees in it the reflection of their own maladjustments, it has something to say to a dozen other people: for after all soldiers have returned to more countries than one. What I regret is that Sherwood, Wyler and Goldwyn (for Samuel Goldwyn "presents") should have preferred to say it in such naive, really such rockbottom terms. I have nothing to say against the choice of the simple, the typical character; after all "The Grapes of Wrath" was a film about very simple characters (so, come to that, was "Potemkin"). But for me at any rate, 'The Best Years of Our Lives' never lifts the simple human being out of the realistic level into the level of creative imagination. Not that I do not recognize in the film several passages dealing carefully and delicately with a complicated human situation: the passage, for instance, where the cripple acquaints the girl with the facts of his mutilation, or the airman's reverie, crouched in the nose of the disused, broken plane. The settings are honorably lacking in grandeur; these people live in small houses and apartments in a modest town. And the camera work (by Gregg Toland) beautifully underlines the solidity of the scene. The piece, in fact is made with all the skill Hollywood has learned in thirty odd years of cinema. But it is made down to its public. Which is a very different matter from creating popularly within the limits of a popular art."

Miss Elizabeth Frank (News Chronicle) claims she was unmoved when she says:

"In the solving of their problems the director uses no short cuts; nor are there any Hollywood miracles to help them on their way. In this sense, William Wyler has left nothing to the imagination. "The direction is admirable and the acting restrained and intelligent, at times brilliant. Yet for all this, the film left me strangely unmoved."

Miss Lejeune (The Observer) touches the root of the British reaction to this film, in spite of obvious and wide-spread columns of admiration:

"'The Best Years of Our Lives' is a beautifully managed film which is clearly designed, with calculated craftsmanship, for an American audience. What seems to us over here like emotional longeurs are incidental to the American style; it is the national trait to exaggerate gaiety, to press home sentimental points to which we would merely allude in passing if we could even bring ourselves to mention them. The emotional candour that was all wrong in 'Mrs. Miniver' is all right in "The Best Years of Our Lives"; it is as much a documentary fact as the square-built tailorings, the cool glasses of milk in the ice-box, the pattern of town and highway and railroad seen from a low-flying airplane.

"This is a picture that no Englishman could have made, or would have made if he could. In its sentiment, its code of accepted behaviour, and its attitude toward a job of work done, it is wholly foreign to our temperament. It would be the greatest mistake to judge this clever and beautifully acted film by our own standards of decorum; because the people in it happen to speak our language. 'The Best Years of Our Lives' is as indigenuous as 'Symphonie Pastorale' or 'Les Enfants du Paradis'; it deserves the clear judgment we should be prepared to give to any other foreign picture. I do not hesitate to say that if Fred and Homer and Al had spoken French, and the lower half of the screen had been cluttered up with sub-titles, the most exigent connoisseurs would queue in the snow for hours to see it."

The British and American reactions to each other as revealed in film criticism would offer a useful study for some neutral sociologist to survey. It may be dawning on Americans that the old-fashioned trans-Atlantic interpretation of us (a proud, aloof, haughty race trained through the centuries to be either Dukes or Butlers or Cockneys) may well have been too specialized to be true. There is no doubt at all in the mind of this British writer that the British are reserved about emotional matters (reserved, not solid or unmoved) and that they find many American films over-emotional. What is over-emotional does not move them so profoundly as the emotion that is implied and therefore left to the imagination. Hence the British passion for understatement of their emotions in the best of their films (some of the war films, and more recently "Brief Encounter," are examples). Yet these films, and more recently still "Old Man Out" (directed by Carol Reed, with James Mason) were for us most emotionally moving experiences. To carry comparisons further, the emotional values in French films are different from those in either British or American pictures. The best that can be said on this subject is that each nation should be true to itself, making its films as its artists feel they reflect most sincerely the way their fellow-countrymen behave. "Brief Encounter" will tell America about Britain: "The Best Years of Our Lives" will tell Britain about America. The bad films made in both countries merely serve to confirm all the wrong prejudices.

JUNE 1947
AUDIENCE

What do movie-goers want? The producers decided that it was about time they asked themselves this question. The MPA research department's first annual report to President Eric Johnston urged a comprehensive survey of film audiences here and abroad.

Report declared: "... who buys my product?" and in the same breath the question is posed who are my non-customers? Not only are we without supportable figures for the total number of people who do and do not attend movies, but we have very little information about the composition of both groups. . . . What are their likes and dislikes? Answers to these questions should be elementary, yet they are lacking today.

25,000,000 Non Movie-Goers. Industry polls arrived at this figure as representing Americans who do not attend Hollywood movies. Growing realization seems to be dawning among film people that, quite possibly, these people are the ones who patronize the foreign film houses, the "art" theatres, discriminatingly selecting the films which they feel they will enjoy because of its adultness, imaginativeness and creatively presented diversion.

Meagerly Indicated. Bosley Crowther offered an answer for Hollywood over CBS School of the Air and reflected many a movie-goer's feeling of being treated like a moron by our film producers. The Hollywood industry should hold a "more complimentary opinion of the public," the N. Y. Times critic advised, suggesting that then we'd have better films.

Out of Hollywood's annual 350 movies, he dubbed only 20 or so "substantial as serious drama or as truly creative diversion." The rest he called "routine paraphrasing of old and conventional plots. A little more logic and proportion in writing and manufacturing of films and a little more honesty in detail could eliminate many of the faults."

His debate opponent, Maurice Bergman (head of Universal's eastern advertising-publicity), argued that Hollywood's contribution to our culture compared favorably to the radio and book publishing industries. Bergman claimed that "as the public itself becomes aware of the screen's possibilities and indicates its pleasure in seeing motion pictures of a more revolutionary nature, Hollywood will be the first to recognize this."

Admitting that producers should be inspired to deal with vital issue on the screen, Bergman countered that public response to "significant" movies has been very meagerly indicated.

An Amazing Parallel. Dore Schary, ex-screen writer and now Executive Vice President in charge of production at R. K. O., gave his views and plans in a N. Y. Times (April 6th) article. "I think you can make money for a studio by making good pictures," he wrote, "because by and large you will find that the best pictures in quality make the most money. If you compare the ten best pictures in terms of critical analysis over a period of years, you will find an amazing parallel between them and the ten biggest money makers."

After Many a Star. In the east, Erskine Johnson's radio program of filmland gossip took a decided rating drop. Johnson moved to change his policy of guest movie stars as of April 21st. From then on he declared—and both eyes on audience response—he would "deal in more controversial matters."

BUSINESS

In 1946, the major producing studios more than doubled their previous year's net profit of 65 million dollars. The rise in admission prices and the lifting of the excess profits taxes were major causes of the record figure of $125,000,000 net.

An interesting financial sidelight was the more than 8 million dollars spent on advertising in national magazines by the studios. Life magazine received one and a half million while Look ran a poor second with a mere $669,984.

Variety reports that, for this year, studio net profits promise to exceed those of 1946.

Closed. The Esquire Theatre at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, took a half page ad in its local newspaper to duplicate its marquee sign: "Closed due to motion picture monopoly."

The ad stated that a "ruthless dictatorship" prevents it from buying first-run movies because of two theatres owned by the major producing studios in the town. Even when a film is made available, ad complained, "the price we have to pay is prohibitive and we are assured of a loss before we show it."

This is only one outcropping of the fight by independent theatre owners against the distribution policies of the movie companies. An anti-trust decree promised to break the monopoly practices but U. S. Supreme Court Justice Stanley F. Reed issued a staying order early in April pending appeal by the movie companies.

Also Closed. Studio employment of writers, technicians, actors, secretaries, publicity men, directors, etc., has dropped to an extremely low figure. The wholesale dismissals began last fall and practically no rehiring has taken place since. Most of the sound stages are under lock and key. The producing lots resemble ghost towns rather than active centers of industry.

Hayden, Stone and Company, of the Wall Street Exchange, offered a possible reason when they stated in a recent report that "the industry carried many extra writers and actors on contract during the years of high tax rates."

The job insecurity which always plagued studio workers has again appeared. Hollywoodites speak morosely of a "recession," forced on them by producers seeking lusher profits.

San Johnson. MGM signed a contract with Van Johnson. Star receives $5,200 each week for seven years. In addition the studio gave him a $100,000 bonus to buy a new house. Total sum just falls short of a round two million.

CULTURE

The National Board of Review at their 38th Anniversary Conference at New York's Hotel McAlpin urged greater production of "family" movies, praised the industry for creating the children's film library, lauded the purpose of the UN film division, announced absorption of 22 national organizations (Boy Scouts YWCA, etc.) into general membership where they will actively participate in Board's work.

More exiting fare came from guest speakers. Brian Ahern damned and excused Hollywood in same breath. He characterized the top film executives as "being chained
to their desks and suffering with ulcers." Then appended: "They're under terrific pressure...to expect them to do better is nonsensical. When we get a 'Best Years of Our Lives,' we should feel darn grateful." 

Symbols. Screen writers severely criticized film use of minority stereotypes at a Masonic Temple meeting sponsored by the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. "Duel in the Sun," "Song of the South," and "Abie's Irish Rose" were specifically decried.

Novelist-writer Dalton Trumbo told the forum that these three movies represented "a melange of racial stereotypes reflecting unfavorably on minority groups.

Robert E. G. Harris, editorial writer for the Los Angeles Daily News, said, "We must stop symbolizing the Negro as a funny man or servant, the Jew disrespectfully, the Mexican as good natured but lazy, the Swede as dumb."

EDUCATION

For twenty years, public school English teachers have wanted the movie versions of novel classics for classroom study. In March, they finally got their wish when the industry turned over to the National Council of Teachers of English 23 condensed versions of their theatrical films based on the classics.

The industry established Teaching Film Custodians as a non-profit corporation, headed by Mark A. May (director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University). They reedited the films down to 40 minutes to fit into classrooms use and changed them quite a bit from the original "entertainment" version.

Some of the films available for rental to schools are "Adventures of Huckleberry Finn," "Alice in Wonderland," "Great Expectations," "David Copperfield," and "Anna Karenina."

A National Film Centre. A group of labor, civic, and minority organizations formed a National Film Centre in New York for distribution of educational films. The Centre will establish its own film library, promote and handle rentals through key offices in Detroit, Chicago and Los Angeles.

Members of this film cooperative include the National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Cooperative, Inc., American Veterans Committee, American Newspaper Guild, United Auto Workers, International Ladies Garment Workers, and AFL and CIO affiliates.

Audio-Visual. The use of films - 'audio-visual' aids as educators term them-in schools has increased greatly since the successful experience of the Army and Navy with movies during the war.

In Mississippi, the state school system recently adopted the use of movies University of Mississippi's School of Education and state superintendent joined to sponsor audio-visual techniques, establish a 150 educational film library for use of schools, and train teachers in their use.

One World Geography. Louis de Rochemont, the producer of "Boomcrang," "The House on 9th Street," and "13 Rue Madeleine" - all noted for the documentary style which de Rochemont brought from his March of Time experience - has turned to the educational film field. He will produce 80 short films in color on the geography of the world - a desire which he has been nurturing since the late '20s.

Using the concept of one world as a philosophical approach de Rochemont is sending out six complete camera crews to cover every important land area. Technical and educational advice will be under the supervision of geologist-geographer Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president Emeritus of Clark University.

De Rochemont hopes to have his first shorts ready by September and expects 35 completed within a year. They will be sold and rented to "audio-visual" minded school systems.

EXPERIMENTAL

Last year, the Solomon Guggenheim Foundation decided to recognize motion pictures by awarding a fellowship to Maya Deren to continue film making of her highly personal silent shorts in 16mm black and white.

This year, the award went to John Whitney, who, with his brother James, experiments with abstract color films using mechanically made "music." Earlier, James held a fellowship with the Peggy Guggenheim Museum of Non-Objective Art, who have made similar awards to other abstract film experimenters.

Serious experimental work has always been negligible in the U. S., especially when compared with work done in France, Soviet Union, England, pre-Hitler Germany, etc. Since the war's end, however, a spurt of experimental film production is evident: Hans Richter ("Dreams That Money Can Buy") - a feature length 'surrealist' film in color and with sound); Douglass Crockwell (animated color fantasies); Joseph Vogel (at work on a fantasy, "All the News"), Lewis Jacobs (at work on "Sunday Beach"). This is only a partial list of present U. S. experimental film activity which is definitely on the rise.

What film experimenters urgently need is a central clearing agency which will enable them to keep in touch and, more important, provide distribution for their films. Even 16mm production costs money; unless experimenters can realize their costs through rental and sale of prints, the financial burden limits their production activities.

And advances in film art, as in any other creative medium, can be greatly stimulated by experimentation.

GOVERNMENT

The U. S. government has never been keen on producing its own movies. During the depression years, the films made - "The River," "The Plough That Broke the Plains," etc.,- were only a handful. The war brought an increase in film making, especially by the Army and Navy. With the U. S.'s return to 'normalcy,' the film section is being cut down.

The State Department's film group, which makes and adapts 16mm films to propagandize America abroad, fired 20 members of its New York Staff in March. With Congress seemingly out to eliminate entirely the overseas educational services of the State Department, it appears quite likely that the little left of the government's film section will soon disappear.

To movie people, it seems paradoxical that the U. S., the largest producer of motion pictures, has never seen the value of government educational films while England, Canada, the Soviet Union and other
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countries have extensive production programs.

LABOR

The most hopeful sign since the stroke of the Conference of Studio Unions (CSU) started in September, 1946, was the April announcement that the Producers were willing to bargain with the Studio Carpenters. Next on the agenda, everyone hoped, would be the Producers sitting down to talk with the CSU and the Technicians local 683.

The strike started over a dispute between the carpenters (affiliated with the CSU) and the set erectors (affiliated with the International Association of Theatrical Stage Employees — IATSE). The producers backed the set erectors and ushered the carpenters out of the studios. The CSU struck in sympathy, claiming that AFL authorities (both CSU and IATSE are AFL unions) stated that the carpenters were in the right.

The CSU felt that the producers forced the strike in the hopes of eliminating the CSU and having only to deal with what the CSU calls the "company dominated IATSE."

The producers held it was a jurisdictional dispute and out of their hands.

The IATSE sat pat, denying the CSU claims.

Soon after the strike-lockout of over 6000 employees began, the Technicians Local 683 bolted the IATSE and went out on strike. The IATSE tried to take control of the union by ousting the officers but met with little success.

Recently, the CSU backed down on most of its demands. It didn't help.

Stated the official Catholic report to the Archbishop of Los Angeles, John J. Cantwell: "The failure of the Producers or the IATSE to indicate willingness to Bargain leaves them open to accusations that they wish to crush the CSU. If this is the case, it would seem that we cannot support an action on the part of an employer and a rival union to deny men the right to organize and bargain collectively."

The report concluded: "The strike must be settled. The war is over. There must be terms for a just peace. All three sides must strive to write those terms. It is their duty in conscience to do this much."

RELIGION

Protestants now have their own motion picture pressure group. Headed by Paul F. Heard, the Protestant Film Council boosts those films it considers "good for Protestants" but, unlike the Catholic's Legion of Decency, does not ban others.

Heard feels that banning of films only increases audience interest in them. Instead the PFC has set up a Protestant Motion Picture Council to review films for the 300 different Protestant publications. Reviews stress what are considered good films and a "picture of the month."

Though the Council insists that it is not interested in propagandizing their religion via theatrical movies, it established in Hollywood a consulting committee of Church coast leaders for relationships with the studios Chairmanned by Dr. Louis Evans, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, the committee intends to provide material for film stories, coordinate the facilities of different Church bureaus, and provide a channel for technical advice to producers on matters relating to the church.

The PFC will also produce seven educational films this year for schools and churches. Six will deal with religious subjects and the seventh will be on the evils of religious and racial prejudice.

MISSIONARIES and Movies. Father Gutierrez' parish takes him from island to island in the San Blas group near Panama. In his dugout canoe, he carries a 16mm projector to give weekly Hollywood shows to the native Indians, many of whom have never seen a movie before. However, to see the films, the Indians must attend church services.

SCIENCE

You may soon see newsreels in color instead of prosaic black and white. At least that's the hope of several newsreel firms known to be making definite plans for color cinematography. The immediate obstacle they claim rises from the scarcity of equipment.

The use of Technicolor appears definitely out because of the intricacy of its technical aspects and its expensiveness. Kodachrome, on the other hand, is only made available in 16mm and when blown up to 35mm size loses clarity and definition. Some color technicians claim that Eastman Kodak made a deal with Technicolor to stay out of 35 mm field.

The "single" film method would be ideal for newsreels. Moviemen have their eyes on the AGFA process which gives the best color rendition and yet is the least expensive. The Soviet Union now controls the process; Americans saw it in the Soviet film, "The Stone Flower."

Because of the slow speed of present day color films, only outdoor events could be filmed by newsreel color cameras. Even this may be changed. Bela Gaspar, head of Gasparcolor, Inc., states that his experiments with a fast color film are proving successful and that he hopes to have it ready for commercial use —within a few years.

Camera Tester. How can a cameraman know if his equipment is operating correctly? A new test for checking the performance of his 35 mm camera elimiates any guesswork. The Society of Motion Picture Engineers and the research council of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences announced jointly this latest gadget which consists of a "visual test film."

John A. Maurer, the Society's vice-president, stated that device provides adequate standards for checking the image recorded by the camera. The film is made up of four sections which test the centering of the film, the timing of the shutter, steadiness of image, and the distortion. All this in only 412 feet of celluloid.

Speed for News. Eastman Kodak scientists tested in Philadelphia a new fast developing process for 16mm film.

Process consists of heated chemicals as the developer, plus a special heat resistant film. Chemicals, heated to almost 125 degrees, flow continuously through the tank which turns out eight feet of film per minute. Old process required 45 minutes to develop a single frame of 16mm sound film; new process takes 45 seconds.
U.S. FILMS ABROAD

Hollywood does not intend giving up the world film market without a struggle. Newest phase of its international sales policy came with announcement of establishing a high powered staff all over world by MPA. Since international dollar accounts for well over 40 per cent of Hollywood profits, the market is very lucrative. Gerald Mayer (head of MPA international division) explained that new organization intends to stop formation of trade barriers and to sell Hollywood movies to foreign audiences.

Campaign of Ridicule. More damaging to Hollywood than barriers has been world film audience’s rising preference for films made in other countries. Phil Reisman (RKO vice-president over foreign sales) sought an excuse for poor reception of Hollywood films abroad. He laid it at the door of what he termed a scientific Russo-British attack which has resolved itself into a ‘constant campaign of ridicule.’

“Deliberate propaganda,” he called it, stating that its now accepted as gospel that American films are bad, even among our film critics.

Behind Iron Curtain. Eric Johnston went to President Truman for help. “We have so many foreign problems, I cannot tell you all of them,” he told newsmen afterwards. “But it is difficult to get pictures into countries behind the Iron Curtain and to get money out. We feel it is important that American films be shown in other countries and that films of other countries be shown in this country to promote better understanding.”

Outside the Iron Curtain. A check-up on nations outside the Iron Curtain reveals the following situation: Denmark—reports current that by September first the import of Hollywood films will be placed on quota basis; Sweden—after reported banning of Hollywood films, our State Department protested, and ban was denied. Subsequent news tends to indicate a limitation on import of U. S. films in offering; Australia—20 per cent cut in Hollywood imports reported seriously under consideration with no reduction of British films; Mexico—exhibitors pressing for 50 per cent elimination of Hollywood movies to all more screen time for own films. 20th Century-Fox sells its 38 theatres and withdraws from market completely. Czechoslovakia—with an open market here, the Commerce Department states that in 1946 the popularity of Hollywood films ran a poor fourth. Britain placed first, U. S. S. R. second and France third.

Dream Land. An indication of what Hollywood likes to see in foreign countries is the situation in Greece. There U. S. films command 90 per cent of screen time according to Spyros D. Skouras who explained that, somehow, the Greeks simply prefer Hollywood movies.

Germany. John Scott of the American Military Government’s film control office in Stuttgart found some heartening news for Hollywood producers (if not for U. S. internationally minded educators). He reported:

“Critics are beginning to understand that we are not trying to feed the Germans propaganda, and that the films we are releasing, while oftentimes conveying glimpses of the American scene, are primarily to afford relaxation and pleasure.”

A More Favorable Light. An idea of what the correct selection of films sent abroad can do for American international relations came from Prague, Czechoslovakia. The film arousing comment there was not a Hollywood entertainment piece but a Warner’s educational documentary, “Hitler Lives”.

An industry representative in Prague wrote back that the film was hailed by the press and that “nobody here suspected that such a short would be produced in America at a time when the Czech press is full of reports about economic aid for the reconstruction of Germany from the U. S. A.”

The movie, correspondent adds, has put America and Hollywood in a “much more favorable light in Czechoslovakia.”

Everywhere Amber. To capture global movie-audiences, “Forever Amber” is being dubbed or subtitled in 24 languages. Besides English, the list includes French, German, Spanish, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Italian, Czech, Finish, Polish, Dutch, Hungarian, Turkish, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Hindustani, Afghan, Greek, Bulgarian, Siamese and Javanese.

ARGENTINA

Don Alfredo Bolognesi, czar of Argentina’s entertainment board, censored heavily recent Hollywood newsreels. The scenes snipped were those seized German films showing the private life of Adolph Hitler and his mistress, Eva Braun. Bolognesi stated they were in “bad taste” since both subjects are dead.

BELGIUM

World Film Festival is to be held at Brussels this June. Among participating nations are U. S., Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Mexico, Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy and Belgium; U. S. S. R. is expected to join. Hollywood, which paid little attention to last year’s Cannes Festival and failed to make any critical impression there, is very eager to correct its mistake. To the Brussels Festival, it is sending “The Jolson Story,” “The Fifth Year of Our Lives,” “The Yearling,” “To Each His Own,” “It’s a Wonderful Life,” “The Egg and I,” “The Razor’s Edge,” “Humoresque,” and “Song of the South.” How well they will make out with these films is another question.

The Festival will be formally opened June 7th with a concert of all-American music conducted by Leonard Bernstein.

DENMARK

During the war, documentary filmmaking developed as Germany occupied the country and Danes turned their eyes on their nation. There are now several directors whose films, it is reported, equal technically and esthetically the best of the British documentaries.

Since Denmark is a land of clubs and societies, there is wide field for non-theatrical distribution of such films aside from the regular theatres which restrict documentary showings to shorts.

Probably the greatest achievement of the Danish documentary has been the film made by Theodor Christensen and his associates, “Your Freedom is at Stake.” It was begun shortly after the occupation and completed a few months after
the liberation; it runs 2½ hours. All the shots were taken surreptitiously under the eyes of the German soldiers and it presents, as vividly as any such "newsreel" photography can, a film history of the occupation.

The film has caught not only the ruthlessness of the Nazis (the indiscriminate machine-guning of people on the streets), the resistance movement of the Danes (illegal newspapers, acts of sabotage), but also the temper of the people during their long ordeal.

### ENGLAND

Alexander Korda began directing his own production of Oscar Wilde's "An Ideal Husband" in which Paulette Goddard is starring. Burgess Meredith, at another Korda Studio, is starring in "Mine Own Executioner" from the novel by Nigel Balchin. Rex Harrison is having trouble remembering the film he is working on. Another version of "The Scarlet Pimpernel," the title was changed to "Elusive Pimpernal" and, more recently, to "I Will Repay."

