University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1941

The culture of Louisville as affected by and reflected in motion pictures.

Eleanor Blake Carpenter
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carpenter, Eleanor Blake, "The culture of Louisville as affected by and reflected in motion pictures." (1941). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1696.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1696>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

THE CULTURE OF LOUISVILLE
AS AFFECTED BY AND REFLECTED IN
MOTION PICTURES

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty
Of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
Of Master of Arts

Department of History

By

Eleanor Blake Carpenter

Year

1941

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

TITLE OF THESIS: THE CULTURE OF LOUISVILLE
 AS AFFECTED BY AND REFLECTED IN
 MOTION PICTURES

APPROVED BY READING COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF THE
FOLLOWING MEMBERS:

NAME OF DIRECTOR: _____

DATE: March 25, 1941

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE OF THE MOVING PICTURE	1
II	LOUISVILLE AT THE MOVIES	22
III	MOTION PICTURES AND THE FINE ARTS IN LOUISVILLE	47
IV	MOTION PICTURES AND EDUCATION IN LOUISVILLE	69
V	CONCLUSION	87
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	91

THE CULTURE OF LOUISVILLE
AS AFFECTED BY AND REFLECTED IN
MOTION PICTURES

CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE OF THE MOVING PICTURE

CHAPTER I
THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE
OF THE MOVING PICTURE

Motion pictures today are having considerable influence upon the American people. This condition is true because of the enormous number of people who attend the "movies," because of the wide variety of subjects dealt with by the moving pictures, and because (as shown by reliable psychological tests) moving pictures influence the thought and sometimes the behavior of those who attend them. On the other hand, the motion picture is definitely moulded by the taste of the public, from which it draws its sustenance in the form of box-office receipts. Examination shows that public taste in moving pictures varies slightly between different sections of the country, between cities of different sizes, and greatly between rural and urban populations. It is, therefore, the purpose of this thesis to consider what effect motion pictures are having upon the culture of one city--Louisville, Kentucky--and what the attitude of the people of this city reveals in regard to their culture.

Any discussion of motion pictures, to be intelligible, must be preceded by a brief summary of the history of the industry.

The genesis of the moving picture is found in the

discovery of how to record motion, made in Rome in 1640, by Athanasius Kircher. He achieved the effect of moving pictures by painting pictures on glass with a revolving disc.¹ The next forward step was made early in the nineteenth century by the Parisian, Peter Roget.² After long experiments in optics, he developed the toy Zoetrope, in which pictures were alternated with black intervals--as in the modern motion picture film. But it was not until the next step that the present moving picture was made possible. In 1888 Thomas Edison recorded the first moving photograph. His first recordings were made on a cylinder, which, however, he soon discarded in favor of the newly invented Eastman film.³ But since the projector was still unknown, Edison's movie was a peep-show. Some of the typical subjects were Sandow the Strong Man, Buffalo Bill, prize fights and dancers. The peep-show met with immediate popularity, but had little room for development, because it could be seen by only one person at a time. Meanwhile, numerous inventors were quietly working on a projector. Their labors finally resulted in the Armat Vitascope, which was immediately bought by Edison.

And so the moving picture was born. The Edison camera, Eastman film and Armat Vitascope combined to

-
1. Ramsaye, Terry, A Million and One Nights - A History of the Moving Pictures, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1926, pp. 6-7.
 2. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
 3. Ibid., pp. 50-58.

produce the first true movie. The amazing spectacle appeared April 23, 1896, as the last act at Koster and Beal's Music Hall in New York. The subjects were Annabelle Moore, a dancer, part of a prize fight and waves on a beach. The audience was wild with enthusiasm. Quickly the new invention swept the country.¹ Movies were soon shown on all vaudeville circuits. Their popularity continued to increase, with the result that, on April 2, 1902, the first motion picture theater was opened at 262 Main Street, Los Angeles.²

Naturally the popularity of the new invention gave rise to producing companies. The original company--Edison's--was interested more in mechanisms and patents than in the production of photoplays, so it was never very important as a producer. Another very early company was the Lambdo Company, organized by Colonel Latham. It, however, had its hey-day in the peep-show era and had begun to decline before the movies were firmly established. It sold its rights and patents to Biograph, the company which did most toward the development of moving pictures. From crude beginnings, Biograph progressed rapidly under the guidance of its vice-president and real manager, Harry Marvin, and its talented young director, David Wark Griffith.

1. Hays, Will, See and Hear, A Brief History of the Moving Picture and the Development of Sound, November, 1929, pp. 11-12.

2. Ibid., p. 16.

Biograph, in its early days, developed scenario writing and indoor photography. It placed its main emphasis on directing and was the real pioneer of story pictures. Another early company was Vitagraph, which worked along the same lines as Biograph. Still another was Kalem, known chiefly as the pioneer producers of comedy. Because all were experimenting,¹ they were friendly, in spite of the fact that they were competitors.

Thus, through the early years of the twentieth century, the new industry was progressing satisfactorily. But all was not as peaceful as it seemed. There was an increasing number of suits over patents, which were seriously hampering progress. In 1907 it was agreed that all picture makers could be licensed under the Edison patents in consideration of royalty payments. Immediately thereafter, the Edison Licensees Group was formed. It included Kalem, Vitagraph, Lubin, Selig, Essanay, Melies and Pathe. But Biograph would not yield. It claimed that it had patents as necessary to the industry as the Edison patents, which it had bought from Colonel Latham. For over a year Biograph and the Edison Licensees Group waged a vigorous war. Finally, on December 18, 1908, they made peace. Biograph and the Edison Licensees pooled their patents and formed

-
1. Griffith, Mrs. D. W., When Movies Were Young, New York, Dutton and Company, 1925.
 2. Ramsaye, Terry, op. cit., p. 466.

the Motion Pictures Patents Company.¹

The new company proposed to license exchanges to deal in the films to be made by the licensed studios, which films were to be rented only to theaters using licensed projectors. There was a charge of two dollars a week for every licensed projector. No licensed theater could handle unlicensed films and no licensed film could be distributed to any unlicensed theater. Most of the industry--producers, distributors and exhibitors--had to submit.² The trust was about to gain a strangle-hold on the infant industry.