Julian Duvivier is now at Cannes writing the script for "Anna Karenina" with French dramatist Marcel Anouihl. Vivian Leigh and Ralph Richardson will star. Graham Greene's intense novel, "Brighton Rock," went before the camera April 14th at MGM's Amalgamated Studios at Elstree.

**Government.** The British Government, ever mindful of the propaganda value of films, embarked upon production of 45 films ranging from one-reelers to feature films. The program, directed by the Central Office of Information, is aimed at showing the problems facing the nation in the postwar world.

### ITALY

"Open City" represents only one of many such realistic films made in Italy after the liberation. "A Day in Life" deals with an event in the partisan fighting against the Germans and is set not in Rome but in the country. "Two Anonymous Letters," which some say is better than the "Open City" because of its simplicity, tells the story of an underground printing press during the occupation; the "letters" are denominations of its work sent to the Gestapo and the story is a whodunit with the villain being an Italian collaborator.

"Life Begins Again," concerns itself with the involved personal problems of an officer's wife left on her own during the war. To ease her financial position she becomes the mistress of a wealthy man whom she drops as soon as she can. When her husband returns after the war, she is overcome with a guilt complex and kills her wartime lover. The subsequent court trial brings out the story.

"Down With Poverty!" is a comedy with Magnani (of "Open City") who plays the part of an ineffectual truck driver's wife. The brisk comedy relates her trials and tribulations in trying to make money to live decently; her present poverty contrasted with her well-to-do neighbors who are up to their neck in the black market.

### PALESTINE

Three documentaries are in production for the United Palestine Appeal: "Creating Earth," showing the teamwork between science and labor in making the land flourish; "Room for All," about the economic and immigration possibilities of the country; "And They Shall Hear Israel," a biblical story.

Fims are being made by the new Palestine Film Productions headed by Norman Luries, official war correspondent with the Jewish Brigade during the war.

### SWEDEN

With an eye to the international market, SAG-Svensson (Wive Film) will produce an adaptation of the British play, "Lady Behave," after finishing up on "Two Women," based on the French film, "Prison des Femmes." Then the studio intends remaking "The Story of Gosta Berling," from the novel by the late Selma Lagerlof. It was this film, made in 1924, in which Greta Garbo achieved such success in her portrayal of Elizabeth Dohna.

### SWITZERLAND

Praesus, producers of "Marie Louise" and "The Last Chance"—two films which received well-deserved critical attention in the U. S.—is filming, with M G M tie-up, a movie on the plight of Europe's displaced children.

Fred Zinneman, of MGM, joined the film company as director, bringing with him a Hollywood written script.

"During the two weeks we spent in the U. S. zone," he wrote back to William H. Wells, UNRRA film chief, "we traveled from Frankfurt to Munich and back, via Heidelberg, Aglasterhausen, Nurnberg, Regensburg, Rosenheim, Gauting, Pasing and Prien. We saw and heard things that constitute the most powerful kind of raw material for a motion picture."

"The story originally written was rejected upon my arrival in Zurich, because it seemed too remote from reality and because it lacked inner truth and strength. My feeling is and always has been that no one has the right to make a mediocre film about a subject of such tremendous importance."

"As a result of this rejection, we are now working very much against time, but we have hopes of coming up with an honest and moving story. The new writer is Mr. Richard Scheizer," who wrote Praesus' two previous movies.

### UNITED NATIONS

First national conference of UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) meeting in Philadelphia urged a commission to study film needs of war-devastated Europe and Far East. Proposed commission would determine extent of such wants as motion picture equipment and personnel. UNESCO, conference also suggested, should encourage exchange of film instructors among member nations.

**Film Student Exchange.** Plan for exchange of film students among United States, England, France and Soviet Union was presented in detail in April 1947 Screen Writer by Herbert F. Margolis.

The plan already has received the tentative support of the British Film Institute, Cinematheque Francaise, and such Hollywood figures as Fritz Lang, Kenneth Macgowan, Dudley Nichols, Dore Schary, George Stevens, and Jean Hersholt.
MOVIES AND DELINQUENCY
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most certainly antagonized by the emphasis on drinking which characterizes many films. But Hollywood is not the instigator of these errors. It only reflects them. When the mirror reflects something we do not like to see, it is hardly constructive to break the mirror.

The most serious aspect of making Hollywood a whipping boy for the contemporary breakdown of society is not the censorship threat against the industry, undesirable as that is. Rather, it is the deflecting of interest from the real causes.

Today’s crime wave is not the product of synthetic Hollywood. Its roots lie deep in the past decade of depression, with its poverty, insecurity, malnutrition, and destructive cynicism. Add to this five years of war with its comitant disrespect for human life, emphasis on immediate physical pleasure in the face of tomorrow’s annihilation, loss of parental authority through absence, a chronic housing shortage and the uncertainties of inflation and postwar problems, and one should not be at too great a loss to determine some of the causes of crime.

Hollywood has not contributed affirmatively to any of these prime social evils. In fact, it has glossed over most of them. The worst that can be charged against the motion picture industry is that it has failed to assume responsibility for educating the public in adequate remedies.

But obviously censorship is not the answer, since censorship can only suppress or alter what is produced. It cannot initiate ideas or their treatment.

The honest critic, if he thinks about the problem at all, will agree that movies cannot be separated from the context of American life and culture as a whole. As long as motion picture entertainment is a commercial enterprise—and there appears no effort to make it anything else—it will continue to provide entertainment on the accepted levels. These levels are determined, not by the movies, but by influences far deeper and more powerful than Boy Meets Girl, Boy Loses Girl, Boy Gets Girl.

THE ROLE OF THE DIRECTOR
(continued from page 9)

films is present in the script before a scene is shot. This is especially true of such writer-directors as Dudley Nichols or Jean Renoir, or such directors working properly close to their writers as Orson Welles, Fritz Lang, William Wyler, John Ford, Alfred Hitchcock or Frank Capra. It may or may not be true in the case of directors called in to shoot a script they have not themselves helped prepare nor been given the time to rewrite according to their own lights. (One may argue that in most such cases the subject is a quickie tomsfournaly anyway, and that it doesn’t matter much one way or the other. Yet, experience shows that such conditions prevail all too often, except in the cases of the men named above and a handful of other top-flight directors who can command the necessary respect from their producers.)

Because the industry does not provide for close teamwork between writer and director, an artificial barrier has sprung up between these two crafts which should be so close to each other as to merge.

What, then, is the role of the director and why is he so important?

The director—if he is actually fulfilling his true function and not allowing the major part of it to be usurped by the producer—is the true animator of the film. He must collaborate with, in fact guide, the writer, working out the story structure with him, and either giving him the actual camera setups as he visualizes them or solving the technical problems of achieving what the writer (with or without familiarity with the technique of the film medium) has conceived.

Beyond this, when the script is written, the director has the job of bringing it to life on the sound stage and thereby on the film. A script may be very
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detailed and the reading of it alone may be almost enough to instruct actors, cameramen, technicians and others in creating what the writer and director had in mind; or, it may be only a shorthand outline to remind the director of what he intended to get out of the actors, what he wanted to achieve through lighting, camera angles, sound effects. In either case, it is the director's proper interpretation of script to actors and technicians, the methods he uses to get them to comply with what was in the minds of the authors (writers or himself), his own on the spot judgement of proper technical effects, as planned or as substituted by him on the stage when the original setup proves unsatisfactory—it is all these that constitute the next part of his job.

Finally, the real director will know cutting, sound scoring and other technical details to the point that he can work with the technicians in those fields to get the proper rhythm of successive images, the sound effects, the musical counterpoint, even the photographic quality that were implicit in the script as it was conceived and as set down.

The director need not DO all these things; he only needs to guide those who do them. But unless he is responsible for them, he is not deserving of the credit traditionally given to directors.

In Hollywood, today, if a film is good, as often as not the producer or writer should be singled out rather than the director. However, individual credit is not really important, except insofar as we are by nature or by habit interested in individuals more than groups and get some sort of satisfaction out of ascribing responsibility (particularly in artistic creation such as a good film is) to a specific individual. The Hollywood struggle for 'credits' within the Screen Writers Guild, the Directors Guild, or other groups, is not an esthetic or a moral one. It is an economic and, at best, an ethical one. It is important only because credits in Hollywood mean the possibility of further jobs.

When the producing and directing credits are broken down between a co-writing and co-working team such as that of Charles Brackett and Billy Wilder, the separation is purely artificial, and completely unnecessary. It is a Brackett-and-Wilder picture in the purest sense that we see, and the important thing is that the team has worked together throughout and a unity of inspiration and of viewpoint has been achieved. Such unity may sometimes mean less good pictures (as in the case of European productions, where the bad ones are really terrible), but it will also mean avoiding that sheen which glistens the run-of-the-mill Hollywood product and brilliance, reduces all but the very best to the same level of mediocre meaninglessness.

In a word, then, the role of the director is that of the creator of the poetry, the magic of the film. Story is insufficient without technique, as is technique without content. To get both of these elements, one man can at best be an animator; unless he be Superman, he cannot be the godhead which creates all of them. As coordinator, as animator, the director is perhaps the most important personage in a film's making, but no more than the writer can he, ever by the ONLY important one.

The director is the captain of a great team, the conductor of a symphony orchestra (this analogy will only permit carrying out so far and no further). His talent, his genius, may be great, but they are not self-sufficient. Films are collective jobs. Though it should be proper to designate a picture as a director's, in all cases it is the work of a team. Only when the organization of the industry permits the team to work together from start to finish will it have understood the basic fact of film production. Film creators are as interdependent upon each other as any people can be; the director should be the guiding spirit of the production, the collaborator and supervisor of the writer, producer or business manager, cameraman, sound engineer, cutter, set designer, musician, and actors.

NEW FILMS FROM ABROAD
(continued from page 10)

life, and reminding one of that unforgettable line from Omar Khayyam, "What then, did the Hand of the Potter shake?" The Pagnol trilogy of Provence, "Marquis," "César" and "Fanny," a vast Balzacian comedie humaine consisting of three films of three hours each, has also arrived, though these were filmed long before the war. The Jean Gabin—Marlene Dietrich film, their first together and her first in French, "Martin Roumagnac," is here, too. The Pagnol trilogy and this I have not seen. Others that I am only able to record without comment are Marcel Carne's "Visiteurs du Soir" and "L'Assassinat du Père Noel" (the former a medieval folk story about a visit of the devil to the earth and the latter a kind of snow-mountain mystery, "Who shot Santa Claus?" with the late Harry Baur). Jean Vigo's two films, "Zero de Conduit," an ecstatically lyrical film about children, which I regard as one of the most beautiful of all films, and his "L'Atalante" with Michel Simon and Dita Parlo, are also here. Siegfried Kracauer tells me that the latter is extraordinary, too. A film on Berlitz, "La Symphonie Fantastique," is not very good, but a comedy with a Hungarian locale and a typical bitter-sweet story by the facile Vicki Baum, "Return at Dawn," is better and far less pretentious. Danielle Darrieux stars in it. A surrealistic comedy, "La Nuit Fantastique," is also here, as is Jacques Becker's (the very clever director of "It Happened at the Inn") "Dernier Atout," a satire on American gangster films. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer has brought over Jean Giraudoux' "Les Anges du Peche," a story of the rehabilitation of fallen girls, but is not quite sure what to do with it; and a print of the magnificently realistic and harrowingly grim "Le Corbeau" ("The Crow"), banned by the French government, is also here, though I suspect it will not be shown. Viviane Romance in "La Collier de la Reine," a historical romance, will be shown. These are not all but they'll give you an idea how France intends to compete for the world market.

From Denmark has come the awesome "Day of Wrath," a study of medieval witchcraft, by Carl Dreyer who made "The Passion of Jean of Arc," one of the classics of the silent era. It is not nearly as great as the latter and is even dull in spots though there's artistry in every moment of it. From Sweden comes "Torment," a penetrating study of a sadistic schoolmaster who keeps a wretched little girl on the side and whom he fascinates and holds in thrall as a snake does a rabbit. A strange and curious film for the usually docile Swedes to have made. Another

With many more months to go, you can imagine the competition Hollywood is going to have in 1947 so far as the contenders for the ten best of the year is concerned. Financially, of course, Hollywood is supposedly not worried. Each film will find its own audience, to greater or lesser degree. The point is—there is such a thing as pride in craft—it is one of the marks of the civilized being. It is the difference between an aboriginie's rude, earthen pot and a Grecian urn. We are supposed to have progressed—remember?

"MONSIEUR VERDOUX"
(continued from page 12)

Verdoux
To be idealistic at this moment would be incongruous.

Reporter
What's this talk about good and evil?

Verdoux
Arbitrary forces my good fellow. Too much of either will destroy us all.

Reporter
We can never have too much good in this world.

Verdoux
The trouble is we've never had enough. We don't know.

(The reporter goes; a priest enters the cell.)

Verdoux
What can I do for you, my good man?

Priest
Nothing my son, I want to help you. I've come to ask you to make your peace with God.

Verdoux
Father, I am at peace with God. My conflict is with man.

Priest
Have you no remorse for your sins?

Verdoux
Who knows what sin is—born as it is, from heaven—from God's fallen angel. Who knows what ultimate destiny is served? After all what would you be doing without sin?

(Then, as Verdoux is led out to the guillotine)

Priest
May God have mercy on your soul.

Verdoux
Why not? After all it belongs to Him.

Like a first rate social caricaturist, Chaplin has succeeded in drawing his picture with simplicity and vigor. The major lack in the film is the omission of at least one aspect of the will to struggle against the condition he presents. It would have been more inspiring had there been brought in some challenge to the state of affairs he depicts. Nevertheless "Monsieur Verdoux" is one of the most significant and unique post-war films and takes its place as a landmark not only in Chaplin's long career but in the progress of the American screen.

NEW FILM BOOKS

"Twenty Years of British Film: 1925-1945"
by Michael Balcon, Ernest Lindgren, Forsyth Hardy, and Roger Manvell
(The Falcon Press Ltd., London, 1947, 10s. 6d.)

This exciting little book gives briefly and well a look at the historical development of British films. No small part of its interesting presentation are the more than a hundred selected 'stills' from their motion pictures beginning with their first sound film, "Blackmail," directed by Alfred Hitchcock in 1929.

An introductory chapter, "The British Film Today," by Michael Balcon, producer-director, gives an insight into the particular desires of British film makers. Mr. Balcon concludes his statement: "And this we must do (develop the British film industry) bearing in mind the greatest lesson we have learned from America: at a time when our country's prestige throughout the world is our foremost consideration we must remember that the good British film, truthfully reflecting the British way of life, is the most powerful ambassador we have."

The brief informative chapters follow: "The Early Feature Film," by Ernest Lindgren of the British National Film Library; "The Documentary Film," by Forsyth Hardy, editor of the recent, "Grierson on Documentary," and Roger Manvell's concluding summary "The British Feature Film from 1925 to 1945."

"Movies That Teach"
by Charles F Hoban, Jr.
(Dryden Press, New York, 1946, $2.50)

Mr. Hoban does not narrow his vision of educational film content to strictly 'technical' subjects. "Now, as never before, educators and the public alike seem to be convinced that education must shed its bookish quality," he states in the preface, "and that it must deal vigorously and effectively with social issues and moral conduct."

Later on, drawing a comparison to Army orientation films, he writes, "Schools need a 'Men of Peace' series (of films) in place of the 'Fighting Men' series. They need a 'Know Your Neighbor' series to replace the 'Know Your Enemy' series. They need films on 'Live and Let Live' to counteract war films on 'Kill or Be Killed.'"

Addressing this study to educators, film producers and visual education specialists, Mr. Hoban analyzes the experiences of the Armed Forces with motion pictures during the war years. Upon these findings, he presents clearly and authoritatively a view of the possibilities of film in our educational system.

"The Factual Film"
A Survey by The Arts Enquiry
(Oxford University Press, London, 1947, 12s. 6d.)

"The documentary is Britain's outstanding contribution to the film," states the opening sentence of "The Factual Film." Those who remember the pre-war "Drifters," "Face of Britain," "Contact," to mention a few of the 300 documentaries made by 1939, or those who recall the more recent "Target for Tonight," "Fires Were Started," "Desert Victory"—a few of the 726 films made by the British government by the end of 1945—will readily agree that Britain has developed the social and aesthetic possibilities of the documentary to a greater degree than any other nation.

"The Factual Film" is solely concerned with its social possibilities. The survey by the Arts Enquiry gives a detailed factual view of British production of what we, in the United States, call "non-theatrical" films—documentary, educational, medical, industrial. By tracing its growth there historically—the pre-war development, war use, present state—the survey indicates its social uses for the future. It does this positively by suggesting a broad policy for the British government and UNESCO.
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International and National Film Scene
Previews

Agnes Morehead is not only one of Hollywood's finest actresses, she is also a very articulate one. The two together are a rarity. So that the article which she is writing for CINEMA should be extremely interesting in its revelation of the acting ideas of one of the finest.

* * *

Though Film Societies have grown by leaps and bounds in the last few years, England has had them for more than two decades. The Film Society movement there has become a well knit group in the British film scene and may account in part for the taste brought to bear on English film productions.

Roger Manvell, our British correspondent, has sent us a very informative article on the growth of their Film Societies. Interestingly, he points out that local community groups regularly rent their town's movie house to show the films they want to see! But more of that in his article.

* * *

What responsibility do movies have to their audience?

We decided to find out by asking some people who should know. We went to the President of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, C. S. Beesmyer, and to the Secretary of the Los Angeles CIO Council, Philip Connelly, to get the views of both groups. Continuing the inquiry, we contacted Mrs. Joseph S. Hook, President of the Los Angeles District of the Parent-Teachers Congress.

Since, in this atomic age, no round table talk would be completed without a scientist, we wrote to David P. Shoemaker of the Association of California Scientists at California Institute of Technology.

Finally we spoke to Hortense Powdermaker, visiting Professor of Anthropology at the University of California at Los Angeles. She is presently at work on a study of motion pictures as a part of United States culture under a Viking Fund grant.

Realizing that the other side of the fence should be heard from, we asked Dore Schary, Executive Vice-President in charge of production at R.K.O., what he thought the audience's responsibility was to movies.

Their answers were provocative and exciting. You will read them in an early issue.

* * *

In checking the New York newspaper and magazine critics' reviews of Charles Chaplin's Monsieur Verdoux, we find that most seem to dislike the new, well-dressed Chaplin and nostalgically prefer his baggy trousers and odd feet.

Alfred Rosenheimer, Jr., is one New Yorker who doesn't see eye to eye with his fellow critics. And he has written for CINEMA an exciting article on the new Charles Chaplin.

Eli Willis

Note to Film Societies

In schools, museums, libraries, churches and private groups, a rising interest has been shown in the screening of "film classics." Forming local Film Societies, the members are able to view once again such various movie milestones as David Wark Griffith's "Intolerance," Robert Benchley in "The Sex Life of the Polyp," Greta Garbo in "Camille," and Sergei Eisenstein's "The Ten Days That Shook the World." The film society movement has grown by leaps and bounds.

We are pleased to announce that with our next issue, CINEMA will devote a column to the activities of the Film Societies and individual film experimenters. In this way, we hope to keep you informed of each other's activities as well as helping to serve as a springboard for the formation of a Film Society in your local community.

This department will be conducted by Mr. Paul Ballard of the Hollywood Film Society. Mr. Ballard has been in the vanguard in inaugurating film groups on the west coast for the showing of art and experimental films.

All communications, news of your Society's activities, and inquiries should be addressed to Mr. Paul Ballard, in care of CINEMA, 8066 Beverly Boulevard, Hollywood 36, California.

Contributors

DR. SAMUEL LOWY of the Viennese school of neuropsychiatry is a Psychoanalyst residing at Manchester, England since 1940. Previously he practiced as a specialist, attached to the Neurological Department of the University Hospital at Bratislava, Slovakia. He is the author of Biological and Psychological Foundations of Dream Interpretations, the first volume of a comprehensive standard work.

ARTHUR ROSENHEIMER, JR., Assistant Curator of the Museum of Modern Art Film Library, is a well-known critic in film circles. His articles on motion pictures have appeared in Theatre Arts, Films, Saturday Review of Literature and he has lectured at Fordham University, New York University, Hunter College, etc. During the war he saw action in France as a Lieutenant in the 79th Division, was wounded and then placed in charge of the Signal Corps Training Film Libraries in Italy.

MARTIN FIELD, screen writer, is on the editorial board of The Screen Writer, the monthly publication of the Screen Writers' Guild. He has written widely on the special problems of the writer in the motion picture industry.

ROGER MANVELL, a leading British film critic, reviewed Odd Man Out for our June issue and in this discusses the cultural film scene as viewed from London. He writes midway between the Czechoslovakian Film Festival recently held in London and the current Brussels Film Festival which he will discuss in a future issue.

HERMAN G. WEINBERG with this issue becomes our New York Correspondent. Credit for importing the two Jean Vigo films which he discusses belongs largely to Mr. Weinberg through he modestly assigns it elsewhere. The series of Film Indexes on outstanding directors, which he is editing for the British Sight and Sound, will be published shortly in book form by Dennis Dobson, Ltd., London.
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**ON THE COVER**
As the classics tell us there are Nine Muses on Mount Parnassus. Terpsichore, one of them, becomes quite indignant with what a Broadway theatrical director is doing in a musical show about the Greek gods. He is making them all jitterbugs.

Angered, Terpsichore comes down to earth to tell the theatre man a thing or two. She succeeds too in this bright, technicolor, *Down To Earth.*

Rita Hayworth, of course, is the goddess Terpsichore. Larry Parks is the Broadway director. Alexander Hall directed with Rudy Mate at the camera. The dances were staged by Jack Cole.
Jean Cocteau's most recent film to reach these shores from France is *Beauty and the Beast* (*La Belle et La Bête*). His own version of this child's story, the film is rich with the pictorial beauty that marks Cocteau's work and with just enough of the fantastic to delight esthetes.

The story, to repeat the well-known fable, tells of a Princess, Beauty, who is mistreated at home by her sisters and her boy friend, the Prince. Fleeing, she comes to the home of the Beast. Overcome with his humanity, she can ignore his horrible appearance. In her eyes, he is beautiful for she sees his soul not his flesh.

In the lower scene, Beauty, played by Josette Day, arrives at the castle and promptly faints upon first seeing the Beast, played by Jean Marais, who also plays the Prince.

In the upper scene, she ponders her fate.

Jean Cocteau directed as well as wrote the screenplay. Christian Berard was art director and the musical score was composed by Georges Auric.
This selection from the writing of Dr. Samuel Lowy, a British Psycho-analyst, examines the satisfaction movie-goers seek, especially in sex fulfillment. The selection comes from his book, *New Directions in Psychology*, Emerson Books, Inc., New York.

**Psychology of the Film Goer**

**By DR. SAMUEL LOWY**

I know of hardly any other device or cultural institution of the present day that plays so important a part in the mental processes governing the masses as the cinema. People go there not simply to spend their leisure; they obviously go there because they receive something that supplements their life of concrete reality. They go there to satisfy their fantasy—a satisfaction which is an essential part of the life of the individual.

It is in the main sexual problems and the large field of the struggle for bread, money, and position, that attracts people's interest; to a lesser degree they derive satisfaction from a just and happy end of a plot, vindicating the supreme validity of the educational principle: "Be good and you will be blessed." The lifelike presentation in the movies appears better fitted to satisfy the imagination of the people than books and lectures presenting in mere words the triumph of virtue and of justice.

I am perhaps not greatly mistaken in saying that the vicarious satisfaction of sexual and aggressive tendencies, providing compensation for what concrete life has not given to the individual—love, happiness, appreciation, success, position, supremacy—constitutes the main gift which the movies are able to present, with such variation and regular frequency, with such appeal to individuals of all types, on a scale which has apparently been approached by nothing else yet known in social history. The overwhelming majority of people feel more or less frustrated, feel more or less a tendency toward revenge and aggression, under the influence of the particular conditions of their life. And there is no doubt about the satisfaction value of the cinema—plays on this point. By the process of identification with the actors of the play the spectators gain a temporary satisfaction of their own ambitions and their tendencies to revenge.

Still more obvious is the temporary satisfaction and compensation for subjective deficiencies in that other sphere of human life, love and sex. I have used the expression compensation and satisfaction. For these are, in fact, two different thirsts that can be quenched through the enjoyment of the pictures. The first type of fantasy-compensation is that for elementary, socially justified expectations which the average individual cherishes, but the fulfillment of which frequently falls short of his hopes.

A modest and warm-hearted girl marries a similarly modest boy, who, like her, wishes to find a loving and sincere companion for life. They both dream of deep and eternal happiness, and they promise it to each other. The first years of their marriage are, however, full of the struggle for existence, and for the bringing up of their child, born in the first year. There is still, undoubtedly, much left of the love of the first months, but the fatigue of the day, and the cares of the economic struggle, force the manifestation of this love more and more into the background of mere good intentions. Soon, however, the small business develops; the husband, previously tied up by the difficulties of narrow financial means, now becomes occupied with the trouble of a big business. His commercial interests require social intercourse with other, even bigger businessmen, in hotels, in clubs, and at sports meetings; whilst his wife, essentially still a modest wife, and mother now of two small children, stays mostly at home. There is no sign of infidelity on his side, or of conscious dissatisfaction; but there is little cultivation of love, still less any increase of love, only a friendly co-existence without either having any time for the other. Regularly on weekends both go out together to the pictures and enjoy the love-happiness of elegantly dressed actors, enjoy the passionate meetings of imaginary people—and they are compensated for what they themselves have not, for what they cannot have, owing to ignorance at the start of their marriage, and no less owing to the social conditions of our age, which absorb the weak individual entirely into the acquisitive process of business and production.

Now an illustration of the other kind of satisfaction. There is a decent girl, well educated and charming, whose only admitted plan for life is to marry an educated and
kind-hearted professional man. In this she succeeds. The young man, in addition, is quite handsome, though far removed from the athletic actor, and certainly not a 'lady's man'. He is greatly in love with his charming wife; and she, too, seems to be happy. At times they go to the cinema, and more frequently to a show; and, to the surprise of the serious and strictly monogamous husband, his charming wife never stops being enthusiastic about the 'sweetness' and 'handsome figure' of this or that actor, about his 'beautiful smile' and other things. The embarrassed husband cannot join in the praise, since he begins to have feelings of inferiority; above all, he is puzzled, because many of the men on the stage who are admired by his wife are, in his opinion, anything but strikingly handsome. I know this from his complaints during a training analysis; I also had the opportunity of knowing his wife more closely before she was married to him, and I am satisfied that she is a decent wife, and also that she would never have thought of marrying an actor or an opera-singer, however handsome. Her conscious aims were always directed toward science, a monogamous, happy marriage, and a religious spirit in the home; and all this is hardly to be expected in the general run of actors.

The solution is clear: the charming wife does not even realize how polygamous she is, in fact, is; how much within her psyche she is craving for the love or attention of famous and elegant actors, who, however, are at the same time the ideal of numerous other girls. Not that our woman would in reality exchange her husband for such an actor. Had she the choice once again, and the opportunity of choosing between both types, undoubtedly she would decide again for that type which her husband represents. The other man is only the subject of her fantasy-life; she, though unaware of this, wishes to enjoy him, but simply and solely during her occasional revelling in a picture or a show. The realm of fantasy—far from actuality—is the field of her longed-for satisfaction, desired by her 'polyamory' complex. This is consequently a satisfaction, but not a compensation for what is being wished in concrete actuality, consciously wished but not entirely attained.

People under psycho-analysis not infrequently dream about particular scenes they have seen in the pictures. They naturally refuse at first to submit to such a dream analysis, stating that it is simply a reproduction. But, in fact, one can frequently find that the part of the film picked out by the dream-process has an intrinsic bearing on the deepest problems, mostly difficult conflicts, of the dreamer. A young man suffers much from jealousy because of his fiancée's behavior, but because of his passionate attachment to her he cannot decide to break off the engagement. He sees the picture Pittsburgh, and in his dream of the following night he finds himself in a merry company at a dance. He recognizes the origin of this dream-motive from the picture of the previous night, where there were two scenes at a dance. He realizes, however, only with the help of the analyst, who happened to know the picture, what is being hinted at by this dream. One hero of the play is an energetic but not quite reliable man, who, because of financial ambitions, marries the daughter of a steel magnate, but thinks that he can keep up his intimate friendship with a girl whom he loves; the latter, being of a good character, refuses to agree. There are two scenes of a dance at which the fiancée, and later wife, of the unscrupulous young man meets the other girl. No doubt the dream-fragment expresses the secret wish of the dreamer to be also unscrupulous enough to marry a 'decent woman of social position' and somehow to keep up simultaneously the passionate relationship with the girl he irrationally likes but intellectually despises.

But, as has been said, visiting the cinema means to most people, on frequent occasions, at least a substantial satisfaction. And implicitly a poisonous factor. Because pictures mostly present solutions that are far from being real possibilities. The acting figures of plays are mostly unmarried, or else without children or dependent relatives to care for. They can wish, and aim at, almost anything; and even if in the play they meet with handicaps, they do many things, and attain things, which are entirely out of reach for the average human being. Pictures, whilst satisfying the psyche for two hours, operating after the fashion of alcohol or a sedative drug, may drop into the mind the additional seed of the desire for the unattainable, instead of solving the difficulty.

I have pointed out how unsuccessful marriages—and unsuccessful careers in general—are mostly the result of neurotic inhibitions and subconscious tendencies. The pictures dramatically describe the existing tragedies of life—but the only remedy they advise is: intrigue, aggression, and adultery; and all this in a way exceeding the real possibilities for average men and women. Surely the great success of films is indicative of the fact that they do give something substantial to the public. However, they could give more: true life and true solutions, or hints at prevention. I am not thinking of the usual propaganda films, in which the artificiality of the setting and the tendency is so obvious; nor of that type of lukewarm sentimentalism the remoteness of which from true life is manifest to everybody. I mean a more serious type of art produced with the help of the highest institutions of public education and science, supported by the State, and finally in fact appreciated by the wider public. People should learn to live; youth should be given illustrations of why and how to avoid situations that lead inevitably to insoluble difficulties.

Above all, the pictures stimulate eroticism undesirably—a process in marked conflict with our actual social need of self-restraint and sublimation; and they attack the ideal of monogamous love. Though to interfere with such a state of affairs is against the principle of freedom; yet, to do so to a certain degree, for the sake of the well-being of people, for the sake of their better mental harmony, is to serve at least as important a social need as that of unlimited freedom. After all, there is no total freedom for the consumption of alcohol—scandalous behavior of the drunkard is opposed by the authorities—and nobody invokes in this respect the principle of freedom.

In creating and supporting a really intellectual type of film production—(this does not necessarily mean restricting films to the 'serious' type)—and gaining more or less public approval for the more realistic type of picture as suggested above, interference with the other type of film may even prove superficial. The social process itself may turn the taste and the requirements of the masses into a more desirable direction; and the enjoyment of that other type of film may be limited to the psychopaths, or to exceptional moments in the life of 'normals'.

CINEMA
on the set

WITH JOHN HUSTON 
directing

The Treasure of the Sierra Madre

as honestly and bitingly as written. His sincerity as a director has already been shown in his impressive and moving war documentary, San Pietro, and in the hard realism of his earlier film, The Maltese Falcon.

"We’re trying to keep the same spirit as in the original novel," Huston said as we stopped beside a street stanchion. "I’m following Traven exactly. No love interest has been superimposed. Except for bit parts, there'll be no women in the picture. And the same tragic, ironic ending is being kept. The motion picture won’t be just another adventure story."

Twisting the ends of his “home-made” cigarette between his fingers, he added, "Actually we are making two big changes. We’ve turned Curtin, one of the American adventurers, into a young, rather naive fellow to contrast with Dobbs, the other adventurer, who is so far gone as a bum he can no longer act as a decent human being. This gives us the chance, at the end of the film, to sharpen Curtin’s realization that if he continued in Dobb’s footsteps he would become as hopeless an individual."

He paused to light his cigarette with a kitchen match. "The other change," he went on, "is to dramatize the attack on the railroad. This is only told about in the book. I carried on a long correspondence with Traven and have his full approval for these changes. Incidentally, he’s very excited about the idea of having his book filmed."

Though a large part of the shooting will be done in Mexico where Traven lives, Huston expressed doubt that he’d meet him. Which isn’t surprising for no one outside of Traven’s literary agent has knowingly made his acquaintance. The mysterious B. Traven, writing his novels somewhere in the Mexican hinterland, will remain an enigma despite Hollywood’s publicity floodlights.

Huston wrote the screen adaptation of the novel. He prefers directing from his own scripts. He feels that this enables him to do a better job. For then, he explained, he knows exactly the demands of the story. As the creative mind behind the movie from the start, he has a clearer visualization of exactly what will appear on the screen.

"I never feel right working from someone else’s script," he explained. "No matter how well written, I read the dialogue and the action and somehow it never seems right. I want to rewrite all the time."

To his writing and directing, Huston brings a literary

By LILLIAN ALLEN

John Huston (extreme right) chats with Humphrey Bogart (left) and Walter Huston between takes of The Treasure of the Sierra Madre, the screen version of B. Traven’s well-known novel.

John Huston walked slowly out of the Acapulca bar and pulled a cigarette tobacco pouch from the breast pocket of his wrinkled tweed jacket. Tall and lanky, dressed in unpressed slacks and a crushed felt hat, he looked like a youthful, gangling cowboy. His somewhat battered ex-fighter’s face wore a quietly serious expression.

Despite this bizarre appearance for a successful film director, there was no affectation in his manner as we stood outside the bar and talked about the new motion picture he was directing—The Treasure of the Sierra Madre, based on B. Traven’s bitter novel of two Americans hunting for gold in Mexico.

The book, published in 1935, has long had a reputation in literary circles as an important “undiscovered” work. Serious-minded film people in Hollywood have often spoken of it as an excellent novel for the screen. Huston has had The Treasure of the Sierra Madre on his mind since well before the war.

"Warner Brothers bought it some years ago," he explained, "and I wanted badly to direct it. A couple of times while I was away in the army, they almost put it into production. But Henry Blanke, the producer, held it for me."

Huston approaches this unromantic and uncompromising book with an earnest desire to present it on the screen
and stage background. His childhood was rich in the theatrical atmosphere surrounding his father, Walter Huston, the eminent actor. After a brief spell as a professional boxer, an actor in a Kenneth MacGowan production in Greenwich Village, a play which he recalls as “not liking very much,” and a two-year stint in the Mexican Army, he began to write. He was twenty-one years old.

H. L. Mencken liked his stories about fighters and bought them. “Then I wrote a thing called Frankie and Johnny,” he reminisced. “I suppose you’d call it a play. It was in play form, anyway. In those days anyone who wrote a book was immediately tagged for movies. I was brought out by Goldwyn. It wasn’t very successful and after awhile I landed on a picture with William Wyler. That’s what got me started in motion pictures.”

But restless, he left Hollywood for England, and Paris where he studied art, returning later to New York, to the stage and writing. He sold Three Strangers to Warner Brothers and came out to Hollywood under contract to them. He’s been with them ever since.

As a studio writer, he luckily didn’t have to wade through the “B” morass which often fouls young hopefuls. He collaborated on the scripts of Juarez and Dr. Ehrlich’s Magic Bullet, both outstanding films notable for their earnestness and sincerity of theme.

Moving from writer to director-writer in 1941, he became properly famous with his first film, The Maltese Falcon, taken from the Dashiell Hammett story. In it, he displayed a rare flair for hard realism, an awareness of camera and pacing, and an eye for fresh casting that has characterized his work since. This movie set the style for the subsequent deluge of hard-hitting “private-eye” dramas that have since flooded the screen.

Though emphasizing the need for a good script, John Huston pointed out the importance of taking the story out of the realm of words and putting it into concrete images. His Paris art studies have come in handy, for it enables him to make sketches of every scene before shooting. In this way he has both the action and the camera set-up planned in advance.

“One of the first things that Henry Blanke told me when I became a director was to make every shot count,” Huston went on as he leaned over to put out his cigarette against the sole of his shoe. “At the time of shooting, each scene must be considered as the most important part of the movie. You have to put everything you have into it. Nothing can be overlooked. Every detail must be taken care of.”

Watching him shoot a scene for The Treasure of the Sierra Madre, I understood exactly what he meant. When I came onto the sound stage at Warners, John Huston had already tried three times to photograph one shot.

The scene was placed in an Acapulca bar which had been built inside the huge sound stage. Joining the other set visitors who were watching through one of the bar’s windows, I saw the same bit of action photographed over and over again in a desire to get it right.

“Quiet, please!” came a quiet voice from the crew around the camera, and “Quiet, please!” boomed another voice over the loudspeaker system. The noise of an extra flipping a page of his Los Angeles Daily News cracked through the stage.

“Camera!” came the quiet voice again, then “Sound!” and finally, “Action!”

The microphone twisted and turned over the heads of Tim Holt playing Curtin and Humphrey Bogart playing Dobbs. Bearded, dirty and down-and-out, they are standing at the bar and arguing angrily with a slick oil man. They want to be paid off for work they had accomplished in his construction camp. The oil man refuses to pay off. He tries to bluff his way out of the situation. Suddenly he throws his whiskey glass at Curtin and lashes out with his fist at Dobbs.

(In the book, the oil man decides to pay them off as the more sensible thing to do.)

The camera was placed close to Dobbs and Curtin to get a close-up of them as they argue. Then it drew back to include the oil man in the fight that ensued.

On the fourth take, Huston felt that the camera had been trucked back too quickly and they had to repeat the scene. The next time the movement of the actors became entangled. Then Humphrey Bogart muffed a line. The timing of the fight didn’t satisfy Huston on the seventh take. Finally, after a few more tries, Huston said they had gotten what he wanted.

The technical crew immediately dismantled the camera from its trucking device and began to change the set arrangement for the next shot—a close-up of the oil man beating up Dobbs (Humphrey Bogart).

“All those who haven’t had their inoculations yet, report to the doctor,” came the booming voice over the loudspeaker. The cast was leaving that Sunday for location shooting in Mexico.

As I walked off the set, John Huston was busy going over with Humphrey Bogart how to act while being beaten up. They were discussing the scene from every possible angle. It would be photographed in close-up and would probably last only a few seconds on the screen in the completed movie. But for that moment of screen time, John Huston had to be certain that exactly the right image flashed before the audience’s eyes.

His film version of The Treasure of the Sierra Madre a sin-

John Huston, a young man in his thirties, is bringing to cerity of purpose and integrity of artistic endeavor that distinguishes him as a writer-director.
DICKENS into FILM

By ARTHUR ROSENHEIMER JR.

Offhand one would be inclined to say that translating Dickens to the screen is the simplest thing in the world. His richness of narrative detail, his sharpness of characterization, his humor, and his humanity would all seem ready for the camera just as they come from the pages of his books. The several previous attempts to film Dickens, however, have all revealed numerous unexpected pitfalls: There is always in Dickens too much narrative detail to permit the straight-line development of plot that the screen demands; his sharpness of characterization often degenerates on the screen into a sort of caricature; while both his humor and his humanity tend to become patterned and conventional because so many years have passed by since first they were fresh and new.

David Lean's version of Great Expectations becomes the first with the courage and perception to alter, change, or eliminate from the original in the creation of a work that is truly cinematic. It is true, and perhaps unfortunate, that what he chose to eliminate was much of the moral comment and observation that makes Great Expectations one of Dickens' most satisfactory novels. But having decided to concentrate on the romantic aspects of the story, Lean has so arranged and telescoped and pruned his material that the development is straight and unflagging: There is no sense of jerkiness or patchiness as the story unfolds; few scenes have been introduced simply because they might be missed by Dickensian purists. And always the characters have been redrawn and rewritten to retain as much of the spirit of the originals as possible, yet at the same time to make them more like people and less like the drawings of "Phiz."

In bringing Great Expectations to the screen, David Lean, as scenarist, has wisely seen fit to retain the structure of the Dickens novel, beginning his story with the orphaned Pip assisting an escaped convict, Magwitch, on the moors. Magwitch, however, is recaptured and deported, and soon after Pip is introduced into the household of the mad Miss Havisham, who lives in musty seclusion with...
her ward, Estella. Miss Havisham, deserted at the altar, intends that Estella shall learn the fine art of breaking men's hearts, and Pip becomes her first victim. At eighteen, quite unexpectedly, Pip comes into a fine fortune that carries him up to London where, with the inspired assistance of Herbert Pocket, he learns to live like a gentleman. Because through the years Miss Havisham has softened toward him, and because the fortune is announced through Miss Havisham's lawyer, Jaggers, Pip concludes that she is his benefactress. It comes as quite a shock, then, when Magwitch returns illegally from New South Wales and explains that Pip owes his good fortune to the frightening experience on the moors so many years ago. Pip, with Herbert Pocket, tries to save Magwitch from the law, but in vain. The old man dead, Jaggers reveals that Estrella, with whom Pip is still desperately in love, is really Magwitch's daughter. Pip returns home in time to save her from the same madness that possessed Miss Havisham, and—unlike the Dickens original—there is every indication of a rather conventional happy ending.

All this is told with the same sureness of technique and sensitivity to human relationships that has marked all of Lean's films to date, but which in this country might be more likely to associate with the work of William Wyler. The resemblance is very strong. Like Wyler's, his camera work is never obtrusive, is indeed more notably reticent than otherwise. The scene in which Miss Havisham burns to death, on which a lesser director might have lavished all the pyrotechnics at his command, is played most effectively in long shots. Pip's first visit to gloomy, murdering Satis House, the scene of Magwitch's return to London, and above all the long first sequence of Pip's youth—meeting Magwitch in the graveyard, bringing him food across the foggy moor, and the ensuing man-hunt—are among the finest things the British cinema has given us so far. And if Dickens' moral implications have been toned down in the telling, so too have his excesses of sentiment. The people here are at all times believable and human.

Credit for that, of course, must go again to David Lean. When a large cast plays with an equal skill, the director is responsible in important measure. But mention must be made, too, of the warmth and sincerity with which John Mills, although a bit too mature for the role, invests the character of the adult Pip. Alec Guinness, new to the screen, but now regarded as one of England's rising young actors, plays Herbert Pocket with exquisite skill; and a similar authority is to be found in Jean Simmons' performance as the youthful Estella. Each of the smaller roles—Francis L. Sullivan as Jaggers, Bernard Miles as Joe Gargery, Martita Hunt as the mad Miss Havisham, and right down to Hay Petrie in the tiny role of Uncle Pumblechook—all leave their indelible mark. Only Valerie Hobson, the grownup Estella, seems a bit mannered and at odds with her fellow players.

There is no mistake about Great Expectations. It proves that knowledgeable film makers, people with respect for their medium as well as skill with its tools, must and will turn out films that the intelligent film fan will want to see and tell his friends about.


"Before I went away to the army," stated Mickey Rooney, "I hardly ever took anything seriously. People who wanted to talk to me about serious business couldn't pin me down — sometimes I'd kid them or do acrobatics or beat on the piano till they were fit to be tied, and it gave me a big laugh. Well no more of that. Now I know when to clown and when to be serious. If anybody wants to talk business with me, I'm always ready to be sensible at the drop of an eyebrow."

"My pictures will never try to drive a message home with a sledgehammer," declared Douglas Fairbanks, after making Sinbad the Sailor. "There is a moral, or a nugget of philosophy, in each of them, but it's not spelled out in capital letters."

"I went to the movie stars in Hollywood who are from North Carolina," he said, "and asked them if they would make a short in the interest of North Carolina's health and they said 'yes.' I go to the managers of those studios who are personal friends of mine and ask them if they will make and distribute that short, and they say 'yes.'"

Every theatre in North Carolina agrees in run those shorts. Every theatre you walk into to see Van Johnson or whoever your favorite is, a North Carolinian comes on the screen and says, 'Did you know that we have 33 counties that do not have a hospital bed in them? Did you know that we have the highest percentage of draft rejections of any state in the Union? Did you know that we had over 17,000 child births with only a mid-wife last year?'

"On every radio station, 47 radio stations, we sent nine transcribed programs a week, with every star in radio furnishing the entertainment and delivering the information. That is the way we took to the people of North Carolina, one, our ills, and, two, the causes, and, three, the cure—the prescription."
Hyphenated Hollywood

By MARTIN FIELD

At the start of each day's shooting on a picture, a certain Hollywood director goes through a curious ritual. With elaborate ceremony he holds up the shooting script, tears out five pages, crumples them into a ball, and tosses the wad of paper into a corner of the sound stage. Thus having disposed of the script provided by the screen writer, he announces that he is ready to direct the picture all by himself.

This impresses everyone who witnesses this act with the uselessness of writers and the corresponding indispensability of directors. What the onlookers do not know is that the director is careful to throw away only the previous day's five pages of shooting script. But it's a good gesture on his part and most satisfying to his ego.

So much for one man's attempt to put the screen writer in his "place." Most directors and producers, however, acknowledge the importance of the screenplay in motion picture production. What makes screen writers gnash their teeth is the film industry's illogic in not recognizing that the screen writer himself, as the creator of the screen play, is important. That, they assert, is like claiming the sculpture and painting produced by Michaelangelo is great, but Michaelangelo himself was a bum of no importance.

No director or producer of a stage play, for instance, would dream of changing a play script without consulting the playwright. It has been common custom in Hollywood to take a screen writer's script and change it to fit whatever ideas the director or producer might have, and any thought of consulting the writer would be considered lese majesty.

"In the beginning was the word" is the battlecry of the writers. And "Who's running this show, anyhow?" seems to be the retort of the producers as they raise shields and spears and form a solid phalanx of defense.

Since ingenuity is a highly-developed quality in a screen writer, it has proven useful in coping with movie producers. Failing to gain from the producers the recognition they felt they deserved, some writers abandoned the frontal form of attack. Instead, one by one, they succeeded in effecting entrance into the Valhalla of authority—through the side door.

These successful solo skirmishes for prestige and power have brought into existence a new order of nobility in the motion picture hierarchy, a nobility recognizable by its (continued on page 23)
Jean Renoir's latest film, *The Woman on the Beach*, is a sombre story of a blind artist (Charles Bickford), his selfish wife (Joan Bennett), and a confused Coast Guard officer (Robert Ryan). Here we see Charles Bickford (left), and Robert Ryan (far right) make port after surviving a boat wreck. The girl, Virginia Huston, plays the Coast Guard officer's fiancee.