But two men fought back, Swanson in the distributing end, and Carl Laemmle in the producing line. Both "went independent." Laemmle organized the Independent Moving Pictures Company of America, better known as Imp. In spite of numerous suits by the trust, he produced and distributed many good pictures. On May 27, 1910, the world learned that the General Films Company had been organized. Backed and really controlled by the Motion Pictures Patents Company, it had as its object the purchase of all distributing companies. Because its competitors could get very little film, they were forced to sell out to the new company. The result was that between April, 1910, and January, 1912, the General Film Company bought the fifty-seven principal exchanges of

1. Ibid., p. 472.

2. Ibid., p. 487.

America.¹ Still Laemmle fought on. Backed by Theodore Roosevelt, he fought the trusts through court after court, until on October 15, 1915, the United States government ordered the trusts to discontinue all unlawful practices--which meant their immediate dissolution.²

In 1912 Imp was reorganized as Universal, with Carl Laemmle as president.³ In 1913 he announced the adoption of a new policy, "quality rather than quantity"--the policy which Universal has followed ever since.⁴

Gradually, through steps which if related in detail would fill volumes, the aforementioned companies evolved into a total of 103 producing companies in the United States. In 1922, Will Hays organized the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, which states that its object is "to foster the common interests of those engaged in the motion picture industry by establishing and maintaining the highest possible moral and artistic standards of motion picture production, by developing the educational as well as the entertainment value and the general usefulness of the motion picture, and by reforming abuses relative to the industry." The Hays' office further states that it operates on the principle that every picture which

1. Ibid., p. 528.

2. Drinkwater, John, Life and Adventures of Carl Laemmle, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931, pp. 83-130.

3. Ibid., p. 168.

4. Ibid., p. 226.

reaches a new high of intellectual or artistic achievement brings a new audience to the movies.

An interesting phase of the history of moving pictures is the rise of the star system. Originally the producers, with the one exception of Carl Laemmle, were definitely opposed to stardom. Except in Imp, not even the names of the players were known to the public until 1912. In the beginning, this lack of publicity was wholly agreeable to the actors, most of whom were rather ashamed to be connected with the movies, as such association usually stamped them as stage failures. Salaries were low, from twenty to forty dollars a week for the best actors, and the work was hard. But the players were sustained by a feeling of pioneering and a belief in the future of the motion picture.¹ In 1910 Carl Laemmle began the star system with a publicity stunt for Florence Lawrence and King Baggot.² From that time on, he gave a great deal of publicity to his players, who soon found it pleasant to be public idols in any capacity. He also offered his actors higher salaries than the other producers. Consequently, he not only got all the best actors but he also pleased the public. The result was that the other producers had to give in and the star system was soon firmly established. Some of the early popular stars were: Florence Lawrence, Biograph--then Imp;

1. Griffith, Mrs. D. W., op. cit., pp. 140-142.

2. Ramsaye, Terry, op. cit., pp. 523-524.

King Baggot, Imp; Henry Walthall, Biograph; Mary Pickford, Biograph; Mabel Norman, Vitagraph; John Bunny and Flora Finch, Biograph; Tom Mix, many companies; Norma, Constance and Natalie Talmadge, Vitagraph; Alice Joyce, Kalem; Florence La Badie, Kalem; Lillian and Dorothy Gish, Biograph; Mae Marsh, Biograph; Mack Sennett, Biograph.

Undoubtedly one of the most important phases of the history of moving pictures is the evolution and development of the feature film. Compared with today's productions, the early films were rudimentary. They were short and usually pointless. The mainsteps in the development of the feature film can be seen from the following pictures:

1. The Great Train Robbery, 1903, notable because it was the first film with a real story; it was eight hundred feet long and was the first film made on location.
2. The Violin Maker of Cremona, 1909, introducing Mary Pickford.
3. For Love of Gold, 1909, in which a close-up was used for the first time.
4. Captain Barnacle, 1910, introducing John Bunny and a new type of comedy.
5. Queen Elizabeth, 1911 (French), gave American producers some idea of the costume play.
6. The Million Dollar Mystery, 1912, popularizing the serial.
7. Enoch Arden, 1912, two thousand feet long. At first it was shown in two installments, but was soon shown as one picture. Its popularity proved that audiences liked longer films, and thereby made possible a great advance. It also used cut-backs for the first time.

8. Tillie's Punctured Romance, 1914, introducing Charlie Chaplin and featuring Marie Dressler.
9. The Birth of a Nation, 1915, directed by David Griffith. He took six months to make the picture. There were six weeks of rehearsals before a single shot was made. Its plot, spectacle, settings, acting and directing were superb. It advanced the moving picture to the point where it was a serious rival of the stage.
10. Intolerance, 1915, the greatest of the Griffith spectacles. It took a year and a half to make and cost two million dollars. But it was too abstract to please the masses.
11. Broken Blossoms, 1919, showing that a simple, human story has great appeal.
12. Orphans of the Storm, 1922, excellent costuming and technique.
13. The Covered Wagon, 1923, began the vogue for epics.
14. The Ten Commandments, 1924, combination of the spectacle and the so-called classical style. It made great progress in the process and use of trick photography.
15. What Price Glory, 1926, showing the possibilities of movies as peace propaganda.
16. The Big Parade, 1926, also peace propaganda.
17. Ben Hur, 1926, noted for costumes, thrills, good spectacle and good acting. It aroused interest partly by means of sound effects which were produced by an orchestra travelling with the picture. It was first presented as a road-show.
18. The Jazz Singer, 1927, proved that sound was practicable.