Pearl White's fabulous career on the American stage and in the early movie industry is a nostalgic memory to many. For her screen biography, Paramount cleverly selected as the title the name that emblazoned many a movie house marquee in those far-off days: *The Perils of Pauline*. Betty Hutton plays Pearl White in her personal and bright style.

FOUR TO
Pierre Benoit's *L'Atlantide*, the novel about the lost continent-island, is again reaching the screen. In this latest version, directed by Arthur Ripley, Maria Montez is Queen Antinea. The two French explorers who come upon the lost kingdom are Jean Pierre Aumont and Dennis O'Keefe. Choreography for the dance sequences, featuring Milada Mladova, was composed by Lester Horton. Movie is titled *Atlantis*.

In *Crossfire*, Adrian Scott as producer, Edward Dmytryk as director, and John Paxton as screen writer have fashioned out of the novel, *The Brick Foxhole*, a vivid story of intolerance in America. The screen version tells of the murder of an ex-GI because of his religious faith and the tracking down of the killer. The three Roberts — Young, Mitchum and Ryan — are in the cast. George Cooper, whom we see here, plays a confused G.I., one of the murder suspects.
A LONDON LETTER

New Spirit in Continental Films

BY ROGER MANVELL

I am writing to you in between visits to London rather than residence in it. I have just come back from a tour of Switzerland with a programme of extracts of British feature films and a few hesitant words in French and far less hesitant in English about what I called the new spirit in the British cinema. I travelled through the known and less known beauties of that country which seems so much bigger than it is merely because so many nationalities are enclosed by its frontiers. After a few brief days in London at the Czech Film Festival, I went to Paris to speak at an Exhibition of British Cinema on which I worked during the winter for the British Council, an official body concerned with the representation of British life and culture abroad.

The moral of all this movement to and from Britain is there is now an increasing desire these last months among the film-producing countries to Europe to draw closer together, because it is clear that there is a community of spirit in Europe evidenced in the style of the post-war films of Britain and of both the liberated territories and the non-belligerents like Switzerland and Sweden. In America the closest approximation to this spirit is to be found in the films produced by Louis de Rochemont, especially Boomerang. It is not limited, as one might think at first, to the production of a few films of a semi-documentary character. It is a style, an approach, an attitude of mind which animates a larger proportion of the responsibly produced work of many studios. It is a school of cinema in which many technicians want to take their due creative place. It will be found obviously in Roma Citta Aperta (Italy), in Stolen Frontiers (Czechoslovakia), Der Rote Enge (Denmark), in La Bataille du Rail (France), in The Way Ahead and Nine Men (Britain). But these films are by way of being past history: they distil our wartime or after-war reactions. In the case of the liberated territories they are even a purgation, films that must be made like the books that must be written after the stifling atmosphere of occupation.

But this spirit goes further than the after-expression of the past. It permeates many films of many kinds. You will find it in the slighter programme pictures: a melodrama, a comedy. Again there are obvious films of exceptional merit such as Brief Encounter and Odd Man Out which are the food of love for the critics and for that growing section of the public which likes to frequent the specialized cinemas. But in Europe the general audience, the grand publice for such films has risen sharply: they are no longer a serious box-office risk and may well become box-office successes. The new spirit is mounting in the public as well.

Two recent British films, The Brothers and Take My Life, the first a melodrama and the second a thriller, are examples which are useful merely because they are unpretentious programme pictures and not the sort of films one goes on quoting in articles for the next twelve months. Both show unmistakably the signs of the influence of the new spirit, which can be called a spirit of "sweet reasonableness" in the treatment of the emotional climaxes which are almost always the essence of the narrative arts. The Brothers is not a film to my personal liking: it represents too savage a distaste for humanity, but when it reaches the States it might be compared with the Hollywood colossus Duel in the Sun which seems to me to have a correspondingly unhealthy and inhumane attitude. But the people in The Brothers, natives of the Scottish Western Isles lusting and fighting over an orphaned Scottish girl who is the victim of their passionate family feuds and rivalries is far nearer to the earth you and I and the editors of this journal inhabit to our cost in human energy, than are the super-powered people in the tawny-browns and the blood-reds of technicolored Texas. I can believe in the people in The Brothers though I do not particularly want to do so. The film does not go beyond what is humanly necessary to make one feel the passions and lusts of the flesh. Duel in the Sun is so over-expressed that its passionate contrivances become ludicrous and grotesque. This is Hollywood, says the critics and most of the public, and only the simplest will be had for suckers and believe in it all.

Similarly Take My Life is a near, precise piece of filmcraft made obviously enough by people who put some thought into it. Like most thrillers, the end is too weak and coincidental, but the first sixty minutes are excellent melodrama, with a credible and exciting build-up about an innocent man who is suspected of committing a vicious murder.

The first feature-length story film made specifically for children has now been released by the Rank organization. It is called Bush Christmas, and is a beautifully photographed story of the adventures of a group of children in Australia who track down a gang of horse thieves (continued on page 21)
ITALIAN REVIVAL

By LUCIANO EMMER
and ENRICO GRAS

Paisa remains the sensation of the screen in Italy. Critics seem rather puzzled by this unusual film and try to discover in it some complicated or even occult factors while the answer to their speculations apparently lies in the plain true-to-life nature of the picture. It is a news film that lasts for two hours and features the progress of the American troops in Italy. The film is divided in six parts, each of which takes place in one of the key spots of the Allied military occupations; the landings in Sicily, the capture of Naples, Rome, Florence and Bologna; and ultimately the crossing of the Po River. Every part is acted by characters of its own and has its own tragic, human and poetical meaning.

Yet the value of this film is not determined so much by the literary factor of its various sketches as by the manner in which they are narrated. The director Rossellini's language is not of the high-brow, carefully-weighed type nor is his poetical world intellectual and abstract. He is more inclined to follow the spontaneous impulse of his instinct and sensitiveness that speak with the strong and convincing voice of genuine poetry. Such bold liberty of movement does at times draw Rossellini somewhat beyond the mark, but these inevitable errors are due to an excess of generous zeal and can therefore easily be accepted and forgiven. By calling things their real names he dismantles them from the conventional meanings they have acquired through generations of literature.

Rossellini, who also directed Open City, recently visited Berlin where he studied the approaches to his Germany In The Year Zero, a film that he expects to realize without professional actors but with people drawn from actual life. He also plans to produce in France a short out of Cocteau's famous one act play, La Voix Humaine, with Anna Magnani who played the leading role in Open City.

Another able director is Alberto Lattuada whose Bandit has been a great success. He is now preparing The Romantic Isthmus after D'Annunzio's Giovanni Episcope, and is said to have plans for producing a film on the adventures of Negro AWOL's in Italy to be called Goodbye Othello.

Vittorio De Sica's Sciuscia (Shoe-Shine) is still a favorite with Italian audiences and he is working now in the wooded mountains of Calabria, the extreme tip of the

Measure for Measure, one of William Shakespeare's less publicised plays, will reach the screen in this Italian version (Dente per Deute). It is heralded as that country's most pretentious and lavish film since Quo Vadis came to America in 1913. According to reports, the film version retains Shakespeare's incisive social comment as well as his broad sweep.
A MILAN LETTER

Shoe-Shine (Sciusha) is a wonderfully told Italian film about the plight of the children following that country's liberation. In this scene is the lively fight in the school classroom.

Italian peninsula, on a film picturing the life of the celebrated bandit Musolino, a kind of romantic popular hero who coupled terrorism with generosity.

Giuseppe De Santis is directing the film Caccia Tragica (Tragic Hunting), featuring the terrible conditions in postwar Italy.

No lesser names than Francois Mauriac, Paul Claudel, Julien Green, Rene Clair, Marcel Carne, Karl Dreyer and Bressen have agreed to join Italian producer Salvo d'Angelo in realizing a series of at least eight films, including one in color on the life of Christopher Columbus, and about twenty documentary films showing the works of art and beauty spots of Italy. One of the first of d'Angelo's short films directed by Luciano Emmer and Enrico Gras will show the Allied War cemeteries in Italy and is intended to convey to the families of the dead Allied soldiers the comfort of feeling that their places of rest are surrounded with affection and care.

Sarah Churchill, the daughter of England's war time premier, has taken the leading role in Daniele Cortis, another d'Angelo production directed by Mario Soldati who successfully directed recently several period films of the '80's. An outstanding feature of this film is its unusual photography due to the skill of the cameraman Scala who brought a new and personal touch into the accurate interpretation of a well defined poetical world.

This may not be much as far as quantity is concerned, but it goes to show that some good work is under way in Italy. The difficulties that post-war conditions in Europe throw in the path of film work is perhaps particularly evident of Italy, where the cinema has presently no assets to draw upon except the ability of men.

Under fascism, funds and Government help were abundantly available but the whole bureaucratic system was devised to secure easy profits to incompetent politicians with the result that hoards of parasites were preying on the industry and nothing of lasting value was achieved.

Now, whatever is done, comes out of a constructive effort of a few men who have the courage and tenacity to face a situation where everything is lacking. This proves, however, the vitality of the Italian cinema and makes us trust that it will eventually get out of the woods. After all, there is something to be said for hardship: it certainly screens the characters and sharpens the wits.

So here is hope!

About the Authors

Luciano Emmer and Enrico Gras began film experimenting during the Mussolini regime. An early film, Destino D'Amore, a satire on a romance between a chambermaid and an Italian soldier, was created through ingenious editing of the couple's picture postcard exchanges. The Ministry of Popular Culture banned it.

Other clashes with the Fascist Government led Emmer to exile in Switzerland and forced Gras into the army.

Reunited after the liberation, they experimented with a 15 minute short, The Story of a Mural, taken from 37 frescoes by Giotto. Next came Paradise Terrestre, the story of Adam and Eve's banishment from Eden as conceived in 27 frescoes by Bosch. Both films have received wide critical attention in Continental circles.

CINEMA
The Films of Jean Vigo

Glowing reports of Atalante and Zero de Conduit have been reaching the United States ever since they were filmed in the early 1930's. Both of these remarkable films by Jean Vigo have at long last been brought to this country.

At the left is Dita Parlo, and, below, Michel Simon (extreme left) in Atalante.

TWO FRENCH CLASSICS

By HERMAN G. WEINBERG

It has taken thirteen years for these two films to come to America. To V. Bejtman movie-goers may well feel grateful. He had the courage and sensitivity to bring them over—and now, at long last, you can look forward to seeing what the camera can do in the hands of a poet ... a Vigo, a pre-Hollywood Renoir, a Carné, René Clair, Pagnol, Duvivier ... Atalante and Zero de Conduit are in that same Olympian company that includes La Grande Illusion, Quai des Brumes, A Nous La Liberté, La Femme du Boulanger and Un Carnet de Bal.

I use the word "courageous" advisedly because, as films go, these two would be regarded as "museum pieces" today because of their age. Yet the life of the butterfly is even more evanescent and still do we constantly delight in the miracle of the butterfly. What there is in these two films of Vigo is as evanescent and as lasting and when the frauds of a thousand more arrogantly pretentious films have been gratefully wiped from the memory, Atalante and Zero de Conduit will still remain shining things to justify the cinema. For there is not a moment in either film that is spurious, that does not spring from life itself. And to all the snobs to whom the cinema is "the movies" and, ergo, beneath contempt, one can point out as unanswerable refutations—Atalante and Zero de Conduit.

Zero de Conduit is a short, somewhat episodic film of the revolt in the minds of a group of schoolboys against their teacher-oppressors. With gradually mounting tension we begin to see the teachers as the boys see them, in a fantastic "dream of revolt," and there is a mock religious procession at the culmination of a dormitory pillow fight against a haze of lightly falling feathers, filmed in slow motion and accompanied by a choral chant of the boys, that is as lovely and original as anything I have ever seen in a film. It ends with the triumph of the boys' "dream revolt." Young Vigo was only 29 when he made it. He remembered his youth with tenderness and affection.

He was 30 when he made Atalante—still young enough to know the rapture of young love. A girl marries a young barge-master whose crew consists of an eccentric old sailor, also with memories of his own youth, and a ragged street urchin. Life on the barge isn't very gay and she almost runs away but she comes back. That's all there is to it. But to see what Vigo has done with it is to witness a revelation of the human soul. There has been no more adorable character on stage or screen anywhere than Michel Simon's old sailor, with all the souvenirs of his highly colored past cluttering up his small cabin. The scene where he finally manages to repair a broken down phonograph and plays it to the distraught barge-master, whose bride has run away, in an effort to cheer him up, is the tenderest thing imaginable. Out of such simple things has Vigo made his film, but he didn't need more. He was young, and his films breathe with the breath of youth.

He made a short film, Apropo de Nice. And then that was all. He died at the age of thirty.
THE HOLLYWOOD STORY

John Steinbeck breezed in one weekend to consult on the movie adaptation of his latest novel, *The Wayward Bus*. He huddled with George Stevens who is writing the script and will also direct.

Stevens wanted to turn Juan, the novel’s bus driver-lover, into a more spiritually-minded person. Steinbeck insisted that Juan only had sex on his mind. Stevens pleaded Production Code limitations.

Steinbeck left in a huff for New York and novel writing.

AUDIENCE

Complaints about films keep pouring in from all quarters.

The conservative Los Angeles Times in an April 24th editorial didn’t treat neighboring Hollywood very neighborly. “There is plenty of what the movies need,” captioned the long statement which explained:

“Any reflective person who spends a couple of evenings a month in a movie theatre must be vaguely troubled by what he sees and hears. . . . (he) will come away from them perhaps grateful for a surcease from his cares but with no permanent enrichment of his experience. He ‘escaped’ for a little while, but he could have escaped into a two-hour nap.”

Their main criticism:

“Many of the pictures he sees dangle somewhere between the earth and the sky, partaking of neither. . . . The characters talk like Americans, dress like Americans, and use American gadgets, but they are no more American than Hamlet was a Dane.”

A solution?

“They could begin by making movie characters appear to think and act like Americans and be preoccupied with American problems. The rest would come easy. Harsh or gentle, grim or gay, the material is there for the taking. It poses its own conflicts and satisfies the seven dramatic situations.”

Sex in Autos? From Chicago’s Better Films Council teen-age reviewers, Miss Bee Randolph drew some provocative conclusions on the movies affect on youngsters. First of all, she found that films confuse adolescent ideas on moral problems; secondly makes them discontent with their own living standards; thirdly gives them a false caricature of nationalities and races.

Turning to a survey among 2000 Catholic high school children in 200 different schools, she pointed out that half the teen-agers readily admitted their moral values were influenced by what they see on the screen. Miss Randolph pointed out that as long as 40 percent (a Legion of Decency figure) of movies showed long embraces in autos and bedrooms, why should adults be surprised at finding their children in similar positions?

A Commentary: From the Senate, Francis Muers of Pennsylvania rapped “pure” entertainment in a speech at the Associated Motion Picture Advertisers’ 30th Anniversary meeting.

“Every motion picture that is produced is a documentary in one sense or another, a commentary on the age and society out of which it has come,” he stated.

And motion pictures, he felt, failed in their responsibility of commenting positively on contemporary life.

Deep Dish: And from Hollywood comes a complaint from one of its favorite stars, Robert Taylor, who disliked have to star in *Song of Russia*:

“Why, they even put me into a high-blown fandango like *Camille*,” he told a fan magazine writer. “That was miles over my head. I’m just an ordinary guy, and deep dish classical masterpieces are out of my line.”

A Better Picture: Finally, even *Variety* offered advice.

“The honeymoon is over,” an editorial stated referring to the box-office slump. It listed possible reasons which many movie-goers will readily agree with:

1. A 50¢ business has gone $2; 2. Maybe they are shopping the choicer product; 3. Pictures haven’t the old staying power for four weeks downtown and don’t run on and on like *Life With Father*; 4. Maybe the day of just going into theatres is over; and 5. Possibly some of those English pictures are as good as the Anglophilic film critics rave them to be, so it must cut into the U. S. product.”

Concluded this State of the Union—Cinema ’47 editorial: “You can’t just expect to be in business as effectively as your competitor who ballyhoos his show a little more, advertises it better, merchandizes it to a fuller degree—or has a better picture.”

BUSINESS

Charles Skouras’ profit of $4,281,250 in a two-year stock turnover is being contested by disgruntled stockholders of Twentieth Century-Fox.

Details of the manipulation were released in a proxy statement. In July, 1944, it explained, National Theatres sold 40 shares of its B stock with the approval of a majority of its voting stockholders. Twenty-five shares went to Skouras, its president, for a little over $553,000; the remainder went to local Fox theatre presidents.

The 40 shares represented a 2 1/2% equity in National Theatres. They were a potential 20% interest if converted into that proportion of the company’s stock interest on payment of an additional $5,085,000. Company retained the right to repurchase the stock at the same price offered by any prospective bona fide purchaser.

In August, 1946, Transamerica Corp. offered $12,500,000 for the stock. National Theatres hurriedly picked up the option by reacquiring the B stock for the difference—$7,415,000. Hence the profit to Skouras.

Another contested stock operation involved Darryl Zanuck. Options were issued and then picked up by the owners when the market price rose. Zanuck netted $3,850,000; Skouras $110,191.540.

CULTURE

Orson Welles, speaking before a packed meeting of the Beverly Hills American Writers Committee, found a lot wrong with the movies and placed its betterment squarely on the shoulders of the film craftsmen and the movie-goer. The film worker, he argued, should not sit back and bemoan the power of the producers; they must, themselves, seek to raise the quality of films at every turn. Movie-goers, he
said, should be as vocal in letting producers know what they like and dislike. He suggested that letters should be written to the studios requesting better films.

"I do not advocate a strike of the intellectuals in the motion picture industry," he said, "but I do think they can be more effective tactically. The only real hope, however, is that people all over the world, by training their critical faculties and by unrelenting pressure, can cause the motion picture industry to fulfill its responsibilities to the people."

**Classics at Leisure:** The Hollywood Film Society recently began its first series of film showings at the newly-built Coronet Theatre. Their 14-week program is probably the most extensive launched outside of New York’s Museum of Modern Art.

The program is under the supervision of John Houseman, Irving Lerner and Paul Ballard. Aside from the important “entertainment” films of the past, they are also showing documentaries and experimental films made here and abroad.

**Profits and Honors:** Has the annual Academy Awards show grown too big for its own britches?

Academy President Jean Hersholt stirred up a small hornet’s nest when he charged that the original purpose of the Academy Awards—to honor equally contributions by all branches of the industry—has been lost in the increasingly pretentious and flashy ceremonies of the past few years.

Declared Hersholt, “Because of the world-wide interest which has grown up around the awards, and because of the tremendous enthusiasm built up by the industry in the actors and actresses, the acting branch has commanded the spotlight, while the important achievements of the other branches of the Academy have not been received with the same interest on the part of the public, a situation which the Academy wants to correct.”

Hersholt conceded that international interest and publicity on the awards had given a tremendous profit to the industry, but said the Academy itself has not profited financially from the presentations, which have progressed from a banquet hall to a movie house to last year’s show in a huge public auditorium.

Hersholt proposed that next year’s show be given 1) for members only, 2) in the Academy’s own 1000-seat theatre, 3) with equal emphasis on the contributions of all crafts.

Even as he spoke, other members of the Academy were calling for bigger presentation ceremonies next year.

**DOCUMENTARY**

Four film veterans have just released a group of documentaries under the baner of Affiliated Film Producers, Inc. The four—Irving Jacoby, Willard Van Dyke, John Forno and Henwar Rodakiewicz—know their field, having produced such noted pre-war documentaries as *The City* and *Valley Town*. AFP plans to distribute its films at home and abroad through various government agencies and other outlets. *Journey Into Medicine*, the story of the education of an American physician, will be translated into 22 languages by the State Department’s Office of Information and Culture for international showing. Library of Congress will distribute the film in this country. *Journey Into Medicine*, written by Jacoby and directed by Van Dyke, was filmed entirely on the premises of three hospitals, Presbyterian and New York Hospitals in New York and the John Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health in Baltimore. Film uses only one professional actor.

Other AFP documentaries are:

*Puerto Rico, United States Caribbean Island*, written by Rodakiewicz and directed by Ferno. Film deals with social, economic and political life of the island.

*East by North*, written by Rodakiewicz and photographed by Jules Bucher. The two shipped out of Halifax, Boston and Lunenburg to get material for this dramatization of the life of Atlantic Coast fisherman. This film will also be distributed by the Library of Congress.

*Osmosis*, written by Jacoby and directed by Van Dyke. A whodunit style picture on this elementary biology subject, film was made for the Motion Picture Association’s new educational program for schools.

**Bread:** How UNRRA affected the life of an Italian family is the subject of a documentary now being completed by Julien Bryan’s International Film Foundation. The short, *Three Ships a Day*, was photographed in Italy with the cooperation of UNRRA. It will be released shortly as a part of Pathe’s *This Is America* series.

**Culture:** As a commemoration to the great Negro educator, Booker T. Washington, a 30 minute documentary on his life has been produced by Harold Azine. The film was timed to coincide with the birth anniversary of this important historical figure.

**EDUCATION**

The Motion Picture Association recently launched an extensive program to develop classroom films integrated with approved courses of study.

“Working with the American Council of Education,” stated Mrs. Alice Evans Fields of the MPA, “the motion picture industry is now embarking upon an experimental film project, producing and testing classroom films in four phases—world geography, democracy, mathematics and art. To date funds approximating $500,000 have been allocated by the industry to finance this work.”

**Ears:** Deaf children enter New York’s Lexington School for the Deaf as early as nursery school age and continue in some cases through high school level. Not only are they taught lip reading and the formation of sound patterns, but the School emphasizes helping the students become self-reliant, well-integrated adults.

To describe this work to educators and doctors, the School recently completed a 15 minute short, *Eyes That Hear*. The film was photographed in their own classrooms with students and teachers going through their customary routines.

**Teeth:** Animation in educational films has long been a standard method of describing a complex, or even simple, technical method. In a new medical film, animation was largely abandoned for a specially devised “mock up” film technique.

In the film, *The Surgical Treatment of Parodontosis*, (or pyhorea as it is
popularly known), a skull was fitted with real teeth and synthetic gum tissue. Upon this "mock-up," the doctor operates while the camera photographs the method in close-up. Then, an actual operation is shown to carry through on this realistic presentation of medical procedure.

The operative technique was developed by Dr. Albert E. Sanders. The difficult filming was done by Sy Wexler with Louis Brandt directing and producing.

**Atoms:** National Committee on Atomic Information aid for films on atomic energy now recommends five shorts on the subject: their own, *One World or None*, with narration by Raymond Gram Swing; the Army’s *Tale of Two Cities*; MOT’s *Atomic Power*; the Navy’s *Operation Crossroads*; and Encyclopedia Britannica’s *Atomic Energy*.

Another Army film, *The Atom Strike*, has created a small mystery, not even the NCAI knowing what became of it.

The only reaction to Hollywood’s *Beginning or the End* is that it will tend to interfere with distribution of the approved factual films. “If this is an atom picture, we don’t want any,” stated one NCAI spokesman as audience reaction.

Though NCAI cooperated in making *Beginning of the End*, it now appears ready to disown it.