Obviously, the subjects and settings of the feature film offer infinite scope for variety. It may portray any part of the globe, any era, any strata of society. It can also present a vast number of ideas and skills.

Immediately upon the development of the feature

picture, movements were begun to reform the movies. On Christmas eve, 1904, Mayor McClellan of New York closed every nickelodeon in the city. The result was the formation of the People's Institute, a voluntary organization, which, in 1909, established the unpaid National Board of Censorship. The producers agreed to make any changes which the board wanted in their pictures. The board was financed by charging the producers three dollars and a half for every thousand feet of film reviewed. (The cost to producers is now six dollars and a half for every thousand feet.) The board never liked its name, as it was really more interested in educating the public to appreciate good pictures than in censorship. Therefore, in 1916, it changed its name to the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures. It both censors pictures and classifies them as "mature," "family," or "juvenile."¹ In 1911 a number of official local censorship boards were set up. They were, however, satisfactory to no one, as they varied greatly in what they cut and what they passed. Those in existence today are two city boards--Boston and Chicago, and seven state boards--Florida, Kansas, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia.²

The Catholic Church has taken a leading part in movements for reforming moving pictures. In 1932, the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae began reviewing

1. Ibid., pp. 473-485.

2. Mimeographed material and correspondence with the Will Hays Office, 1937-1940.

films. The church was so pleased with its work that the bishops requested the federation to continue its reviews--with classifications. These classifications are: A films--fully approved; B films--partly objectionable to some phase of church doctrine (as suicide being made honorable in Ceiling Zero. The review explains just why the picture is considered questionable, then leaves attendance up to the individual conscience.) C films--flatly condemned. (These are very few.) That these classifications influence the movie attendance of Catholics--and there are twenty million of them in the United States--is seen by the fact that whenever a New York theater shows a film before its classification has been made public, the theater is besieged with telephone calls inquiring whether it is A, B, or C.

The best known movie reform work of the Catholic Church was its "clean-up campaign" started in 1934. In the years immediately prior to that date, vulgarity had undoubtedly infected many films. Nor can we justly condemn the producers. The public attended the vulgar type of picture, so naturally the producers gave the public what it seemed to want. Then the Catholic Church formed the Legion of Decency, organized many local Better Films Councils, and began an active campaign for better pictures. The producers responded immediately with such features as The Life of Pasteur and Zola. Honestly expecting these films to play to empty houses, the producers were surprised to find that they

drew fairly good audiences.

This improved standard of purity has been maintained. Moreover, the producers have tried to raise the public taste in films, artistically as well as morally. As Will Hays says in his 1939 report as president of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America:

The increasing number of pictures which treat honestly and dramatically many current themes proves there is nothing incompatible between the best interests of the box-office and the kind of entertainment that raises the level of audience appreciation whatever the subject treated. . . . An entertainment art for millions has risen to such high estate that the best which the living theatre can create is now demanded from the films. It is not so long ago that thrilling action for its own sake was considered a satisfying movie; that the custard pie was the symbol of hilarity and amusement from the screen; that the chase was sure-fire entertainment technique; that boy-meets-girl supplied all the drama that a motion picture audience apparently demanded.

While the feature picture was developing, so also were numerous types of shorts. Travel pictures were very popular in the early days of moving pictures, but lost much of their popularity as other types of pictures developed. Among the most popular kinds of shorts today are news reels. They began by explorers and adventurers taking their own pictures, which were retouched by the studios. The first motion picture of current events was of McKinley's inauguration in 1897. Scenes of the Spanish-American War were made and exhibited by Edison. News reels gradually increased in scope and popularity, but it was not until the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson in 1913 that they became a regular part of

movie programs. The earliest news-reel company was Kinegrams. With the advent of sound, news-reels received so great an impetus that now the public demands them. By far the most popular today is the March of Time.

Another type of short is the educational picture. Countless early experiments with it were made, but none were very successful. In 1922 research work in this field was begun under the auspices of the National Education Association, in the University of Chicago, by Charles H. Judd. Other experiments were made in 1923 by Teachers College and Yale University. The results were the Yale Chronicles of America in photoplay. In 1929 was begun the Secrets of Success Series sponsored by the Public Relations conference's Committee on Social Values in Moving Pictures. The subjects of these pictures are scenes from feature films in one reel, illustrating life situations. Their object is to teach right conduct. Today they are used in one hundred and forty-nine schools, where the teachers generally agree that they actually change conduct.¹

The last-born child of the moving picture industry--the cartoon--is the most beloved by the American public. Cartoon pictures first became popular during the World War. The earliest popular series was "Out of the Ink-well." The pictures were very short. Both sound and color were required to increase either the length or popularity of

1. Ibid.

cartoon pictures. But today, the Walt Disney productions lead all other pictures in popularity.

Sound and color have also given rise to numerous other shorts, most of which are semi-educational, such as Popular Science and Unusual Occupations.

At this point it is well to consider the development of color and sound in motion pictures. Experiments were made along both lines from the peep-show days. Color achieved tolerable success long before sound, with the productions of the Kinemacolor Company in 1912. Unfortunately, however, the company came to an abrupt end within a year, owing to the death of its president, Mr. Brock. However, others continued to work with color. In 1929 the two-color technicolor process produced a film, On with the Show. In 1932 Walt Disney began to use his three-color process. The first feature length picture photographed by the new process was Becky Sharp, produced by Rouben Momoulin, with Robert E. Jones supervising the color. Since then there have been many exquisite color films such as the Garden of Allah and Robin Hood. But the color process still has much to accomplish. It is unreliable, some colors registering better than others, and it is expensive.

The development of sound pictures was slower than color in the early stages, but once made practical at all, it developed far more rapidly. The earliest sound device was Edison's Kinetoscope of 1894, a peep-show with a

phonograph and ear-tubes. In 1908 Carl Laemmle showed his Synchronoscope in Indianapolis. It was at first successful, but died young because it could hold material for only two reels. In 1913 Edison exhibited his cameraphone, which failed because of poor synchronization. About 1921 various American engineers began experimenting with the main problems of sound pictures--namely, to produce satisfactory qualities of sound in adequate volume. As so often happens with inventions, several groups of scientists working independently obtained satisfactory results at approximately the same time, in 1926. Most notable was the work done by the Bell Laboratories. The new invention was called the Vitaphone. At first no producer could be induced to take it seriously, with one exception, Sam Warner. He immediately saw its possibilities and persuaded his three brothers to equip the Warner Studio for sound.

The first sound pictures were presented to the public on the sixth of August, 1926, in the only theater then equipped for sound, the Warner's own theater at Broadway and Fifty-Second Street, New York. They consisted of an introductory speech by Will Hays, songs by Martinelli, Marion Talley, Anna Case and the Metropolitan Opera Company's chorus, and violin selections by Zimbalist and Elman. There was also an orchestra synchronization for the feature picture, Don Juan. Criticisms were favorable, the audience was greatly interested, but still the producers did not take sound

seriously, because they did not believe that it could be used successfully for dramatic speech. Only the Warner brothers persisted. Finally, on the sixth of October, 1927, they presented Al Jolson in the Jazz Singer, in which not only music but also speech was used successfully. The motion picture industry was immediately revolutionized.¹

The development and growth of the industry have been continuous. The money invested in the moving picture theaters of the United States today is approximately two billion dollars. The average price of admission is twenty-five cents, and the annual total of paid admissions is a little over one billion dollars. Here is how every dollar received at the box-office is spent:

Rental of pictures.	28	cents
Taxes and property rent	22	"
Payrolls.	20	"
Light, heat, power, insurance	11	"
Advertising	9	"
Maintenance and depreciation.	5	"
Interest and profit	5	"

The Hollywood studios spend annually about one hundred million dollars in producing between five and six hundred feature-length pictures. They produce more than twice this many shorts. This is eighty per cent of the motion pictures of the world. In America, nearly half a million miles of film is used annually. A large studio consumes in one year enough electric current to supply

1. Hays, Will, op. cit., pp. 38-51.

thirty-three thousand homes for the same period. The industry employs some two hundred and seventy thousand people. The cost of a feature picture varies from fifty thousand to several million dollars. Two hundred and seventy-six different industries, crafts and arts are involved in the making of a picture. Usually two hundred and fifty prints are made from each original film. The master negative is carefully preserved at the studio. The prints are distributed to the theaters through film exchanges located in thirty-two cities in the United States.¹

Eighty-five million Americans attend the movies every week. Of course some of these are "repeaters." The producers, through an experimental poll in 1937, estimated that there were about twenty-six million Americans over twelve years of age who attend the movies rarely or not at all. In the United States there are seventeen thousand motion picture theaters, providing one seat for every fifteen Americans. These theaters are located in nine thousand towns. There are one hundred and seventy-five theaters in eighty-five communities which show foreign films, but only about half of these show foreign pictures exclusively. In the United States, only the negroes are under-served by the movies. Approximately only one seat

1. Mimeographed material and correspondence with the Will Hays Office, 1937-1940.

is available for every twenty-one thousand negroes.¹ The producers desire most to please people with incomes of upwards of fifteen hundred dollars a year, living in cities of upwards of fifty thousand inhabitants. In the better-class houses it is the adult female who predominates heavily. "She wants opportunity to escape by reverie from an existence which she finds insufficiently interesting."²

We have seen that a large number of Americans attend motion pictures and that these pictures deal with a great variety of subjects. The vital question is, therefore, to what extent are the audiences influenced by what they see? The most nearly adequate answer to this question is found in the research work which is sponsored by the Payne Fund and done by competent psychologists. The object of this research was to ascertain "what is the amount of knowledge gained and retained from motion pictures by children of various ages, and the types of the knowledge most likely to be retained,"³ and also to ascertain the effects of motion pictures upon childrens' emotions, ideas and behavior. For the sake of comparison, many of these tests were given to adults as well as to children. They were made by such men as W. W. Charters, Director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University; Wendell

1. Will Hays Report, March 27, 1939.

2. Thorp, Margaret Farand, America at the Movies, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1939.

3. Charters, W. W., Director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Motion Pictures and Youth, New York, Macmillan, 1933, p. 2.

Dysinger, Department of Psychology, State University of Iowa, and others of like calibre. The results of the tests are tabulated in twelve monograms published by Macmillan. They show some interesting findings in regard to the emotional responses, perception and retention of ideas and incident, and effects of motion pictures on attitudes and behavior of children who attend them.