**EXPERIMENTAL**

Sidney Peterson of San Francisco is one of the more active film experimenters of the new post-World War II group.

His first venture began in the summer of 1946. With James Broughton, he spent three months shooting and then more months editing *The Potted Palm*, an experimental film in the French surrealist tradition. For it a musical score was composed by Frances Campbell.

This spring, Peterson conducted a newly organized film workshop at the California School of Fine Arts. Just completed is a half-hour short, *The Cage*, also experimental in a documentary-phantasy vein according to reports.

Nearing completion is a film version of a dance by Marion Van Tyle with a musical score by John Cage. Titled *Horror Dream*, the dance tells of the feelings of the dancer before going on the stage. Peterson directed and Hi Hirsch did the photography for this one-reeler in Kodachrome.

**Credits:** Experimental film makers in the United States will finally get their proper credit. A British publisher is bringing out a book on the activity of experimental filmers all over the world. Roger Manvell is editing.

The United States chapter is being written by Lewis Jacobs who knows the field both as an experimental film artist and as author of *The Rise of the American Film*. His section will cover the development of experimental film work from its beginnings after the first World War to the present spurt of activity.

**FILM ART**

Alfred Hitchcock just completed one tour de force in *The Paradine Case* and is all set for another in *The Rope*. In the former, the greatest part of the drama takes place in London’s Old Bailey courtroom. In true English style, neither the lawyers or defendant are permitted to walk about.

How prevent such a long scene full of dialogue from being static? Hitchcock has attempted to solve it by shooting with many camera located in different places in the courtroom. Then he intercuts all the footage at his leisure. He’s still cutting the film.

In *The Rope*, all the action takes place in the confines of one small room. The problem is even more acute. To get movement in the film, Hitchcock is abandoning “objective” style treatment. Instead, he will use the subjective “I” method so prosaically attempted in Robert Montgomery’s *Lady in the Lake*.

To cut down on production, Hitchcock plans to thoroughly rehearse the cast before shooting. For this, *The Rope* will be presented as a play, its original form, at a Southern California theatre this summer. Its film cast, including Gregory Peck, will appear.

**Progress:** Nine years ago, G. E. Richardson, still cameraman on *Union Pacific*, photographed Robert Preston firing a gun out of a box car door. Recently assigned to *Whispering Smith*, his first job was photographing Robert Preston firing a gun out of a box car door.

**GOVERNMENT**

The Thomas (ex-Rankin) House Un-American Activities Committee recently grabbed front page headlines with what *Variety* called a Hollywood “witch hunt.” According to the findings of the Committee, *The Best Years of Our Lives* contained “communist propaganda.”

**A Testament A Credit:** “Like many other citizens,” stated Rep. Eddie Herbert (D., Louisiana), “I have in the past occasionally regretted the false picture of our country that has been presented abroad by our Hollywood films . . . . *The Best Years of Our Lives* is a testament, in film, to the spirit and strength of the American people and, as such, will serve to represent us faithfully and well overseas.

*The Best Years of Our Lives* is a credit to the United States, and it is the consensus of opinion of all those who have seen it that it will do more to promote understanding and goodwill toward this country than any other film we have ever exported.”

**SCIENCE**

Photographing dawn or dusk is tough on motion picture cameramen because they have no control over the lighting and, moreover, the natural light is much too weak for good results.

Hans Peters of the Society of Motion Picture Art Directors came up with a solution. While working on *The Beginning or the End*, he devised an artificially simulated dawn or dusk effect. He used a synthetic known as “Scotch Lite,” consisting of finely ground glass particles attached to a backdrop. A key light is placed above the movie camera: brightening it effects "sunrise" and dimming it produces "nightfall.”

With this arrangement, dawn or dusk can be filmed at high noon.
BELGIUM

Brusel producers have launched a series of films that will depict the lives of famous Belgians.

First completed one is on the life of Pieter Paul Rubens, the famous Flemish painter. The film will have a commentary in French, Flemish, English and Arabic.

Only two professional actors have been used in this "educational" film. Charles Danjou portrays Rubens and Renee Saeyes has the role of Isabelle Brant, the artist's first wife.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Puppet films have always been popular and developed probably to the highest degree of skillfulness at Czech studios. The first creator was Karel Dodal who founded the Ire-film studios which specialized in animated shorts remarkable for their color and drawing. Lucerna Is Haunted was his first puppet venture, an advertising film.

After Dodal left for America, his assistant, Hermina Tyrova, moved to Zlin where she continued the work and made Forda the Ant. This animated puppet film was full of witty figures of beetles and told of the escapades of Forda, an ant, and his fiancee, a little fly. They become caught in the web of a garden spider but escape at the last minute, of course.

Her most recent puppet short is Revolt of the Toys and she is now completing Endless Work, a humorous bit extolling the house wife.

Other puppet filmmakers include Karol Zoman who directed the movement of the puppets in Christmas Dream and then produced A Horse Shoe for Luck and The Abend. He recently completed Mr. Snooper at Work, a witty jibe at red tapism.

EGYPT

The country's seven studios are heavily in production to meet the growing demand for exclusively Arabic films. The 35mm. producers have a schedule of 100 films this year and hope to have at least 60 completed and distributed before the year is out.

Of the 180 film houses, 118 are now showing Arabic motion pictures exclusively and others are going over to this policy. Outside of the large cities of Cairo, Alexandria and Port Said, where there are large international populations, the demand for foreign films has dropped considerably.

GERMANY

The reconstruction to democracy of a Hitlerized land continues to have its very bright and very dull spots.

In Berlin, a bright spot, the Theatre Am Wittelsbacher Platz is playing nothing but Lang directed films for thirty days starting June 1st.

Fritz Lang, eminent film director, had fled his native Germany in 1933 when the Nazis offered him complete charge of the state controlled motion picture industry. There he had achieved great stature with such film classics as Metropolis, M, and Dr. Mabuse.

Coming to Hollywood, he made equally famous films as Fury, You Only Live Once, the more recent Scarlet Street, and the still-in-production Secret Beyond the Door.

All his films were banned by the Nazis. One of Lang's old friends who spent four years in a Hitler concentration camp brought the news that his films are now being rightfully honored.

From Frankfurt-Am-Main, a dull spot, comes word of the "purging" of a theatre owner. He had been tagged a Nazi by the Denazification Board and relieved of his theatre. Promptly he appealed to the Pruefungsausschuss, charged with the task of cleaning up the film industry in his state.

That board decided that the man's "bearing, professional qualifications and excellent reputation" should be considered. They cleared him therefore with the provision that 11 percent of the profits go to the theatre lessee and only 49 percent to him.

At Stuttgart, an even duller spot, public resentment has been aroused by that city tribunal's acquittal of Werner Krauss, a leader in Hitler's film industry. Krauss had been a member of the Nazi Kultersenat and the Chamber for the Theatre and Film; he had played four roles in the Nazi distorted version of Lion Feuchtwanger's novel, Jew Suss.

Berlin Abend, an American licensed paper, strongly hinted collusion in high places. They implied that Krauss was sent for trial to Stuttgart because no positive evidence against him would be readily available there; moreover, in Berlin where he had been living, the approval of all four powers would have been required for his acquittal.

SOVIET UNION

Under government's post-war five-year plan, construction of 6000 film theatres is scheduled for this year. Emphasis is on the building of small theatres in outlying districts and towns which have never before had them.

Many of these theatres, according to reports, will be built with provision for the new three dimensional motion picture technique which has proved so successful.

Inventor Semyon P. Ivanov developed this highly satisfactory three-dimensional movie which does not require special glasses or any other audience accessories to be seen. Method involves a special type of screen and film negative.

Robinson Crusoe, a film fabricated in this manner and Moscow's Little Theatre adapted for screening, Pravda reports that people line up early in the morning waiting for the doors to open and that film has been playing to capacity audiences.

Konstantin Simonov's provocative play, The Russian Question, is being prepared for filming at Moscow's Mosfilm studio. The play openly deals with the touchy differences that exist between the Soviet Union and other nations.

Script has been written by Michael Room who will also direct. Among the top stars to appear in the film are Peter Aleinikov, V. Tenin and Mark Bernes.
for the Discriminating Movie-Goer

By DANA KINGSLY

The Best Years of Our Lives. Academy Award Winner for 1946, this film stands out as one of the most sincere to come from Hollywood. It is a moving, sympathetically told story of the readjustment to civilian life of three veterans—an ex-sergeant banker, an ex-flying officer soda-jerk, an ex-sailor cripple. Throughout its three-hour length it is completely engrossing. Though some may find its postwar America a little too "sweetened," the film emerges as one of the year's best under the careful direction of William Wyler, the writing of Robert E. Sherwood, and the acting of some of the finest—Frederic March, Teresa Wright, Myrna Loy, Dana Andrews and Virginia Mayo.

Boomerang! This unpretentious mystery-thriller is graced with the documentary flavor bestowed by its producer, Louis de Rochemont, that raises it well above the usual whodunit. It tells a true story of the railroading of an innocent man to prison in a small New England town. Some basic Hollywood principles are abandoned for a large part of the film: no "hero," "romantic angle," or "solution" to the murder of the town's priest. The last half, unhappily, doesn't live up to the beginning and falls into a tricky, plotted pattern. Nevertheless, the film is often fresh and frequently exciting.

Brief Encounter. Noel Coward's production of his own one-act play is superbly directed by David Lean and acted by Celia Johnson, for both of whom the film is really a tour de force. The story may be a little thin in its drama of a middle-age love affair, but its treatment is so impeccable and handled with such sensitivity and restraint that you are completely absorbed.

Children of Paradise. In truly epic proportions, Marcel Carne has drawn this portrait of his country—France. Using the symbols of a pantomimist, an actor, a gambler and a girl in early nineteenth-century France, he tells this historical romance with poetic feeling and a sensitive touch. The film is long, leisurely paced, and rather literary in style. Some may find these as shortcomings; most will be completely absorbed in the delicately told story with its magnificent panorama of a past era in French life.

The Farmer's Daughter. Producer Dore Schary, writers Allen Rivkin and Laura Kerr, and director H. C. Potter have combined to lift his cliche plot of a "farmer's daughter" (Loretta Young) marrying the rich woman's son (Joseph Cotten) into a skillful travesty of present-day political Americana. Done with wit and taste, not a "propaganda" piece, the story cleverly suggests that people not only vote but also check the records of the candidates—a theme which raises the plot immeasurably.

Ivan the Terrible. Sergie Eisenstein, the great Soviet director, has made in Ivan a highly stylized version of the life of one of Russia's early Czars. An unusual film, it can best be enjoyed if previous conceptions of motion pictures are forgotten. Then its frequent touches of artistry—especially the opening Coronation sequence—can be appreciated. Despite its staticness, Ivan is magnificent in scope, operatic in style, and brilliant pictorially. The outstanding musical score was composed by Prokofiev.

Odd Man Out. Brilliantly directed by Carol Reed, Odd Man Out tells of the last eight hours in the life of a hunted Irish revolutionary, played by James Mason. The beginning recounts a "chase," as Mason seeks to elude the police, whose equal for vividness, realism and excitement has seldom been seen on the screen. The film stands out as one of the most expertly rendered and tense melodramas though you may find the last half too heavy with allegory. The fine cast of players was drawn largely from the Irish Abbey Theatre.

Open City. Still one of the best postwar films, Open City tells in forthright, moving and realistic terms of the underground movement in Rome during its occupation by the Nazis. In its honesty of treatment and naturalness of presentation, the film assumes the validity of a newsreel. The lives of a priest, a simple Italian woman, a communist, a night club entertainer, and a Nazi lesbian are all interwoven into this profoundly moving story. Anna Magnani gives an especially stirring performance as the wife of an underground worker.

Stairway to Heaven. A love affair between an English airman and an American WAC serves as the basis for this very witty and at all times ingratiating film. Directors Powell and Pressburger tell this psychological-phantasy with rare imagination and a lively spirit. In its tongue-in-the-cheek use of Technicolor, its presentation of a pilot's idea of heaven, and an amazing court trial in the sky, the film is completely charming and bright.
Hyphenated Hollywood
(continued from page 11)

Hyphenated names. Freshly born are such appellations as writer-director, writer-producer, and, awesomely, writer-director-producer. More and more, it seems, the studio contact which calls for a three-way deal is the contract that really counts in the industry. The fellow who scores a two-bagger as a writer-director or a writer-producer is not to be scorned, by any means. But the man who hits a triple is a mighty man indeed, and to be a home-run king you have to be Charlie Chaplin.

Writers, especially those who have become members of the new hyphenated nobility, hail this development in the film industry as the inevitable solution to their problems. Simon-pure writers find it difficult to talk back to executive producers, but as writers armed with the extra authority of directors or producers they can more easily pin down executives with the weight of their words.

Thus, armed with greater authority, the hyphenated movie creators can exert an influential force on picture-making. And, in the main, through such films as Sister Kenny, None But the Lonely Heart and Sullivan's Travels and the more recent The Red House, The Miracle on 34th Street, The Woman on the Beach, The Treasure of the Sierra Madre and Mourning Becomes Electra (the two last named still in production), the new nobility has displayed it is striking out in a fresh direction. Such individual film craftsmen as Orson Welles, Dudley Nichols, Sidney Buchman, John Huston, Delmar Davis and George Seaton have had a major hand in turning out a better film.

Studio executive producers who supervise the work of writers and directors tend to eliminate any originality in script or treatment and insist on "playing it safe" by repeating previously successful formulas. Films made by creators with greater say-so are less likely to be molded in this common pattern.

Since this is the case, all additions to the ranks of hyphenated creators should be encouraged and applauded. At the same time, it must be realized that many writers function best purely as writers and similarly many directors have talent only for their specialized craft. Working as a team, instead of as individual film creators, they actually function, in the best cases such as Billy Wilder and Charles Brackett, as a hyphenated unit.

Writers, as writers without hyphens, must be a force in themselves. The struggles of the Screen Writers' Guild for recognition from the motion picture producers is a reflection of this effort to achieve stature and standing. These struggles have already shown results from a purely economic standpoint: minimum salaries, minimum working hours, credit arbitration and so on. In recent years, the Guild has considered the status of the screen writer as a creative contributor and fostered his advancement in the eyes of the industry and the public especially through the pages of its own lively organ, The Screen Writer magazine.

In the last analysis, the vast majority of screen writers can depend only on their organized strength in cooperation with the other Guilds and Unions to achieve their goal of greater prestige and authority in the motion picture industry. In this way, both hyphenated and unhyphenated writers can effect their mutual objective—better quality films.

NEW FILM BOOK
Audio Visual Methods In Teaching
By Edgar Dale
(The Dryden Press, New York, November, 1946)

With the large growth in the school use of audio-visual aids in the last half-dozen years, has come the need for just such a book. Mr. Dale in this one volume accomplishes the worthwhile service of integrating all the aspects of the "new" method of teaching.

Of special interest are those chapters dealing with the use of motion pictures in education. He discusses the "pure" educational movie, then the documentary and finally the entertainment film in its relation to teaching. Necessarily brief, the chapters are more a summary of the basic facets of motion pictures as related to the specific problem at hand. He pleads especially for "courses or units in motion picture discrimination," and for teachers to bring to film criticism the same awareness that they traditionally assign to literature.

For use as a textbook or as a general introduction to the field, this book should be on the shelf of every audio-visual minded educator.

Continental Films
(continued from page 14)

in the Bush. The story moves simply at a pace suitable for children under twelve years of age (the normal organized audience for our children's films in the Rank club matinees). It stars the children and Chips Rafferty.

I mentioned the Czechoslovakian film festival in London at the beginning of these notes. The delegation attending the festival was an official one of administrators, artists, technicians and film journalists. The films shown at the London News Gallery, a large cinema in Regent Street (and subsequently at cinemas in Scotland) were largely films of the resistance made with admirable restraint and consequently with increased emotional effectiveness. They included Men Without Wings, Stolen Frontiers, The Strike and The Warning, together with documentaries and a number of charming puppet and cartoon films in black and white and Agfacolor. The festival was opened with the least effective film of the repertoire, the Agfacolor historical Robin of Dale. This attempted to be "big" and became as a result rhetorical and stately. It is salutary to remember, though, that this film cost only $400,000, and that most Czech films cost little over $100,000 to produce. Those of us who visited Prague in October, 1946, for the festival of British films held there by the Czechs have been able in some measure to repay their hospitality. The Czechs are now definitely in the van of European production.

In June we shall all meet again in Brussels for what promises to be the largest of this year's international festivals. There is no doubt now that the cinema is one of the strongest links in the cultural chain between our rich and diverse countries.
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Jean Vidal, editor of L'Ecran Français, writes from Paris that he is preparing an article for Cinema on the divergent facets of the French film scene.

L'Ecran Français is a weekly Parisian film magazine which prides itself on its independent criticism. The most recent issue received, dated June 3rd, is about equally divided in attention between Hollywood and Continental films. There is a lengthy analysis of the first person movie story technique used in Robert Montgomery's The Lady in the Lake; an interview with the French child actress, Odile Versoix, recently starred in Dernieres Vacances; an historical review of Errol Flynn's film role as "The Prince of Adventure"; a summary of a motion picture expedition among the pygmies of the African Congo; other articles and reviews of current films plus a special enclosed sheet which lists all the films playing in the Paris theatres.

Recommended new films are Hellzapoppin, Jour de Colere, Maria Candelaria, Le Silence est D'Or, Rebecca, Arsenic and Old Lace, La Belle et La Bete, Brief Encounter, among others. Certainly, an internationally ciné-minded selection.

Especially novel is the featured listing of what the Paris Film Societies are showing. These "ciné-clubs" have regular theatre projections and any night in the week you can select from any three or four of the film revivals which they exhibit. For the week of June 5th, The Long Voyage Home, The Passion of Joan of Arc, The Crow, The Puritan, and Daybreak were among those available.

From Prague, Czechoslovakia, we received an interesting letter from Rudolf Patena and M. Svoboda, editor and general secretary, respectively, of their country's Film Bulletin.

"The aim of this Bulletin," they explain, "is to inform foreign countries of the work in our Nationalized Film Industry." A weekly, it is printed in English, German, French and Russian translations.

They will keep Cinema informed of their country's film activity which has shown such great vitality since the Liberation and has been so quickly reestablished.

To those who recall the exciting prewar Czechoslovakian film Janosik, the resurgence of excellent film making there does not come as too much of a surprise. But so far few Czechoslovakian films have reached this country; their early import is to be looked forward to.

Liam O'Laoghaire writes us from Dublin, Ireland, that, for the first time, motion picture production is getting under way there. Mr. O'Laoghaire is author of Invitation to the Film (Ker-ryan Ltd., Ireland) which Roger Manvell has described as "a book of more than local or national interest. . . (Mr. O'Laoghaire) has a lively mind for cinema and he should obviously be producing Irish feature and documentary films for exhibition at home and overseas."

As the book explained, Irish film production was prohibitive because of the small home market which can only permit a gross of about $25,000 for a successful film.

Now Mr. O'Laoghaire informs us that while they still do not have a film industry "there are signs of a start and already we have a small unit working here who are turning out simple documentary films. This unit called Hibernia Pictures has accepted a scenario of mine for a film on Dublin which they hope to make in the near future. It roughly follows our plan of Ruttman's Berlin which is of course the master type for pictures of this kind."

He is preparing an article for Cinema in which he will discuss the Irish film scene at greater length.
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ON THE COVER

Back from the Army, a factory worker in a small Ohio town murders a night club magician who has seduced his girlfriend.

In his top story flat, he is forced to shoot it out with the police. During his long night’s vigil in the barricaded room, remembered events tell his sombre story.

Henry Fonda plays the ex-GI, Barbara Bel Geddes, his girl friend, and Vincent Price, the magician.

Screenplay for The Long Night was by John Wexley. Anatole Litvak directed.
ENGLAND

Deborah Kerr (right) in the Technicolor Black Narcissus, directed by Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger.

Two From Abroad

Viviane Romance in The Queen's Necklace, adapted from the novel by Alexander Dumas.

FRANCE
IN ACHIEVING RECOGNITION as a respected member of society, the actor has had a long road to travel, for his original status was a lowly one, economically precarious and socially despised. During the Elizabethan period, he was little more than chattel of the nobility; by the end of the seventeenth century, he had begun to establish his independence under the leadership of such men as Thomas Betterton, who, in 1694, led the first actors' strike.

The actor in America inherited the full traditions of his English predecessors; these traditions crossed the ocean as tangibly as did Lewis Hallam, the first English actor who braved the Western wilderness to seek a career in the new country. Part of this tradition was the historically imposed necessity to struggle for recognition, for in America, as in England, the theatre was subject to periodic banning. However, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, as American culture has achieved an entity of its own, American actors have become an accepted part of our cultural life. With the rise in that era of great native American actors as Charlotte Cushman and Edwin Forrest, actors achieved popular followings and were recognized for their cultural contributions to the American scene. From that time on their status has risen, until today they are esteemed not only for their artistic achievements, but for the persuasive role they perform as servants of society. That position has not been easily won; behind it lies centuries of hardship and humiliation, conquered through an indomitably courageous spirit.

The actor's social status today has been made more secure by the elevation of economic and professional standards, achieved through group action. Perhaps the single most significant achievement of the actor in his struggle for stability and recognition has been the headway he has made in the past few decades towards self-organization, chiefly through the unions which are banded together in the 4 A's. Such organizations are today the instrument through which actors can crystallize the gains they have made.

From the past three hundred years in the theatre have emerged marked changes in acting technique. These changes have been brought about inevitably by technological developments in the medium itself. For instance, because the Elizabethan theatre was an outdoor stage, the actor necessarily resorted to declamation and flamboyant gesture. With the Restoration, the theatre acquired a roof, and a proscenium arch described the boundaries of the stage, but the acoustics were still inadequate; the actor compensated with an oratorical style, in keeping with the formalized tradition of that period's acting.

The Romantic era saw a drastic breaking away from the past under the leadership of such dominant men as David Garrick. It was he who banished the privileged members of the audience from their seats upon the stage and thus established the fact that the stage belonged to the actor alone — the instrument through which he projected his artistry. It was Garrick, too, who introduced footlights; rudimentary though this candle illumination was, it made the faces of the actors visible, and thus contributed to growing realism. It was during this period that actors were, for the first time, exploring the emotional content of their roles, in distinction to the stylized interpretations which had characterized performances before that time. This new emphasis on the emotional was without benefit of psychological understanding; it is true, and manifested itself in florid, undisciplined displays, but in its recognition of human values, it marked an enormous advance.

Such external changes in the theatre as the use of, first, gas and later, electricity in theatrical lighting, left their mark on acting technique. The fact that an actor's gestures and facial expressions were increasingly visible to the audience served as an impetus to developing greater depth and understanding in the interpretation of a role.

The progress of a realistic acting technique was stimulated, in the latter part of the past century, by the beginnings of an understanding, on the part of both the actor and the audience, of psychology. This new knowledge spurred the actor really to understand the role he was portraying, and to interpret not only the overt emotions, but the motivations behind them. Such an approach to acting inevitably leads to refinements in technique, for the more complex the concept of the role, the more varied were the devices of voice, gesture and facial expression used to portray it. American pioneers in the school of acting which placed emphasis on this type of insight were Steele MacKaye, the great actor-teacher, and Minnie Maddern Fiske and Clara Morris, two illustrious actresses who searched
deeply into their own art and attempted to define its techniques. Two great European teachers added immeasurably to the growth of realism—Antoine and Stanislavski.

Of particular interest to screen actors are the pronounced revisions in acting technique which were brought about by the new medium of the screen, which in the brief span of fifty years has developed from the crude films of its early period through the predominantly pantomimic phase of silent pictures to the intricate art form it is today. The screen, highly developed technologically, capable of complex and subtle effects, gives actors a rare opportunity to reflect, through close-up, microphone, lighting and a score of other effects, the most delicate nuances of characterizations, the most searching interpretations of the thoughts and feelings of the character he is portraying. In the three hundred years in which the actor has moved from the crude outdoor theatre to the modern sound stage, he has acquired the benefits of scores of technological advances—and his technique has been accordingly modified. He has developed from gestures that were necessarily overdrawn and flamboyant (in order to be seen at all by the audience) to registering emotions sensitively through the expression in the eyes, as recorded by the close-up—from performing at top-voice, in order to be heard, to the eloquence of a whispered word, picked up by the microphone.

To chronicle the development of acting technique in this manner is not to indicate that the actor today is necessarily superior to his predecessors, for all art must be judged in terms of the historical period in which it developed. Even the greatest actor cannot go beyond what has developed in his time. The test of the great artist is his ability to make creative use of these developments. For the actor, the challenge lies in using today’s superb technology and today’s understanding of psychology for the enrichment of acting. To meet this challenge, he must not only make full utilization of what today offers, but must be ready to adjust his technique to new changes which are to come. For they are coming. We need only to contemplate the future of television to know that another revolution in technique lies ahead for actors.

Acting can never be dissociated from the content with which the actor works. As the content expands and achieves depth, the opportunity it offers to the actor for depth of interpretation likewise expands. In the Elizabethan and Restoration periods, for instance, when the theatre was primarily the possession of royalty, content was limited to material which would appeal to the nobility and roles were likewise limited. All protagonists were of the nobility; if any members of the lower classes were written into the plays, they served the function of clowns. With the development of a merchant class in the early eighteenth century, the theatre reached out to broader audiences. That new audience was reflected on the stage by the appearance of new characters in the plays—middle-class characters whom the audience understood, and whom, therefore, the actor was impelled to interpret with greater realism.

As the theatre became increasingly popular, the range of characterizations which found their way onto the stage expanded, and each expansion offered further opportunity to the actor. Today, the screen provides a mass form of entertainment never before paralleled, and by the same token, there is a steady demand for the content of the screen to deal with people whom the audience understands—facing the problems familiar to that audience. This trend had been highlighted by the global war which led the audience to seek on the screen honest and courageous treatment of the issues involved—treatment which evoked from the serious actor honest and courageous performances. Since the war, there has been a sliding off of story standards in film production. Repetition of cliche situations and characters and the avoidance of social themes is reflected in screen acting which lacks vitality. The actor finds it difficult to orient himself to characterizations lacking in authenticity and realism. Such recent films as The Best Years of Our Lives and Crossfire, which attempted to deal profoundly with contemporary problems, evoked performances that deepened the meaning of the content—performances that are memorable.

The actor today has assumed greater responsibilities not only as an artist but as a citizen; he has fought the war on all fronts—in uniform, as an entertainer in Army camps, in countless home-front activities. Because he is so thoroughly integrated into the world in which he lives, it is particularly important that he develop a sense of his historical past, that he think of his profession in terms of a national and international heritage. Too often the actor thinks of his profession in narrowly, as a bag of tricks. Particularly is this true of the screen actor, who is less aware of his identification with a long tradition than the stage actor is likely to be. Through an understanding of his past, the actor is better able to evaluate his position in relation to the present and the future, for the roots of the actor are deep in the whole development of society. He didn’t rise out of a vacuum to make faces into the camera, or just to amuse and entertain. He has articulated the aspirations of people throughout the centuries, enriching their understanding of life.

**Reelisms**

For *Cry Wolf*, the deep-green oak-covered hills of the location site photographed too beautifully. To break up this natural splendor, five truck loads of artificial shrubs and bushes were distributed on the landscape.

For *Two Guys From Texas*, an indoor location was used rather than going to a natural site. To duplicate the Lone Star State, set dressers used 20,700 square feet of canvas sky, 31,328 square feet of sand-covered flooring, two carloads of Texas flora and a huge ranch house with seven fireplaces.

For *Silver River*, real dirt rubbed into the face and uniform of Errol Flynn, playing a Civil War battle scene, didn’t look "dirty" enough. As a substitute they used 25 pounds of Fuller’s Earth in assorted colors ranging from gray to red to brown.

For *Treasure of the Sierra Madre*, Humphrey Bogart plays a gold prospector who flings himself down at a water hole after a long trek and drinks thirstily. But the Mexican burros he was leading nonchalantly sauntered away from the water as though the last thing on their mind was thirst. Director, cameraman, and actors huddled trying to figure out how to trick the burros into drinking in order to make the scene look realistic. Finally, as the production crew waited, the burros were taken on a long walk through the open countryside under the hot sun. But after bringing them back to the water hole, they still refused to drink. A native who had been watching this all-day procedure finally walked up to Bogart and explained that burros only drink when they are dying of thirst—otherwise they get their water from the dew on grass.
"Hollywood" Music

If it is true that music has powers to soothe the savage breast, one would think that it might have been employed more generally than it has for purposes of social therapy. Yet the Carnegie Halls from coast to coast service only a tiny segment of the population. Only the mass media of communication—films and radio—have been distributing this healing balm with largesse. But there is considerable doubt about its therapeutic value. Film music in particular is held suspect by its examiners. They warn against it as though it were a new patent drug attempting to evade the safety regulations laid down by the Federal Trade Commission. Such eminent doctors as Igor Stravinsky regard it as a mere placebo, as "primitive and childish" in concept. Other observers seem willing enough to tolerate it, if it will only take the trouble to be composed by Europeans like Prokofiev and Auric (they conveniently ignore the Lev Schwartzes of Russia and the Hubert Baths of Elstree), or if it will confine itself to the modest fulfilment of its lowestest functions. But let it not try to break out of its functional frame, pretend to be Art. Art is strictly the business of the graduates of Juilliard and Curtis, or of the pupils of Hindemith and Boublanger.

The defenders of film music, and there are many, answer quickly that so-called "serious music" has held itself economically and esthetically aloof. When it does come down into the market place, it keeps its price high and advertises for a restricted clientele. It has produced more snobs than genuises, and it is a safe refuge for poseurs, mystics and conductors. Worst of all, it has submitted to the stewardship of the Judsons and Huroks and their retinues of stylish ladies, under whose auspices all decent people are relegated to sitting below the salt.

This exchange of cordialities cannot be said to have produced any noticeable change for the better, either in the quality of film music or in the ethics of the concert hall. Both the cinema and the concert hall seem to be here to stay, and it would be to their mutual advantage to arrange some way of getting along together. The atomic bomb will not distinguish between them; in smotherens they will be identical. Meanwhile both are living in glass houses and they would do well to mend their manners or draw the blinds.

One does not need to be a Peeping Tom to discover what goes on among these Montagues and Capulets of music. Most of the issues are plain, and, for the most part, insignificant. To begin with, film music is an interloper, and it made a bad choice in the selection of its birthplace. Hollywood has the reputation of being a cultural slum, and it appears that its inhabitants will never quite live down that ignominy, no matter how many Wilsons and Mice and Men are produced, fine musical scores written. Hollywood is too full of "copy" to be allowed to lapse into quiet respectability. Publicity agents and a press corps second only to those of Washington and New York make good livings by peering into every corner, reporting every scandal and every deal. Besides, censors and preachers and Congressional investigating committees like to keep the spotlight burning brightly enough to illuminate their apprehension of sex, sin and socialism.

Of course, no one is obliged to pay any attention to the gossip and chatter emanating from Hollywood. The printed page can be turned as rapidly as the radio dial. But columnism, with its stress upon the bizarre, has converted "Hollywood" from a place name to a generic term adequate for the complete enumeration, description and damnation of whatever goes on in film studios. In respect to music, it includes everything from the score of the cheapest Monogram western to the touching lyricism of Our Town. It includes all the composers from Axt to Zeisl. It includes all the functional musical devices from the leitmotiv to the mickey-mouse. In fact, it includes so many things that the term has even been used to describe the music of composers who never set foot inside a studio gate. It is amazing how much "Hollywood" music is being composed by people who despise the place. In short, "Hollywood" is an invective, most frequently found in the mouths of "serious" composers in the act of describing the compositions of their colleagues.

Film music's second sin, they say, is in having been as unselective about its parentage as it was about its birthplace. It was sired (spawned, some say) by the nineteenth century. All of it, it is averred, is derivative from the romantic and post-romantic masters—from Tschaikowsky and Rachmaninoff, from Wagner and Brahms and Strauss, from Franck and Debussy, from Sibelius—and frequently seasoned with the condiments so
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lavishly furnished by the scores of Ravel and the young Stravinsky. This discreet and genteel form of plagiarism is generally conceived of as taking place alongside of a swimming pool. The composer, with a highball in one hand and a score of *Petrushka* in the other, simultaneously refreshes his spirit and replenishes his dwindling stock of musical devices. Tune detectives will notice the Stravinsky influence in the carnival scene of the composer's next score.

It is true that there are one or two of Hollywood's hundred-odd film composers who have private swimming pools. Another dozen have arrived at a state of affluence comparable to that of successful merchants. But the great majority are men of such moderate means that the average income of the whole hundred-odd is eight to ten thousand dollars a year. It is also true that some of them compose with the score of *Petrushka* in the other hand. But most of them compose from memory. In any case, the relation between their incomes and their affection for the musical styles of the nineteenth century is a tenuous one. It is not at all certain that their music would be more modern if their incomes were reduced to college-professor size. No; it is not income but prevailing musical fashion that determines the character of film music. And in this respect Hollywood shows not its separation but its identity with prevailing musical mores. Its preference for late romantic music indeed represents the taste of a public that prefers Franck's symphony to any one of Roy Harris. On the whole, the public is conservative—at least, that small and elite portion of the public that patronizes symphony orchestras and buys phonograph records. It likes music that is comfortable, music that insinuates itself easily into the thalamus without disturbing the cortex. Such likes (and the corollary dislikes) are easily satisfied by conductors and recitants afflicted with similar cortical sluggishness. Everybody plays safe, takes no chances. So do the film composers. So long as picture making is a commercial rather than an artistic enterprise, it would be folly to deny the public what it will spend money to hear. This is no doubt a cynical philosophy; but it is obviously shared by such "artists" as Iturbi, Stokowski, Melchior. Any notion that they are high priests of art who occasionally step down from their pulpits to mingle with common humanity via the movies is sheer nonsense. They were always of Hollywood, long before they were in it. Masters of the "wow" technique, and safe conservatives in their tastes, they fitted into the Hollywood scheme without tailoring, diet or make-up.

This is not an attempt to excuse Hollywood's musical conservatism. Conservatism in the arts is inexcusable. It has always been the *avant garde* that has provided the materials for change, growth, evolution. Thus the young radicals of the nineteen-twenties provided us with nearly all the materials for modernity in music, even if they created no unyielding masterpieces of their own. But in film music there has never been an *avant garde*. Sound pictures, themselves revolutionary, generated no musical revolution except insofar as they challenged composers to find a suitable technique for satisfying the functional requirements of the film. Their idiom, on the whole, remained static. Music was one part of the old *status quo* that could safely be retained in a changing world. Screen writing, photography, recording and a thousand other technical approaches to film making had to be recast in the light of new conditions. But not musical sounds. The old familiar melodies, like the girl-meets-boy stories, were like an umbilical cord that kept films attached to their history and tradition, brief as these were. Composers no doubt enjoyed their sense of esthetic security. And it was well for them that they did. For, as time has proved, producers and front-office personnel do not welcome revolution. They want stability; and their search for it quickly ended up in the discovery of formulas. Inescapably, their formula was the familiar. Musically uninformed, and with uncultivated tastes, they nevertheless presumed to set themselves up as experts, as barometers of public taste. And being bosses, their positions are unassailable. Thus revolution, even if it had been desired by the composers (which it was not), would have been suppressed at the first outbreak.

Yet a very gradual swing toward modernity is observable. Anyone who has listened actively to recent film scores must have observed that the composers are not totally unaware of events such as those that transpire in Boston's Symphony Hall under the baton of Koussevitsky. The contemporary spirit has somehow squeezed through studio gates although, to be sure, she hoversraith-like over the sound stages. Oscar Levant pointed out several years ago that the Hollywood boys knew Hindemith's *Mathis der Maier*, through the published score and the German recording, long before this landmark of contemporary literature was taken up by the symphony orchestras. The prevailing estimates of Hollywood's music therefore require further revision. The composer may have a highball handy, but he is not reclining by a swimming pool, he is not living in the style of an Oriental potentate, he is not paying more in income tax than most of us earn in salary. Now, it appears, he is no longer cowering from *Petrushka*. The objects of his study are the scores of Hindemith, Harris, Copland, Prokofiev, Shostakovich, Bartok.

Here again he shows not his separation but his conformity with prevailing styles, even with the style of the young men from Juilliard and Curtis who are so noisily critical of Hollywood. They, too, are courting the "influence" of the contemporary masters. They have gathered themselves into little sects, each devoted to the supremacy of a Schoenberg, a Stravinsky, a Copland—or are building their careers on a faith inspired by folk music. And they imitate a-plenty. Like the film men, they provide tunes and detecting with an abundance of incriminating clues. Any young composer, asked where he was on the night of June 21, would have to admit (unless he lied) that he had been rifling the warehouse of Contemporary Masters, Unlimited. This crime, however, is not a capital one; it is not punishable by death. One can only insist that whatever punishment is imposed, it be the same for the composer of film music as it is for the composer of symphonies and sonatas. Originality is indeed rare.

Every endeavor deserves to be judged by its best productions, not its worst. Every composer, including the classic masters, has produced his share of inferior merchandise. So the serious composer of today is peddling a large amount of second-class wares, and film composers have undoubtedly taken advantage of the privileges of mediocrity. Yet, at their very best, film scores have made handsome contributions to cinema art; and not all of them have been written by the "classical" composers who only occasionally work in films—Bernard Herrmann, Aaron Copland, and recently Darius Milhaud. Hollywood's career men—especially the more adventurously ones like Hugo Friedhofer and David Raksin—have driven the confining barriers back, little by little. But insofar as Hollywood falls short of its best musical potentialities, the problem is not Hollywood's alone. It is everybody's.

(Continued on Page 19)
The Woman on the Beach
The Long Night
Guilt of Janet Ames
Possessed

NEW and NOW

By RICHARD GRIFFITH

The efforts of imported European directors to do justice to their new scene and yet hang on to their own predilections in film material represent a thirty-year-old Hollywood dilemma that none of them has ever completely met. Two new films, if they do not solve the problem, considerably illuminate its post-war aspect.

Atmosphere—the aspect of a scene and the mood it creates—were often the preoccupation of Jean Renoir in his French films. Sometimes it got between him and the stories he was telling, but it was also the particular excellence of what is to my mind the most perfect of his pictures, The Loves of Tony. In The Woman on the Beach he plumbs for atmosphere entirely, leaving to its own confused devices a plot which makes no sense—or rather which makes too many senses, riding off in all directions until it concludes in a scene so meaningless that at first you think there’s a reel missing from the picture. The film bears all the marks of many changes of mind during production. Yet it is evident that Renoir hoped to the last that the mood he was building would rise to overwhelm story inconsistencies and create a final impression.

The scene is a seascape—a lonely stretch of coastline reminiscent of those French cinema waterfronts inhabited by neurotic derelicts, to which the also derelict but non-neurotic Gabin invariably found his way. And sure enough, Renoir presents us with Robert Ryan as an American Gabin. The young Coast Guardsman who patrols the beach on horseback is carefully portrayed as the very type of simple, inarticulate manhood. But he suffers from nightmares caused by his war experiences, and it is this single complexity in his otherwise monolithic character which makes him susceptible to the very complicated woman on the beach, who proceeds to induct him into the knotted tangle of her private life. She is married to a great painter, blinded by an accident which she caused. Chained to each other by her guilt and his obsessive love, they have left their urban haunts the better to torture one another in this solitude. The Coast Guardsman becomes a pawn in their game of mental chess, each using him to cause the other pain.

Not bad for a start. But the incidents used to develop the situation are inconclusive, and they tend to cancel each other out. Perhaps the painter is not really blind—perhaps he’s only pretending in order to make his wife a culprit. The young man thinks so, and arranges a trap to force him to reveal himself. But the resulting catastrophe leaves the spectator in doubt as to whether the painter’s fall over a cliff was not just another charade, albeit a drastic one. His wife is equally a sphinx with too many secrets. It is possible that her devotion to the man she has maimed is also, or alternatively, a pretense. Maybe she’s just waiting her chance to get her hands on his remaining paintings, which she could sell for a sum sufficient to restore her to the New York night clubs. Also, though she tells the Coast Guardsman he loves him, we are given to understand that he has had many predecessors. So it goes until the spectator tires of the story’s broken promises to clarify itself and consigns the characters and all their works to a psychiatrist. It ends with everyone realizing the error of his ways, and the couple and the sailor walk off in opposite directions toward no conceivable destination.

Perhaps all this was intended as a study of confused motive of negative character. As such it is conceivable against a European background, but as Americans the characters are too mongrelized to be convincing, despite Charles Bickford’s powerful performance and Renoir’s considerable success in making Ryan a certain type of young American whose decency and courage are not in themselves beyond his limited experience of life. Miss Bennett is far from base, but provides a typical example of the movie star whose talent is for stardom only. She acts in a sort of pictorial rhythm, every movement timed to a beat, every gesture weighted with a significance that never reveals itself. But one feels a sort of sympathy for her: the insight of a Duse would not have helped her illumimate this role. Faced with these basic contradictions, the director seems to have spent his artistry on the milieu of beach and gull and wave, and particularly on the

Henry Fonda and Barbara Bel Geddes in "The Long Night"
dreams of the Coast Guardsman—themselves sea-dreams—perhaps with some idea of removing his drama from the real world into a land of the imagination where it would become plausible.

At first screening The Long Night seemed one of the most ambitious, courageous, and inventive films made in the United States since the war. That it is ambitious and courageous there is still no doubt, but when I learned that it was a re-make of Le Jour se lève, a French film with Gabin which I had almost forgotten, my admiration for its careful and imaginative workmanship was left somewhat at sea. The setting is changed from France of the thirties to America today, but since the original has been duplicated literally scene by scene, the contribution of director Litvak and screen writer Wexley must be judged by the meaning they make the story take on in its new frame of reference.

On the whole it translates well. The basic situation might form a headline in the New York Daily News: "Vet Runs Amok With Gun; Hole up in Hideout." It is set down carefully in a well-created midwestern industrial town, peopled by anonymous workers all of whom lead lonely lives, their only link with the rest of humanity being the casual daily friendliness which make them champion the veteran in his trouble. Litvak lines them strongly as individuals, but when the time comes for them to act together his line falters. It is blurred by the fact that in the three-cornered relationship between the police, the crowd and the veteran, all the emphasis is laid on the individual and his thoughts. Thus the significance of the citizenry's defense of civil rights against police arbitrariness is only hinted at. The meat of the idea is in the individual alone with himself.

It is excellent that Fonda and his girl are both foundlings. This sets them apart as types of modern humanity, searching in an institutionalized world for the comfort of flesh and blood. And brilliant it is that the girl can be turned aside in her search by the glitter of far places, gowns, jewels; with feminine conservatism she makes sure of second best if first is not to be had. For Fonda, these are just the things he wants to do without, and the conflict is implicit from the start. The catalyst who precipitates it is a more doubtful element. Reminiscent as he is of Mario's magician and other literary figures allegorizing the spell of totalitarian propaganda, he is convincing in European terms but he lacks recognition-value as the American type he is supposed to be. This is a pity for his U. S. counterparts exist and their accurate portrayal here would have made the film a very modern instance indeed. In itself the mental struggle between the worker and the magician is disturbingly true. From the start Fonda's honesty tells him that his opponent is a professional liar. But the lies succeed one another too fast, the conjured illusions dissolve too smoothly into one another, to be excoried by instinctive honesty alone. In the end the veteran has no resource but the one he has so recently been taught—to stop the hateful tongue with a gun's argument. Whatever one's thoughts on the implications of this truth, it is a truth and a daring one. But the foreignness of the magician as a symbolic figure removes him from our midst and leaves the parable an abstract one.

This abstraction points up the uncertainty in the post-war efforts of the screen's best men to get through to the people with something they can use. Wyler with realism, Capra with fantasy, Chaplin with satire, have tried to paint a significant picture of our scene. Their painful problem has been to portray it in terms sufficiently familiar to be understood. Now Litvak and Wexley try the intellectual approach, with problematical results. The picture never reaches for emotion until its final scenes. The danger is that it will affect none among its audiences save those already sufficiently aware to have done their own thinking. Yet this re-make has considerable power, and is far more apposite than the pseudo-French film Renoir has made out of a fragment of the American scene.

Craftsmanship is as much the source of that power as the purity of the basic situations. It is as though the makers, having failed to solve their story problem, lavished special care on detail. Litvak's camera and cutting have seldom been more sensitive, Fonda's reading of Wexley's pungent Americanese has his unique sincerity and comprehension. Vincent Price succeeds in making the conjurer a possible American type, though not the type which could adequately represent the forces he is evidently supposed to stand for. Ann Dvorak is vividly attractive, Miss Bel Geddes a sort of latter-day Mae Marsh. In every department the production sets a high mark—except for the fact that the screen credits informs us that Dmitri Tiomkin is the composer of a certain Seventh Symphony sometimes attributed to Ludwig van Beethoven. This film's makers have wrought energetically and well, hampered most, perhaps, by the fact that what they fundamentally have to say is too true to be good.

The Guilt of Janet Ames and Possessed begin with an identical scene. Miss Crawford and Miss Russell are both well-dressed beauties dazedly wandering the streets of a large city, looking for somebody who isn't there. Each is picked up and taken to the local equivalent of Bellevue, where begins the long process of establishing their identities, trying to find out what's the matter with them, and doing what can be done to set it right. This is a better beginning than most of the psychiatric films have managed. The brutal day-to-day business of psychiatry is too much concerned with the mental difficulties of famous concert pianists as with those routine casualties cut adrift from their social moorings by the stress of living in an anxious world. Moreover, by being introduced to the patient, without knowledge of her history, we identify

(Continued on next page)
Crossfire opens with a scene showing, in shadow, the killing of a man. And when the eighty-five minutes of celluloid have been unraveled, something else has been killed—the idea that Hollywood is incapable of making a film that speaks out clearly and unmistakably against the disease known as anti-Semitism.

This melodrama of murder and intolerance is a taut, suspenseful film with acting, directing, production and writing which give it a quality and distinctiveness well above the usual movie fare. Rarely has the American screen attempted to treat so profound a theme or so vital a contemporary problem and at the same time made such a skillful and exciting movie.