In the emotional realm, it was seen that the curve of response to scenes of danger, conflict and tragedy reaches its peak with children of nine years of age, begins to decline rapidly at sixteen, and is weak in adults. On the other hand, response to love scenes is totally absent at nine, is very weak up to fourteen, reaches its peak at sixteen, and is weak in adults.¹ At all ages "Emotional responses are to specific incident. Subjects are largely interested in and moved by the scene of conflict or of danger or of love rather than by the picture as a whole. In many films there was little or no appreciation of the final outcome."²

In regard to understanding and retention of plot, ideas and incident, it was found that a high standard was attained by all age groups. This is probably due to the

1. Ibid., p. 27.

2. Dysinger, Wendell S., Department of Psychology, State University of Iowa, and Ruckmick, Christian, Professor of Psychology, State University of Iowa, The Emotional Responses of Children to the Motion Picture Situation, A Payne Fund Study, New York, Macmillan, 1933, p. 116.

fact that movies are impressive because they provide imagery (both visible and audible), have dramatic form, and are usually attractive. In tests for perception of plot, ideas, and incident, it was shown that adults get 87.8% of the items on which they were tested; children in grades nine and ten get 80.9%; grades five and six get 65.9%; and grades two and three get 52.5%. Retention is remarkably high. After three months second and third grade children remember ninety per cent of what they got from the picture in the first place. Children of all ages accept what they see in the movies as absolute fact. Adults accept most of what they see.¹

The tests also indicate that the attitudes and behavior of children is influenced by what they see at the movies. A number of children were shown Sons of Gods, The Birth of a Nation and All's Quiet on the Western Front. The curve of the subjects' attitudes toward Chinese, negroes and war shifted greatly as a result of these pictures. It shifted still more (in the same direction) with some of the children who were shown other pictures dealing with the same subjects. At the end of eighteen months the effects had not worn off.²

In regard to behavior, the reports imply that delinquent children are more affected than others. The

1. Charters, W. W., op. cit., pp. 8-10.

2. Ibid., pp. 20-23.

report states, "Crime pictures have a pronounced effect upon delinquents." The children copy cues and techniques of minor crimes. The report also states that sex pictures have an extremely powerful effect upon many delinquents, and that for all children "movies constitute patterns of conduct in day-dreaming, phantasy and action."¹

Moving pictures are today a feature of American life which we cannot afford to ignore. The factors which make them important throughout the United States, are present in Louisville. This thesis will proceed to examine one important phase of motion pictures in Louisville, namely, the culture of Louisville as affected by, and reflected in, moving pictures.

1. Ibid., p. 16.

CHAPTER II

LOUISVILLE AT THE MOVIES

CHAPTER II

LOUISVILLE AT THE MOVIES

Louisville is in many respects a representative American city. It is neither northern nor southern, eastern nor western. It is neither very large nor very small. It is not extremely wealthy nor extremely poor. It has a relatively small foreign population. Therefore in studying the motion picture situation in Louisville we are to some extent studying it in America.

Louisville has been a good "movie" town almost from the beginning of the industry. The general trend of the history of motion pictures in Louisville reflects that of the country at large.

The first moving picture play in Louisville, Miss Jerry, was seen on February 18, 1898, at Library Hall. It was received with great enthusiasm, more of course, as a wonder and a novelty than as dramatic art. Throughout the early nineteen hundreds moving pictures were shown as last acts in the local variety theaters, as was happening throughout the United States. On April 6, 1904, the first regular motion picture theater in Louisville was opened. It was the third moving picture to be opened in the United States, the first being in Los Angeles, and the second in New York. The Louisville theater, called Dreamland, was located on Market Street near Fifth. The new enterprise

proved so successful that soon its owner, Mr. Irvin Simon, with Judge Allen Kinney, formed the Princess Amusement Company which opened three more moving picture theaters--the Columbia, the Casino and the Orpheum.¹

The first motion picture theater of any size in Louisville was the Majestic at 544 Fourth Street. Built by a group of Louisville business men headed by Mr. Louis J. Dittmar, it opened on Christmas day, 1908. Its original seating capacity was six hundred and fifty, but it attracted such large audiences that in 1912 it was rebuilt to accommodate one thousand patrons. It was in this theater that Louisville really learned to love movies through the work of such players as John Bunny and Flora Finch, Mary Pickford and Marguerite Clark. During this period, the Majestic had music typical of the motion picture theaters of the country. It had a good orchestra and two feature singers, Amanda Gray and Joe Ramser, who regaled the audience with illustrated songs. In 1924 the Majestic was bought by the Keith interests. Its audiences began to diminish shortly afterwards, as was happening all over the country. On January 1, 1929, the property on which the theater was built passed to new owners and the Majestic ceased to exist.²

The next theater in Louisville to show motion

-
1. Deitz, Martha, "Bringing the History of the Theater Up to Date, Louisville Courier-Journal, July 2, 1922.
 2. Louisville Herald-Post, September 21, 1928.

pictures exclusively was the Mary Anderson at 612 Fourth Street. From 1907 it had been run as a vaudeville house. In 1910 it was bought by the Keith circuit. Then, when in 1913 Keith's acquired the National Theater, they operated the National for vaudeville and the Mary Anderson for movies. Soon, however, the Mary Anderson returned to vaudeville and had a checkered career until 1933 when it again became a motion picture theater and has remained so ever since.¹

Another early motion picture theater of importance in Louisville was the Alamo, on the west side of Fourth Street between Walnut and Liberty. It was the inspiration of "Mike" Swito and Dennis Long, who about the same time organized the Fourth Avenue Amusement Company, with Mr. Dolle as president. The Alamo opened on Thanksgiving Day, November 26, 1914, with Dough and Dynamite, featuring Charlie Chaplin. Shortly afterwards, it introduced a very successful musical novelty. On each side of the screen there was a box containing an orchestra. One was a jazz band, the other a Hungarian orchestra, which presented "classical" music. The two orchestras played alternately and received fairly equal applause. The Alamo's early years were successful, but in 1925 it felt the general movie slump. In 1928 it was wired for sound and was re-opened on the day of the opening of Loew's new theater.