The plot of the film can be summed up as a rather conventional murder mystery. A man named Samuels, played by Sam Levene, is found beaten to death in his Washington, D.C., apartment. Police Captain Finlay, smoothly portrayed by Robert Young, finds that three soldiers picked up by Samuels in a bar were in Samuels' apartment. One of them is the murderer. How Captain Finlay, with the aid of an army sergeant, acted fliply by Robert Mitchum, figures out which soldier is the murderer, traps him into a confession, and then is forced to shoot him dead, is the story of the picture.

What elevates Crossfire from a very well-produced "whodunit" to a startling adventure into realism is the frankest recognition of anti-Semitism ever projected on the American screen. The message is crystal clear: intolerance of fellow Americans on racial or religious grounds is based on ignorance and this same blind prejudice can culminate in murder. And since the wages of murder is death, bigotry means death for the bigot.

The novel from which Crossfire was adapted, The Brick Foxhole by Richard Brooks, had the unacceptable "gimmick" of homosexualism motivating its action. Hollywood worshiped at the altar of this great god gimmick which is the magic word for the twist, the novel element, the boxoffice angle which draws the public to see a particular picture. Ordinarily the usual motivation of money or normal sex lust would have replaced the homosexualism gimmick and the result would be another run-of-the-mill, expertly contrived action film.

However, the use of the motivation of anti-Semitism for the murder of a man in Crossfire is no mere gimmick: the origins of the prejudice are examined; the present-day virus of anti-Semitism is illuminatingly compared in the film with the wave of anti-Catholicism stirred up in the United States when the Irish came to this country to escape their native land's potato famine a hundred years ago. An unforgettable scene is the one in which Robert Young, as the Catholic police captain, explains the motivation for the murder. The lucid analysis and the awareness of unreasoning racial and religious hatred which can become psychopathic and deadly probe deeply into the basis for anti-Semitism. And the directorial ability of Edward Dmytryk transformed this static sequence, full of expository talk, into an exciting scene that is tense with suspense and movement.

The superbly written screenplay by John Paxton, the skillful direction of Edward Dmytryk and the sympathetic production of Adrian Scott blend into a unified work of film art that is greater than the sum of its parts. The actors are familiar Hollywood faces, yet somewhere in the film you begin to say, "This isn't the same Robert Young I've been used to seeing," because this time Robert Young is projecting a three-dimensional person—a man concerned with racial and religious prejudice, a man who is believable and solid, a man you could know personally. The performance of Robert Ryan, as the ex GI who kills Samuels "because he is a Jew," is an acting triumph on the screen; a performance to be ranked with that of Victor McLaglen in The Informer. The background he reveals as a "cop in St. Louis" and a regular Army man are lightning flashes into his distorted mind. Paul Kelly's inspired limning of A Lost Man is the kind of portrayal that, performed by an Abbey Theatre player, would inspire superior sneers at Hollywood's inferior character actors.

Every now and then the creative film makers of Hollywood—writers, directors, producers, actors—get a chance to make a picture that, as Sheridan Gibney so vividly stated in The Screen Writer, has "the magical quality common to all good art: it conveys a sense of truth." Instead of the usual, rather senseless, without-real-rhyme-or-reason who-dunit, Crossfire offered a challenge to portray people and motives ably and unambiguously. The result is an inspiration both to film makers and public alike.

NEW AND NOW (continued from preceding page)

ify with the psychiatrist and follow him through what becomes a detective story of the soul. Thus both films begin on a saving note of practicality.

Resemblance between them ends abruptly there. Miss Russell comes too, to find herself paralyzed from the waist down. She is told that this is a physical symptom of a mental state, that she really doesn't want to go where she had consciously intended to. Shriekly she denies this and her psychiatrist, equally irascible, seems to have given her up as hopeless when Melvyn Douglas, a drunken reporter, is summoned to the scene. In the space of the next three hours he induces her to have five dreams which make everything clear. These visions are on a level with "dreaming true" in Peter Ibbetson, which Mr. Douglas actually cites as his authoritative guide in amateur analysis.

It seems that Miss Russell's husband was killed in the war when he threw himself on a hand grenade to save the lives of six fellow-GIs. Convinced that he was a paragon, his widow plans to visit each of these six men just for the satisfaction of proving to herself that they were unworthy of the sacrifice—something like probing a sore tooth. Dreams and Mr. Douglas show her that the first five men are just ordinary guys, taking their chances along with the rest of the Army, not fit subjects for moral denunciation. More than that, we learn that she herself was the cause of it all, so selfish and domineering that her husband didn't want to live because he had nothing to come back to. Even yet the psychiatric revelations are not finished, though it will surprise the reader no more than the spectator to discover that Mr. Douglas himself is the sixth man she is seeking, his alcoholism caused by his guilty knowledge that he was the captain who ordered Miss Russell's husband's sacrifice. On this point of the captain's mental conflict, the reactions of ex-infantrymen would be as interesting as those of psychiatrist to the picture's implication than Transference is best effected by seeking out the person you hate and making him your analyst. At the

(Continued on page 19)
In the winter of 1946-47, the Art in Cinema Society of the San Francisco Museum of Art launched a series of programs of avant garde films. In their search, they uncovered motion pictures made here and abroad, prints that were believed unavailable. The films were shown to enthusiastic audiences at the San Francisco Museum of Art and the University of California at Berkeley. Out of these showings, arranged by Richard Foster and Frank Stauffacher, has come a unique book, *Art in Cinema*, a collection of the program notes as well as statements by many film experimenters.

The contents include *A History of the Avant Garde* by Hans Richter; *Notes on the Making of "Un Chien Andalou"* by Luis Bunuel; *Audio-Visual Music* by John and James Whitney; *The Origin of Dr. Caligari* by Erich Pommer; and other articles by Henry Miller, Elie Faure, Man Ray, Oskar Fischinger, Maya Deren, Grace L. McCann Morley and George Leite.

This book, published by the San Francisco Museum of Art, is a very welcome addition to the small but growing list of film literature printed in this country. The illustrations on these pages are from *Art in Cinema*. 

---

Dr. J. Sibley Watson and Melville Webber: *LOT IN SODOM*

Jean Epstein: *FALL OF THE HOUSE OF USHER*

Oscar Fischinger: *THE ABSOLUTE FILM*
There seems to be a post-war revival of interest in the experimental film. In Paris, Jean Cocteau has finished his surrealist fairy tale, \textit{La Belle et La Bete}. In New York, Hans Richter is putting the finishing touches on \textit{Dreams That Money Can Buy}, with scenarios by Fernand Leger, Marcel Duchamp, Man Ray, Max Ernst, and Alexander Calder. In San Francisco, Sydney Peterson and James Broughton have completed their psychological fantasy, \textit{The Potted Psalm}. The films of Maya Deren, made with a simple 16mm. home movie camera, and at a cost less than that of a week-end in Bermuda, are evoking the praise of critics and public wherever they are shown. With the perfection and availability of inexpensive equipment, more and more independent artists and intelligent amateurs are exploring the infinite resources of the film as a medium of personal expression, trying to catch flashing across the screen that ephemeral moment when light and shadows fuse with movement to release an emotion that could arise from no other art . . . Perhaps we yet may find, in years to come, that these experiments were more in the main development (of cinema) than we thought.

\textit{from Introductory Notes to Art in Cinema by Richard Foster and Frank Stauffacher}
Movies and Society

"What responsibilities do movies have to their audiences?"
We asked this question of distinguished individuals from representative groups—

DAVID SHOEMAKER
Association of California Scientists, California Institute of Technology

A very important responsibility which movies have to their audiences is the maintenance of proper perspective in the presentation of fact and opinion.

A good example is in the presentation of the accomplishment of science. Motion pictures can do a great educational service in reporting scientific advances accurately, in giving correct impressions regarding the nature of scientific research, in portraying scientists properly, and in presenting objectively the problems created or emphasized by the development of the atomic bomb and other weapons. They can do a great disservice by playing court to incorrect popular notions of science.

A recent film dealing with the development of the atomic bomb has been widely criticized by scientists who found that historical facts were distorted, the scientific events were overdramatized, and a weak love plot was introduced, all seemingly for the purpose of making the film conform to a standard Hollywood pattern. Some of the same criticisms are applicable to a film produced several years ago which was based on the life of Madame Curie. Is this pattern a vital necessity for entertainment value, or is it just habit? Is it not more important in any case to be on guard against creating mistaken popular conceptions? Other films have shown that it is possible to live up to the responsibility of presenting scientific facts accurately, and that this can be done without detracting from entertainment value.

In trying to live up to this responsibility, movie makers should solicit the advice of competent experts in the scientific and other fields which provide material for motion pictures.

HORTENSE POWDERMAKER
Visiting Professor of Anthropology, University of California

The first responsibility is the realization that there is one to John Doe in the audience, after he has paid for his ticket and taken his seat.

Secondly, there is a responsibility of choosing between thinking of John Doe in the audience as a "sucker" to be exploited or as a human being worthy of respect. The John Doe in the audience is not a static being. He is conditioned by many forces outside of the movies. The educational level of our entire population is rising very rapidly—free college education becoming more and more universal—and this causes among other things a more critical and developed taste. War and social and economic changes also affect our John Doe. But the movies are a conditioning factor, too, and can either lower or raise his taste. It is a trait of the human species not to be satisfied with the same diet indefinitely and to usually seek something better.

Thirdly, realizing that the basic appeal of movies is on an emotional level, as is all art, acceptance of responsibility would include the avoidance of the exploitation and debauchery of the emotions on a phony basis and the positive endeavor to satisfy them honestly and to fulfill the age-old dramatic function of catharsis.

Fourthly, we can speak of a responsibility which movies do not have, namely, to please all people all the time. Most important problems are of a controversial nature and, therefore, if any one of them is handled realistically, someone is bound to be displeased. Controversy need not necessarily involve financial risk; it may actually be very profitable. But it does take courage and, if done well, honesty.

All these and many more responsibilities are included in the realization of the almost infinite potentialities of the movies.
MRS. JOSEPH S. HOOK
President, Los Angeles District,
Congress of Parents and Teachers

We believe that vivid dramatization such as exists in
the motion picture is a potent force in shaping the
thinking and manners of theatre-goers. Young people
are especially susceptible to the glamour of stars.
The type of lovemaking and family life as portrayed on
the screen are accepted by teen-agers as a way of life. The
lightness with which marriage vows are broken is re-

flected in the increased divorces throughout the nation.

As American parents, we are using our privilege of
criticizing the entertainment fare which is offered to us
commercially. We would like to do two things, first to
educate our youngsters to discriminate between trash
and good drama, and secondly we would like to speak
through the box-office and urge the motion picture indus-
try to seize its opportunity to portray a higher standard
of morals by eliminating some of the crime and horror
and emphasizing decent family living rather than the
"glamour girl" whose morals are lax but who always wins
t.

SOME NINETY MILLION Americans see motion pictures
each week. The combination of drama by sound and
music plus drama by depiction of human action, played
upon an audience in a darkened room, has a tremendous
effect on people. It influences their ideas, their morals,
their buying habits, their human relations and many other
aspects of their lives.

Motion pictures can help people become better citizens
by dramatizing the actions which make people become
better human beings. Many motion pictures tend to make
people better citizens, better husbands or wives, better
business enterprises, better parents, better Americans. The
motion picture industry should be encouraged by public
taste to avoid pictures which might stimulate (particu-


PHILIP M. CONNELLY
Secretary-Treasurer, Los Angeles
CIO Council

It seems to me that the obligation that movies have to
audiences is to give an honest and realistic portrayal
of American life and the problems that concern the Ameri-
can people.

The movies are not fulfilling this obligation.

The most obvious distortion of the American scene is
the emphasis on wealth and superficial glamour. But
underlying this glittering veneer is a much more dangerous
distortion of the moral and social values that constitute
what we call the American way of life. Recent pictures
have shown an increasing tendency to cheap sensual-

ism and violence; this sort of thing is all the more
pernicious when it is dressed up in fake "psychological" or
"psychoanalytical" trappings. Particularly shocking ex-
amples of the cult of brutality and sex are "The Outlaw"
and "Duel in the Sun." The latter picture also has an
obvious racist bias. We have had blatant anti-Semitism
in "Abie's Irish Rose" and an offensive portrayal of Ne-
groes in "Song of the South."

DORÉ SCHARY
Executive Vice-President in Charge
of Production, R.K.O.

Of Mr. Schary, distinguished film producer,
we asked: "What responsibility do audiences
have to movies?"

Audiences have a responsibility to discrimi-
nate and shop for their motion pictures. This
shopping should go on at all intellectual and
economic levels. Once the audiences seek out
the best kind of motion pictures and reject the
worst kind, motion picture producers will work
harder in order to satisfy the audience demand.

Nobody starts out to make a bad film, but
there is no doubt that the effort expended in
making good films would be even greater if
the search for pictures of the best type was
more insistent.

C. S. BKESEMYER
President, Los Angeles Chamber
of Commerce

larly, in the case of our impressionable youth) thinking,
habits and actions not constructive to society.

Because of their immense power over the emotions and
the thinking of the big majority of Americans, motion pic-
tures have the responsibility of presenting themes, sub-
jects and treatments which will help build a better civil-
ization.

In opposition to this trend, there are a number of recent
pictures which show that there are honest and creative
craftsmen in Hollywood. "The Best Years of Our Lives"
is an outstanding example of what these craftsmen can
accomplish.

It nevertheless remains true that ninety percent of the
Hollywood product ignores the realities that affect ninety
percent of the American people. Working people either
on the job or in their family social life are never shown
on the screen. The millions of Negro citizens are shown
only as buffoons or "inferiors." This situation could be
changed if the general public—which is made up largely
of workers—made an organized and vigorous demand for
better pictures.

It is reported from Hollywood that the studios are plan-
ing several pictures that are anti-labor, and anti-demo-
cratic, fomenting fake spy scares and propagandizing for
war. Trade unions and people's organizations have been
far too apathetic concerning the movies, far too ready to
accept the myth that what is projected on the screen is
"pure entertainment." We'd better make sure that our
entertainment remains pure, or we shall be treated to in-
creasing doses of poison.
THE HOLLYWOOD STORY

"Films should not be assembled as are automobiles or mechanical orange squeezers. There are intangibles of mood, inspiration, and subtlety of characterization which can scarcely be expressed."—from The Role of the Director by Harold J. Salemson in Cinema, June 1947.

"From Hollywood arrives the first issue of Cinema . . . It forthwith sets out a piece by Mr. Harold J. Salemson calculated to reorder the process of making pictures in Hollywood by concentrating authority in the director, after considering the work of producers, writers and other contributors . . . Hollywood gets an amazing flood of advice on how to make pictures. When changes are made in methods, Hollywood will make them."—from Editorial by Terry Ramsaye in Motion Picture Herald, May 24, 1947.

"A wave of 'individuality' is sweeping studios as result of rising criticism against Hollywood's 'button-factory type of production' . . ."—from Variety, June 13, 1947.

AUDIENCE

The audience, that ordinarily patient group, is beginning to talk back. In Chicago, 1,500 youngsters protested against the high box-office prices. The goal of the newly-formed "Youthful Movie-Goers" was simple and explicit—special rates for teen-agers.

To bring down prices, the young people proposed to boycott films, complain to theatre owners, picket if necessary. To adolescents, whose allowances are limited by parental decree, adult rates are just too high. And special rates for "children under twelve" leaves them out on the street.

In St. Louis, Missouri, movie-goers also picketed. They were protesting the ban on Negro patrons in four first-run houses. It started late in May and is part of the local agitation against the segregation of whites and Negroes in places of amusement.

Only in a few neighborhood houses in the colored sections of St. Louis are Negro and white movie-goers both allowed to buy tickets.

By far the most effective audience revolt, however, was the passive resistance policy being pursued at the box-office. Movie-goers just weren't going. To the already dark picture of low box-office returns came further complications. A recent audience research survey showed that there are more movie-goers who could go today than ever before.

The figures: 51,000,000 potential movie-goers in 1942 against 71,000,000 today.

Then why the slowdown in movie attendance? The survey indicated that the public was not too particular about the type (romantic, comedy, musical, etc.) of picture it saw, but it was shopping around for the good ones.

AND ABROAD: With the world eager for good movies, Hollywood may be cutting its own throat economically. According to United Press correspondent Henry Gris, the current practice of unloading old films on the European market, closed during the war, is "stupid and farcical" and building up nothing but ill-will.

In their attempt to realize every cent on films made during and just prior to the war, says Gris, Hollywood producers are forcing films on the foreign market which ignore in their content and technique the new psychology of audiences whose perceptions and logic has been sharpened by the war.

"Hollywood is trying to influence the world through methods worked in the past, but which don't work now," said Gris. "(The audience abroad) resent being shown old pictures blurred with a lot of silly publicity about dramatic love scenes. Most of all, they resent the old pictures, especially in view of the new, adult ones being turned out by British, French, Italian, Czech, Russian and other studios."

BUSINESS

The "art" theatres can point to an audience of over half a million. French, English, Italian, Russian, etc., films have been eating into Hollywood's profits.

Hollywood sought an answer and came up with one that they hope will bring back the movie-goers' money. It decided to spend about twenty million dollars making motion pictures abroad.

R.K.O. has already completed in Paris the Maurice Chevalier film, Le Silence est d'or, directed by Rene Clair, and to be shown in this country as Man About Town.

M-G-M is now showing in the "art" theatres their French-made film, Stormy Waters, starring Jean Gabin and Michele Morgan and is behind film production in Switzerland.

Berlin Express, an R.K.O. production, is being shot in France and Germany.

Columbia is using money frozen in Italy for the Rome filming of La Bohème.

England is the biggest drawing card with most major studios producing their own on their own or in conjunction with Alexander Korda or J. Arthur Rank.

Whether these Hollywood-films made-abroad will be any different than Hollywood - films - made - in - Hollywood remains to be seen.

COUGH SYRUP AND ART: David O. Selznick created havoc with movie distribution methods when he released his Duel in the Sun. Instead of the usual policy of playing first-run houses first and then neighborhood theatres, he made nearly every theatre a first-run house for his film.

James Mulvey, President of Goldwyn Productions, took due note of this new showmanship as has every other industry member.

"The whole system of runs and clearances as we know it will shortly be out the window and a new system of simultaneous release will take its place," he told the R.K.O. National Sales Convention in New York.

Present system, he declared, is maintained by the "vested interests of theatre monopolies." He blamed them for selling artistic creations like "a can of soup or a bottle of cough syrup . . ."

SEE THAT PICTURE! How to recoup the drop in the box-office is taxing the studio film sellers. Latest solution involves a complicated advertising-publicity campaign based on Audience Research Institute findings.

Campaign is called "temporal plan" and is in four parts:

1. Pre-Production — publicity releases, stunts and twists about how much was paid for screenplays, who is going to star in film, etc.

2. Production — ads begin to get the audience "emotionally set" (ARI terminology).

3. Post-production — stories planted in magazines, promotional tie-ups, etc.

4. Release period — final ad blast starting exactly six weeks before release date.

System is being used for Miracle of the Bells, whose "pre-production" cam-
Campaign has already filled newspapers and radio. First national ad appears in Life on July 25, 10 days after start of production and eight months before release of film.

Harry Brandt, President of Independent Theatre Owners Association, told movie producers his solution to box-office drop at a Brown Derby luncheon: "Make good pictures and you won't have any problems."

CENSORSHIP

No surprise to Hollywood producers is the news that censorship difficulties stimulate box-office. A recent survey by California Poll shows how much.

According to the survey, twice as many people are likely to see a film with censorship trouble as otherwise. Largest percentage, however, remains indifferent.

The question: When a movie does have trouble with the censor, does that make you more likely to see it or less likely to see it?

The answers: No difference, 41 per cent; more likely, 36 per cent; less likely, 19 per cent; no opinion, 4 per cent.

The poll also indicated (1) women are more likely to stay away because of censorship trouble, (2) people who think censorship should be stricter go to see the banned films anyway.

CULTURE

Picking up the cue from Europe, albeit belatedly, Hollywood is planning its own International Film Exposition in August, 1948.

The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, which is sponsoring the festival, plans in true Hollywood tradition to make the American conference bigger and better than any yet held. President Jean Hersholt, who has conferred with State Department officials on the project, is considering, in addition to the orthodox film showings and award giving, a conference of top experts from all countries and an international exchange of documentary films for school and library use.

With this in mind, executive secretary Mrs. Margaret Herrick leaves for Europe the end of July to survey the European industry, ascertain the proper people to invite, and familiarize herself in general with methods and procedures. She will stop off in London, Brussels, Locarno, Venice, and Cannes—the last four themselves scenes of international festivals—and plans to participate personally in the Venice exposition this year.

She will show various Academy exhibits, including the Carey Wilson 17-minute short made for this year's Academy's award banquet and a group of still photographers' work.

MUSIC

Hollywood's music composers have become conscious-striken. Readily admitting that they frequently base film scores on music classics, they squirm in their collective seat to find themselves credited with an "original" musical score which the familiar can spot as coming from a Beethoven symphony or a Bach fugue.

This cribbing from the hallowed graveyard is not always the film composer's wish. Often he finds himself told by the studio producer that such-and-such a musical piece is to be used in such-and-such a place and would the composer please rewrite the classic so that it will be suitable for background sound.

The members of the Music Branch of the Motion Picture Academy of Arts and Sciences recently went on record opposing this practice of giving them sole credit for a score which wasn't theirs to begin with. They are asking that film titles be altered to give credit to the original composer.

How Hollywood producers will react to this artistic urge is still in doubt but in the most flagrant cases they will probably abide by the music composers' requests.

SCIENCE

The bulky, over-sized, cumbersome sound camera has always been the bane of directors and photographers. In the early sound days, the camera couldn't even be moved about except during changes of scenes. Since then, technological developments have given greater mobility and manual control over the camera.

Latest advance grew out of directorial problems in The Paradine Case. Alfred Hitchcock wanted a fluidly moving camera with which he could take low angle shots as well.

Morris Rossen (Selznick's head grip), Edward Fitzgerald (camera operator), and Bob Mattey (head of special effects), came up with the answer—two new devices. The new dolly does not require tracks and allows camera movement forward, sideways and backwards in one continuous move. It was used in the film for following the actors about the set.

The other device is called a "hi-hat" setup. It is attached to the new dolly and permits low angle moving camera shots with the lens only 16 inches from floor level.

With such innovations, perhaps the sound camera will regain the mobility that marked such classic silent films as Variety and The Last Laugh.

UNITED NATIONS

More than 1,600 attended a regional meeting of UNESCO (U.N. Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization) held at Denver. Delegates came from Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, Oklahoma and New Mexico.

The meeting discussed the broad problems of better understanding between nations, better relationships between races and religions, and furtherance of keeping the peace. The place of films, radio and the press in this program was gone into.

The Film Section recommended general policies for the encouragement of films promoting international understanding, explaining the work of the UN and UNESCO, and also for establishment of local community groups to carry out the purposes of the National Commission of UNESCO.

One film already under way by UNESCO is also sponsored by the French Government. The film is a documentary on French Guiana. Producer Harold Davis is already in Africa getting footage.
London Letter

By Roger Manvell

Summer has come to London with a burst of heat and violence. The British film seems to have produced little but paranoic melodrama, whilst the American film has been crowned by *Duel in the Sun*. This film elicited, as it was intended to elicit, the type of criticism which leads to widespread condemnation and long queues at the box-office. The periodical Picture Post held a roster of opinion for the film critics giving them a hundred or so words apiece to purge the poison from their veins. Alan Dent (News Chronicle) called it "a silly tussle in the dark," Leonard Mosley (Daily Express) "spasm in the chasm," whilst Miss Lejeune (The Observer) remarked: "The last scene, in which Miss Jones and Mr. Peck are alternately shot and crawl towards each other in a welter of something practically indiscernible from tomato ketchup, seems to me one of the most preposterous, nauseating and humanly degrading incidents I have ever seen on the screen."

Perhaps the most considered review came from Campbell Dixon (Daily Telegraph)—"David Selznick is the De Mille of his generation. Nobody has ever been more expert at concocting a vast, highly-seasoned dish tickling the public palate, and collecting awards in a community where 'pretentious' and 'grandiose' are terms of praise. *Duel in the Sun* reveals his qualities and shortcomings to a nicety. It may be synthetic, and a little salacious in spots; wags may talk of 'Lust in the Dust' and the outlay on tomato ketchup, used by all except conscientious documentary makers as a substitute for blood. I could have done, too, with less crawling by women, less scrabbling in bloodied rocks. Considerations of taste, however, never kept millions from the box office. Technically the film is superb. Beside this gigantic spectacle of sand, sex and sadism, the most ambitious Lyceum melodrama is just a pleasant charade at the vicarage. I would add, too, that the acting is first-rate."

But what was the British reply to such violence? Emphatically it was not to play the Duke or the Gentleman to so much rough stuff. The reply is assassination and paranoia time and again. *Take My Life* (Cineguild; director Ronald Neame) is an affair of murder by a schoolmaster whose very terror at what he has done saves him from immediate detection and puts an innocent man in the dock. It is most competently made until the end, where coincidences have to be introduced too strongly to be really comfortable for the innocent hero's safety. But the earlier part of the film has a pace and a virtuosity of style which combine narration, flashback and immediate visual narrative into a dynamic whole. *The Upturned Glass* (Gainsborough, featuring James Mason) throws away the excellent realism of its characterization by making a medical specialist into a paranoic, whereas, James Mason, who plays the part, acts him as a man of exceptional reasonableness and calm, until the needs of melodrama seem to insist he should murder the friend of the woman he loved merely because he suspects she knew more than she should of the former's sudden death. Here again there is a manifest competence in the technique of the film which develops an atmosphere of considerable tension. *They Made Me a Fugitive* (Alliance, directed by Cavalcanti) is both technically and in subject the best of the group: in this film the theme develops from a very real post-war problem, the absence of excitement in civilian life for an ex-serviceman who joins a black-market gang in London's Soho district. Trapped in crimes beyond his control, he is framed for homicide. He has to learn the hard way, and regain a social conscience through a bitter first-hand acquaintance with crime and criminals. The film has no easy happy-ending but the hero returns to prison in the last sequence with the police on his side in a desire to clear his name and with his girl prepared to wait for him. Cavalcanti's unusual pictorial sense is highly relevant to this story of Soho, with its alley-ways and wet pavements, its cafes, bars and a curious undertaker's room full of coffins stuffed with stolen goods. Every set-up is a study in composition and lighting. In many ways *They Made Me a Fugitive* is the best British film since *Odd Man Out*; its stars, Trevor Howard (of *Brief Encounter*), Griffith Jones and Sally Gray, all give sound performances.

The most unusual British film, about which I have said nothing yet in London Letter, is *Black Narcissus*. Reviewing it in "Tribune" at the time of its release, I wrote: "To my mind, *Black Narcissus*, a most accomplished film, is the best that the Archers' unit, led by Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger, has yet made. I have seldom seen Technicolor so beautifully used as in the controlled splendours of the ancient Indian palace on the high cliff-face, where the nuns of the story struggle to control their earthly desires, only to meet with failure. There is a certain amount of hokum in the story, the hokum of the mysterious influence of old places and strange peoples on the human blood, turning the ghosts of passion into living desires; the hokum of the beachcomber whose goodness is the product of his hedonism, a goodness not native to a nunnery. But hokum apart, this film is the very visual essence of the hidden pleasures symbolized by the dark colours of flowers, the exotic suggestion of eastern murals, the opening of richly carved doors and the blowing of mountain winds through the white habits and veils of the troubled women."

"Alfred Junge, the designer, and Jack Cardiff, who was in charge of the photography, share the credit for these lovely compositions, which are not merely beautiful pictures used to enrich a barren theme, but integral parts of the film's meaning that the human blood cannot easily be denied."

---

Dollars and Sex

GI's in Germany have long found the Army movie theatres, showing the newest films, a wonderful and inexpensive place to take their frauleins on dates.

The girl friends liked it too. Especially since only 40-odd Hollywood films have been released for showing to German civilians. And these movies, handled by the Office of War Information, pending the taking over of distribution by the industry's Motion Picture Export Association, were all oldies.

The American Military Government heartily approved this form of fraternization. They felt that the new films offer a wonderful orientation course to the frauleins in the ways of democracy.

The film industry doesn't see it that way and has threatened to withdraw all films from Army theatres unless the German public is kept out. Even if only girl friends were taken, the industry claimed, it would siphon off future trade at the box office when these same films are released to the German public.
“Hollywood” Music
(Continued from Page 8)

excellent book, “Toward a New Music,” said that stupid films, with stupid scores, are made for the millions of stupid people who want them, and that the problem is not one of cinematic production, but a social problem of educational nature. In the context of a musical life that has not clearly distinguished between a Toscanini and a Stokowski, between a Klemperer and a Flagstad, between a Schoenberg and a Harl McDonald, Hollywood does not seem to be quite so much of a cultural slum.

A first step toward education could be the writing of some genuine musical criticism, criticism of the caliber generated by literature and the arts. Of this, Hollywood music has had precious little. Even the preliminary job of naming the animals as they pass in review has not yet been accomplished. One might presume that the critics refrain from discussing individual composers and works because they don’t know them, just as they have been reluctant until very recently, as Copland pointed out, to be specific on the subject of American music. Certainly some distinction should be made between the rich and elaborate texture of Deutsch’s scores, the chromaticism of Rozsa’s, the folk-song quality of many of Harline’s and the high dramatic tension of Eisler’s. The term “Hollywood” cannot encompass the variety of method, idiom and style exhibited in such music; nor does it tell anything about quality.

As substitutes for criticism there has been much charming and humorous commentary from writers like Levant, George Antheil and H. W. Heinsheimer. They perpetuate the legend of the swimming-pool composer. There has been much polysyllabic denunciation in esoteric magazines. They perpetuate the legend of European superiority. And there has been scorn from the frustrated little men who have not been able to crash the studio gates. They perpetuate the legend of Hollywood’s lack of any sacrificial devotion to Art. All of them together have accomplished no more than to note the presence of profound contradictions in contemporary life. This might, perhaps, be the beginning of wisdom—if one would concede that contradictions are not matters which, like the weather, no one can do anything about. They are man-made and can therefore be resolved. Even the Security Council of the United Nations has been able to agree on some things; and certainly musicians and their critics should be able to do better than foreign ministers.

New and Now
(Continued from Page 11)

end. Miss Russell and Mr. Douglas, cured by mutual ambivalence, are headed for the marriage-license bureau, and God go with them.

The final comment on the picture’s contentions is that Miss Russell’s fifth dream takes the form of a night club act in which Sid Silvers travesties all psychiatric films. This must be seen to be believed.

During the course of her long treatment in Possessed, Miss Crawford never does come out of her catatonic trance, except under narcosynthesis, and it is more or less made clear that if and when she does recover she will face either a trial for murder or commitment to an institution. This is the measure of the picture’s maturity. The heroine is a nurse in the wealthy household of Raymond Massey, whose wife is a hypochondriac insanely jealous of her sedate and foreboding husband. The nurse has entered into a casual affair with a neighboring engineer, Van Heflin, but when the time comes to say goodbye Miss Crawford hangs on. She refuses to believe he is tired of her, is sure there is another woman, and finally, in a fit of rage, she resolves to murder her. She雇s her lover. The next day he has the woman’s nurse drowns herself. Her daughter thinks she did it out of jealousy of the nurse, and Heflin suspects Miss Crawford cold-bloodedly drove her to it to halt his going. He will have nothing further to do with her. Desperate, drifting, she accepts Massey’s eventual offer of marriage and for a while achieves a precarious peace, but each time she encounters Heflin her latent possessiveness returns, coupled with strange guilt and fear. She begins to believe that she actually murdered Massey’s first wife, and is only dissuaded from confession when he tells her that he had been with the woman shortly before she threw herself into the lake. But by now her personality is too disordered to accept this assurance or the steady love he offers.

When one delusion is dispelled it is immediately succeeded by another. The definitive experience required to blot out the line between reality and unreality is provided by her discovery that Heflin and her stepdaughter are in love. When she murders him to prevent his marriage it is a real act, but to her no more real than the hallucinations with which she is surrounded, and easily cancelled by another illusion. After it, she stops every man she meets on the street in the belief that he is her murdered lover.

What this amounts to is an honest treatment of the typical Crawford vehicle and a realistic rendering of the star’s typical role. Always in essence the neurotic manipulator, she is invariably portrayed as a martyred victim instead of the cause of all the trouble. Here it is made clear from the start that her heroine is a woman who shouldn’t be at large, who will generate melodrama wherever she goes regardless of humdrum circumstances. Miss Crawford’s comprehending performance admirably supports this metamorphosis. An odious troublemaker at the start, she swiftly makes you feel the tortuous compulsions she is undergoing, and for the first time in my experience of her is genuinely moving and pathetic. She is equally able in establishing the credibility of other people’s acceptance of her as a normal wife. Her customary face is the cool, competent nurse’s mask, her occasional tantrums and irrationalities discounted as the kind of foible we tolerate in people close to us.

How this came about is something only the Warners can explain, but we need look no further into motives than to give them a rousing cheer for risking a picture as responsible as it is serious. At that, their gamble may create a new audience for the star. Anything but a “woman’s picture,” it will generate sympathy in all males as they watch Miss Crawford’s relentless pursuit of her struggling prey. They may also entertain some wry reflections on the plight of Mr. Massey, whom death relieves of one neurotic wife only to marry another. The picture doesn’t say so, but this happens often enough to be worthy of separate psychocinematizing. Just what the Crawford regulars are going to think is something to give one pause, but it is at least a safe bet that no audience which sees the picture will ever again accept the Janet Ames version of psychoneurosis.

More than that, the film vigorously makes clear that psychotherapy is not magic but a scientific process which is available to anyone. The luxurious case history is linked to ordinary life by the hospital, neither a shrine nor a chamber of horrors but just a place of healing.

(Continued on Page 22)
Art

Unlike their predecessors of the '20s who worked with professional movie equipment, the experimental film makers of today use the less expensive 16mm. equipment. Moreover, since 16mm. projection equipment is readily available to universities, film societies, and similar groups, their films receive a wider screening than if they were on the professional 35mm. size.

Among the new avantgarde filmers working with "amateur" equipment is Curtis Harrington of Los Angeles. His latest film, Fragment of Seeking, is a one-reeler, in black-and-white 16mm., for which he used a Bell & Howell 70-DA camera, a wide angle, 1-inch and 2-inch lens, assorted filters, tripod and lights—all inexpensive "home movie" apparatus.

Fragment of Seeking is a highly personal and forthright statement of adolescence. A scenario and shooting script was prepared beforehand; actual photographing took three days; the exposed footage was then cut to the script. Due to the high cost of a recorded sound track, record music is used as accompaniment.

Mr. Harrington conceived the film as a short story in the Poe tradition, seeking for what he calls the same "pre-conceived totality of effect." He was highly successful for the film mounts continually to the very end, following a simple "story" line.

Documentary

CIO is distributing a documentary strip based on the by-now-famous report of economist Robert Nathan proving that wages could be upped without raising prices. The film, called appropriately enough, Raise Wages, Not Prices, includes quotes by Abraham Lincoln, sympathetic to labor.

In Indiana, where the film strip was first shown, labor audiences could not believe a Republican had said such nice things about them. CIO film head George Guernsey had to bring out Raymond Massey's Lincoln album of records to prove it really was so.

Now the Massey album is standard equipment with the film.

Education

We've got to get together and let out a yell
Or first thing we know we'll blow this world to—
is the theme of a new documentary on the atom bomb based on the original ballad of a singing Los Angeles newspaperman, Vern Partlow.

Partlow sings the ballad to his own accompaniment on the guitar in the 16mm. short, Old Man Atom, produced by H. A. Klein. Atomic scientists have praised the film as a tuneful version of a message they themselves have been trying to get across.

Religion

The Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church of the United States, recently sent Rev. W. Burton Martin to China. His task is to use films in the missionary work. the first time a specific visual program has been launched in this field.

Equipped with 16mm. motion picture apparatus, Rev. Martin will produce films, establish a distribution center and train workers in the films' uses.

Stated the Reverend: "One of the most powerful methods for teaching the Chinese with the Christian message is the use of the 16mm. documentary film produced on Chinese soil and showing the impact of the Christian faith in the experience of the Chinese people."
The British Film Society Movement

By ROGER MANVELL

It was recognized over twenty years ago that the film was more than a medium for easy popular entertainment. As soon as distinguished artists like Griffith, Chaplin, Von Stroheim, Wegener, Lang, Eisenstein, and Pudovkin, and the more important members of the French avant-garde began to produce a fairly continuous flow of films deserving serious study and criticism, the literature of the cinema commenced—(for example, the British publication in Switzerland called Close-Up)—and people already fascinated by the possibilities of the new art gathered together to exhibit for themselves those films which for various reasons could not find an outlet in the commercial cinemas.

In this way, the Film Society movement was born. (I use the term Film Society for the large private audience meeting for the most part in a cinema, and the term Film Club for the smaller, more informal, group using 16mm. apparatus to project films for the most part in their own premises.) In England, it began when the London Film Society gave a lead to the country as a whole as early as 1925, with a series of private exhibitions to its members in the New Gallery Cinema. It was later followed by the development of Film Societies all over Britain, most of them founded during the period 1929 to 1935.

The motives of these various societies differed considerably, and the date of their wider development is signifi-

cant. From 1919 to 1928, the silent cinema was international. I remember a large new Cinema in an industrial provincial town in England opening for the first time to the public with Fritz Lang’s film Metropolis. With the coming of sound, virtually all films shown on British screens were American, augmented by a gradually increasing number of mainly bad English films.

The Film Society movement became a national attempt to keep informed about the Continental cinema. It was supported, both in London and the provinces, by the intelligentsia, and it often suffered from tendencies to be over-aesthetic in purpose and to worship the more extreme forms of cinematic experiment. At its best, however, it did represent a permanent desire by intelligent people throughout the country to subsidize the private regular showing of programmes of foreign-language films supported by the work of the British documentary units, which were glad to have this outlet for their films, which were rarely wanted by the commercial exhibitor.

In the years preceding the war, about fifty film societies were in operation, meeting usually once a month in cinemas especially hired for the purpose, or in private premises equipped with 35mm. apparatus. In addition to these audiences, innumerable small clubs using 16mm. projectors were developing elsewhere, linked usually with schools, clubs, societies, churches, and other social and educational organizations. Many of the film classics of the silent period were available on both 16mm. and 9.5mm., and most British documentary films were reduced to 16mm. and available free of charge. To give a first-class film-show of silent and sound films was a very inexpensive undertaking.

The war, with all its dangers, dislocations and pre-occupations, did not destroy the film society movement. On sub-standard size film, it vastly increased as part of wartime welfare and recreation. Some, but not all, of the larger societies, including the London Film Society, were, however, forced to give up their work. Since the war,
most of the large societies have revived; and several new ones have started in addition. Many of them are now grouped into a Federation organized by the British Film Institute so that they can share a common policy and arrange for standard terms for the renting of films from the many distributors in Britain handling foreign productions. The number of major film societies in Britain is now about seventy: in addition, there is the widespread 16mm club movement for which there exist no statistics.

These provincial societies show for the most part French and Russian films, of which there are a large number of titled prints in Britain, and a smaller number of films of other nationalities. British documentaries and the early films of historical interest from the National Film Library make up the main part of the supporting programmes. Occasional revivals of British and American feature films — (Citizen Kane, for example, is a favorite) — are included.

The Film Society movement is, however, wider in its interest than this would indicate. It has many sections which specialize in showing the following types of films:

(1) Films of historical interest in the development of the art and history of the cinema. (Most of the films for these programmes come from the National Film Library and are available on both 16mm. and 35mm. Many, of course, are silent.)

(2) Films of scientific interest. There is a very large number of Scientific Film Societies meeting regularly all over the country to see programmes of scientific and documentary films.

(3) Films with political themes. The Workers’ Film association has a large international library for organizations who want to study contemporary political and social problems through the cinema.

(4) Films about education and social welfare. Teachers and social welfare workers of all kinds meet regularly to see documentary films covering every aspect of their interests. There is a particularly strong movement for the use of the educational film in Scotland, with many keen amateur film producers.

(5) Religious films. The Churches are showing an increasing interest in the cinema, though there are few good religious films, as such, available yet. Plans for the future production of religious films have been worked out.

(6) The amateur film-production clubs. This movement is strong and supports a monthly journal called Amateur Cinema World. Regular club meetings are held to show amateur films, (fiction and documentary), and frequent competitions keep amateur film standards high pre-war.

As soon as cheap sound projectors are once more available, there will be no limit to the development of 16mm. film projection in schools, church halls, club premises, village community centres and all places where people meet together socially.

It would be incomplete to finish this account of the film society movement without reference to the development of education in film appreciation and to the discussion-groups meeting to study the film. This work is limited only by the shortage of competent lecturers. The Ministry of Education has for many years regarded the film as a suitable subject of study along with literature, drama and the other arts, and is prepared to finance courses for its study. Many schools study the film, some of them as part of the regular curriculum, most of them informally in discussion-groups which are not part of the regular curriculum of study but are part of the school film-club movement.

The British Film Institute, often in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, the Film Societies or the local Education Authorities responsible for the educational administration of the urban and rural areas of Britain, organizes a continuous series of intensive courses on the film all over the country. Film-makers and technicians, (both in fiction and documentary), are realizing the importance of meeting the public represented by such audiences and speaking on various aspects of their work. Again, the only limit to this educational programme appears to be set by the small number of people qualified to conduct the lectures and discussions.

The increasing recognition by the general public that the film is an art and a social force as well as an industry, demands the development of this educational work in the future, for in the end, it is the pivot of the film society movement, the object of which should always be the increase of film appreciation and the recognition of the outstanding importance of the cinema in the world today.
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where people go when things get too much for them. The opening scenes are particularly striking, as Miss Crawford is wheeled through busy corridors to be “processed” and become one of dozens of “cases” to a harried psychiatrist appalled at the stream of damaged lives which frustration and insecurity spew at him all day long. These scenes owe their power to the direction of Kurt Bernhardt, trained in the subjectivist German school. His best achievement comes later in the film, when Miss Crawford’s stepdaughter returns from a concert to accuse her of murdering the first Mrs. Massey. The second wife turns on her in fury and kills her. Tranced, terrified at what she has done, Miss Crawford stares at the body. Then she hears the sound of a car, and, looking out the window, sees her stepdaughter alighting—returning from the concert. Nothing has happened except in her mind. This is not handled as a dream or an hallucination. It is one of those moments of introspection known to every human being when we look into ourselves and learn, with fatal recognition, exactly what we are capable of.
U.S. Film Societies

Notes of West Coast Activities

By PAUL BALLARD

Pasadena

The Pasadena Art Institute, under the direction of Miss Goudy, is showing its second series of films covering an overall picture of cinema as an art form. The present series is devoted to comedies such as David Harman, Million Dollar Legs, and early Chaplin comedies. A new series of film showings to cover a period of thirty-six weeks is now being scheduled and will include important milestones in the development of the cinema.

Members of the Institute and their guests are admitted to these film showings.

Los Angeles

Due to the success of a short documentary film series made available to members and non-members alike at the Los Angeles County Museum last winter, a new and more comprehensive program of documentary films has been arranged for the coming year beginning in October, 1947, to cover a period of thirty-six weeks.

This series will include many outstanding classics of the documentary film produced both in the United States and abroad. Among the films to be presented are People of the Comriderland, A Place to Live, Liberation of Paris, Peoples of Canada, Four Hundred Million, A Better Tomorrow, Art Survives the Times, Matisse, Mailol, and The Art of Persia. Unusual material such as Tyranga and Walkabout (Australian aborigines) and Life in a Punjab Village (India) will also be shown. Of interest to specialized groups will be the showing of This Is Robert and Children Must Learn.

This series was planned in association with Mr. James Breasted, Jr., Director of the Museum, and Mr. Russell Smith, Head of Education.

Hollywood

The Hollywood Film Society, which is a newly organized cultural, non-profit organization devoted to the study and review of motion pictures as an art form, has become an outstanding success. Aside from the Museum of Modern Art in New York it has programmed the most pretentious list of films to be shown by such a group. There are four specific series of films in progress.

In Series "A" we have scheduled and are showing such films as Camille, Passion of Joan of Arc, Kamradschaft, Million Dollar Legs, and Variety. Each feature film also has outstanding short subjects accompanying it such as Studies in Abstraction by Oscar Fischinger, L’Amittie Noire, White Flood and Brotherhood of Man.

In Series "B" are shown such famous classics of the documentary film as Plan That Broke the Plains, Turksib, A Child Went Forth, Granton Traveler, Triumph of the Will, Song of Ceylon, and Valley Town. This particular series makes available for the first time on the Pacific coast a large collection of important documentary film material.

In Series "C" we are covering the history of motion pictures in chronological order and are showing these films specifically to students of the cinema as an art form. These films include early Caplin comedies, Tol’able David, Three Musketeers, Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, etc.

In Series "D" the emphasis is placed on material that is especially suited to children. All of these programs contain features such as Adventures of Tom Sawyer, Grandma’s Boy, and Adventures of Cibro; a weekly serial; and education shorts on nature, science, sports and human endeavor.

Two special programs were scheduled and shown in addition to the above: Abstract and Experimental Films, including Abstractions by Fischinger, Emak Bakia and L’Etoile de Mer by Man Ray, Introspection by Sara-Kath-
Evidence of a growing maturity on the screen is accompanied by the introduction of a new film magazine, Cinema, which should fill a long-wanted need in the field.

Edited by veterans with a serious interest in motion pictures, Cinema takes a worldwide view of accomplishments on the screen.

With correspondents covering developments in England, France, Italy, Germany, Latin America, New York, and the Soviet Union, as well as Hollywood, the magazine shows a healthy respect for America's competition.

Striking in appearance, with illustrations that are superior to anything you will find in the average movie magazine...

Its aims are definite, and in its first two issues the editors have demonstrated their ability to put out an interesting and varied review of the international scene...

A new film publication called, simply, Cinema, is making its bow... I recommend it to the ever-growing group of 'discriminating movie-goers,' and to many others, too.

This publication, thank the celluloid god, is not another fan mag. There are enough of them on the market today, telling a palpitating public what Lulu Witless has on her breakfast tray this morning to keep her figure svelt and what Leander Glassjaw used on his dome to give it that slicked down but not greasy look.

Cinema leaves the fan side of the movies to the established publications. Its effort is toward the treatment of the motion picture as an adult art...

Here is a magazine for study groups, schoolroom classes, film councils, and the like, in addition to the individual "discriminating movie-goer."
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