1. Martin, Boyd, article in Courier-Journal, August 20, 1933.

But with the opening of the newer theaters nearer Broadway, the Alamo's clientele changed rapidly. In May, 1937, the Fourth Avenue Amusement Company gave it up, and it became the Ohio, which has since been torn down.¹

During the decade of 1910-1920 neighborhood houses were coming into existence. Two of the earliest were the Cherokee at Bardstown Road and Bonnycastle, and the Crown on Seventh Street near Oak. Neither is in existence today. But the neighborhood houses continued to increase in number and to improve in quality. The process is still going on.

On February 10, 1916, Louisville's first really good negro movie theater opened. It was the Palace, one of the earliest up-to-date negro movie theaters in the country.²

On May 11, 1921, Louisville's movie lovers were elated over the opening of the Rialto, 616 Fourth Street, then acclaimed the finest moving picture theater south of Chicago. It was built by the Majestic Amusement Company at a cost of one million dollars. With a seating capacity of thirty-one hundred,³ the Rialto is still the largest moving picture theater in the city. Its early programs, characteristic of the grandiose ideas of moving pictures of the time, consisted of an overture by the Rialto Symphony Orchestra, a scenic picture with orchestra accompaniment,

1. Courier-Journal, March 16, 1933.

2. Ibid., February 10, 1916.

3. Ibid., May 11, 1921.

a song specialty, a news-reel, an organ concerto, Novelty Film Flashes, a prologue by the Rialto operatic quartette, the feature picture and a comedy finale. The program was changed twice a week. In February, 1931, the Rialto was bought by the Fourth Avenue Amusement Company, when Mr. Johnson Musselman was made manager.¹ For a brief time it tried vaudeville programs, but soon adopted its present policy of movies only.

On October 6, 1921, Louisville's first down-town second-run house was opened at 651 Fourth Street. It was the Kentucky, the first theater in the state of that name. It was, and is, managed by Mr. Simon Swito.² It was extensively remodeled in 1940.

In 1923, the Strand, 326 W. Chestnut, formerly the Schubert Theater, was acquired by the Fourth Avenue Amusement Company. Two years before that time it had shown movies for a short time, but never regularly. In 1923 it became a moving picture house and has remained so ever since.³ To the Strand belongs the distinction of being the first theater in Louisville and the second in the entire world to have permanent wiring for sound, the first being the Warner theater in New York. In August, 1926, the Strand showed the first sound pictures ever made--the shorts described in Chapter One.⁴

1. Herald-Post, February 15, 1931.

2. Courier-Journal, October 6, 1921.

3. Ibid., February 9, 1923.

4. Mimeographed material from the Will Hays Office.

September 1, 1928, saw the opening of Loew's United Artists State Theater, 625 S. Fourth. The building was, and is, the "last word" in moving picture theater architecture. Its cost was about two million dollars, and its seating capacity is three thousand and fifty. It was the first theater in Louisville to have "refrigeration," as the press of that time called it. Its chief architectural distinction is its open sky effect. The local press, at the time of its opening, made the following comment on its program policy: "Many this past week expressed surprise over the character of the entertainment. It was expected that vaudeville would be offered together with pictures, but instead, the management announced, for a first bill at least, a synchronized programme which, of course, is now no novelty for Louisville, as the Strand's bills have been, in many instances, entirely synchronized. Loew's will, however, start the innovation of a sound comic, Metro's 'The Old Gray Mare,' said to be a novel film of its kind."¹

In 1930, the Brown Theater, which had been showing road shows and stock, was wired for sound and became permanently a moving picture theater.²

There have been other down-town theaters in Louisville which ran moving pictures for brief intervals, but

-
1. Martin, Boyd, article in Courier-Journal, August 26, 1928.
 2. Herald-Post, February 1, 1930.

none were of importance in the development of motion pictures in the city.

The reception which moving pictures met with in Louisville corresponded to their reception throughout the country as a whole. At first they were received as an interesting novelty, and were shown mainly as an appanage to vaudeville programs. Gradually, however, they completely replaced vaudeville, especially after the introduction of sound. We have seen how the Louisville vaudeville theaters one by one changed to motion pictures. Sound also made it possible for motion pictures to compete successfully (financially at least) with legitimate stage drama. The only Louisville theater in existence after the invention of movies which never had to succumb to pictures was Macauley's. It was beloved by Louisville audiences and provided excellent plays for them from 1875 until 1925. In that year it was torn down for reasons concerning the property on which it was located, and was succeeded by the Brown Theater. Probably, however, even Macauley's would have had difficulty in competing with moving pictures after sound was established. Movies were taken more seriously here, as elsewhere, as the feature picture developed, especially after the Birth of a Nation in 1915. But by 1920 they seemed to have reached the limit of their development, and in the years shortly following there was a nation-wide slump in box-office receipts. Then came

sound, which revived and increased interest in moving pictures to such an extent that in 1930 Louisville's only remaining legitimate theater, the Brown, became a motion picture house. There was of course some decrease in box-office receipts during the early years of the depression, but the motion picture industry on the whole suffered less than most businesses. Perhaps one reason for their relative business success was the introduction of double features, which was the idea of the producers. Skeptical at first, the exhibitors soon received the plan with enthusiasm.

In 1939 motion picture attendance reached its peak. The managers of the Louisville theaters report that there has been a slight decrease in attendance since the accelerated tempo of the European war, but comedies hold their own and more.

The development of Louisville's taste in moving pictures can best be ascertained by determining what pictures have been popular here. According to the managers of our local theaters, the following pictures have had marked popularity in the city:

- 1903 The Great Train Robbery.
- 1910 Captain Barnacle, with John Bunny.
- 1912 Enoch Arden, The New York Hat, with Mary Pickford, and the serial, The Million Dollar Mystery.
- 1913 The Birth of A Nation.
- 1914 Tillie's Punctured Romance, with Charlie Chaplin and Marie Dressler.
- 1915 Intolerance.
- 1916 The Immigrant, Charlie Chaplin.
- 1918 A Dog's Life, Charlie Chaplin.
- 1919 Broken Blossoms, Lillian Gish and Richard Barthelmess.

- 1920 The Three Musketeers, Douglas Fairbanks.
- 1922 Grandma's Boy, Harold Lloyd, Orphans of the Storm, with the Gish sisters; and Tess of the Storm Country, with Mary Pickford.
- 1923 The Covered Wagon.
- 1924 The Ten Commandments.
- 1926 The Big Parade, What Price Glory, Ben Hur.
- 1927 The Jazz Singer, Al Jolson.
- 1928 Laurel and Hardy in Big Business.
- 1929 Disraeli, George Arliss, Sunny Side Up.
- 1930 Big House, Wallace Beery.
- 1933 State Fair, Will Rogers.
- 1934 The Thin Man, Bengal Lancer, The Merry Widow, Catherine the Great, Private Life of Henry VIII.
- 1935 Mutiny on the Bounty, The Informer, Crusades, The Ghost Goes West.
- 1936 The Great Ziegfeld; Modern Times with Charles Chaplin.

According to the census of 1940, the population of Louisville is 318,952. Of this population approximately 47,354¹ are negroes, which leaves a white population of 271,598. The aggregate seating capacity of the moving picture theaters of the city is 30,784. The total seating capacity of the theaters for white people is 27,072, while for negroes it is 3,012. Therefore in Louisville there is one seat for every 10.36 inhabitants--one for every 10.068 white inhabitants and one for every 15.72 negro inhabitants. As noted in Chapter One, throughout the United States, there is one seat for every fifteen inhabitants and only one for every twenty-one thousand negroes. So we see that the seating capacity of the Louisville theaters is above the average for the country--especially for negro audiences. The motion picture theaters of Louisville today are:

1. Negro Year Book, 1930.

NAME OF THEATER	LOCATION	SEATING CAPACITY
	<u>For white audiences</u>	
Baxter	1053 Bardstown Road	952
Brown	315 W. Broadway	1491
Capitol	2139 S. Preston	832
Cozy	Third and Central Ave.	350
Crescent Hill	2862 Frankfort Ave	514
Downs	3423 Taylor Boulevard	300
Broadway	816 E. Broadway	1338
Hiland.	4302 Park Boulevard	275
Hilltop	1757 Frankfort Ave	496
Hippodrome.	Second and Market	400
Ideal	Twenty-Third and Market	1187
*Kentucky	651 S. Fourth	796
Loew's United Artists State	625 S. Fourth	3050
Mary Anderson	612 S. Fourth	1405
Norman	Twenty-First and Portland	308
Oak	1169 Dixie Highway	750
Orpheum	Jefferson near Eighteenth.	1090
Park	Forty-First and Market	774
Parkland	2811 Dumesnil	448
Rex	408 S. Fourth	700
Rialto.	616 S. Fourth	3100
Ritz	1601 S. Second	560
Savoy	211 W. Jefferson	700
Shawnee	3725 W. Broadway	490

Shelby	1224 S. Shelby	375
Shelmar	726 E. Market	390
Strand	326 W. Chestnut	1950
Towers	331 W. Oak	1243
Uptown	1504 Bardstown Road	1200

For negro audiences

*Dixie	Preston and Caldwell	280
*Lincoln	Thirteenth Street near Walnut. .	677
Lyric	604 W. Walnut	800
Grand	Walnut between Sixth and Seventh	655
*Palace	Walnut near Thirteenth	603

It can be seen from the above list that the geographical distribution of Louisville's movie theaters is good, although it is rather surprising that there is no theater on Bardstown Road beyond Eastern Parkway.

Of these theaters the Strand, the Rialto, the Mary Anderson and Loew's are first-run houses. The Brown is also a first-run house, but shows only pictures which are held over from one of the other first-run houses. The Kentucky is a second-run house, and all the others are either second- or third-run houses. The Strand, Rialto, Kentucky and Uptown are owned and operated by the Fourth Avenue Amusement Company. The Brown takes pictures from any of the first-run houses except the Mary Anderson, which does its own holding over. Interviews with the managers of the local theaters make it plain that the managers have a spirit

* Temporarily closed, but will reopen soon.

of cooperation rather than of competition. While practically all of our theaters have black-booking (and like it), the managers have some choice in the selection of their films. For example, both Loew's and the Rialto rejected Our Town. The Strand accepted it. The managers try not to have two good pictures of the same type in town at the same time, but in this they are not always successful.

How does Louisville avail itself of its opportunities to attend moving pictures? The first-run houses report that their combined average attendance, except in July and August, is approximately one hundred thousand people a week. In July and August it is considerably less. Unfortunately there are no statistics available from the neighborhood houses. Their managers say they would not know how to make an estimate of their attendance. Their box-office receipts tell very little because of the large number of children who attend and because all the neighborhood theaters have one night a week (usually Monday) when they admit two people on one ticket. But we can get some idea of their attendance from the following facts: The total seating capacity of the five theaters reporting an average of one hundred thousand weekly admissions is 10,021. They have twenty-eight performances a week, except the Mary Anderson, which has thirty-four. The total seating capacity of the theaters not reporting on their attendance is 19,763. Most of these theaters have only sixteen performances a week, though a few have more. However,

the number of performances probably does not have a very great effect on the number of admissions, as throughout the United States, seventy per cent of all people who enter the moving pictures theaters arrive between seven-thirty and eight-thirty P.M.¹ In summer our neighborhood houses are usually filled nearly or wholly to capacity. In winter their attendance is less. We can, therefore, estimate very indefinitely that the average attendance in the neighborhood houses is somewhat above that of the first-run houses. But we can say with certainty that Louisvillians attend moving pictures in sufficient numbers to make motion pictures an important factor in the life of the city.

In order to surmise what influence motion pictures are having upon the city, we must ascertain the type of pictures which the Louisville public is seeing. This question can be answered only by the managers of our local theaters.

Mr. Hunt, manager of Loew's, states, "What the people want now is a chance to laugh." He says that the comedy type of picture is always popular in Louisville, but has been especially so since the present war began. By comedy, he is not referring to the "custard-pie" type but to something more really human, as the Hardy Family pictures, Mr. Deeds Goes to Town, or pictures with a touch of subtlety,

1. The Story of Moving Pictures, Milestones of Progress, mimeographed material from the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

as Ninotchka. He says also that musical comedies and light operas are very popular in Louisville. Next to comedy, he says, action or adventure pictures go best, but always there must be human appeal, and usually romance. At present there must be nothing to provoke serious thought. For example, Mortal Storm, an exceptionally good picture with popular stars and made from a popular novel, drew poor houses, undoubtedly because it provokes too much serious thought about the present world situation. At present the Louisville public is decidedly tired of biographical and historical pictures. Mr. Hunt finds that of course the stars appearing in a picture have a great deal to do with the size of the audience, but that one star usually means little--it must be a team as Nelson Eddy and Jeanette MacDonald or William Powell and Myrna Loy. Furthermore, he feels that not even the most popular of teams will draw a good audience unless they have a good vehicle. He feels that plays made from popular novels (modern or old) draw well, provided they have good actors. In other words, today's audiences in Louisville want a good story, good acting, good directing and good settings. In short, he says, our audiences have learned to recognize a good film when they see one and are not satisfied with mediocre pictures. The attitude of the Louisville public toward what Mr. Hunt calls the "heavy classics" is quite interesting. He says that any suggestion of the "high-brow" scares away the

masses,¹ but that the people who do see the so-called "high-brow" pictures, like them immensely. For instance, Romeo and Juliet drew a small audience here, but a questionnaire sent to working girls showed that the few who saw it liked it very much indeed. Romeo and Juliet was "absolutely tops" in very large cities, but a complete failure in small towns. Captains Courageous, in spite of its lack of romance, was well liked here, as elsewhere. Mr. Hunt attributes its success to good acting and directing, human appeal and action. Mr. Hunt feels that every time the public sees a picture of very high standards the public taste is raised, which accounts for the general upward trend of pictures. His point of view backs up Will Hays' statement quoted in Chapter One.

Mr. Hunt lists the following pictures as having brought in large audiences: The Hardy Family (any and all of them are absolutely tops with our audiences because of Mickey Rooney and the comedy, and because they are about people whom anyone can understand), Gone with the Wind, The Women, Another Thin Man, Young Tom Edison (less popular, however, than most Mickey Rooney pictures), Mr. Smith Goes to Washington, Babes in Arms, Northwest Passage, Thunder Afloat and Grapes of Wrath.

Mr. Hunt states that it is his definite opinion

1. All of our local theater managers speak frequently of the "masses" and the "elite." By the former, they mean the uncultured major portion of their audiences; by the latter, the intellectual few.

that the culture of the city is more reflected in, than affected by, moving pictures. He points out, very logically, that the producer and exhibitor must give the public what it wants or go broke. Nor is this condition peculiar to twentieth century America. He noted that the same state of affairs existed with Aristophanes and Euripides.

At the present moment Dr. I. Q. is running a series of programs at Loew's. As his series is not yet finished, complete statistics are not available, but it is interesting to note that on his first night here, the Louisville audience had a higher rating than the audience in any other city which Dr. I. Q. has visited. Louisville's first night score was 3.2% above the next highest city and 39% above average. Other cities which Dr. I. Q. has visited include Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Saint Louis, Dallas, Denver and Atlanta.

Mr. Musselman, manager of the Rialto, agrees substantially with the opinions expressed by Mr. Hunt. Mr. Musselman emphasizes the public's present desire for comedy, the fact that both stars and a good play are necessary to the success of a picture, and that Louisville demands good pictures. For instance Errol Flynn was a great success in The Charge of the Light Brigade, but a box-office failure in the weak vehicle, Another Dawn. Mr. Musselman also calls attention to the brevity of the average star's popularity. He says that the theater which today advertises Greta Garbo,

Marlene Dietrich or Mae West is certain to have a poor audience. All of these stars were once public idols. Shirley Temple, too, has had a marked decline in popularity in the last year. Mr. Musselman seems to feel even more strongly than Mr. Hunt that romance is essential to the popular success of a picture. He quotes as evidence his experience with Deanna Durbin's pictures. One of her best pictures, in his estimation, was A Hundred Men and a Girl, a picture in which Stokowski and the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra played prominent parts. The picture had the best of music (though it was not too heavy), and excellent comedy, acting and directing. But so far as Louisville is concerned, it was a bad failure. Mr. Musselman says that the audience was scared off in the first place because the masses were afraid of Stokowski, and the real musicians felt he would be in an incongruous setting. Then the few of the masses who came to the early shows missed the romance and the picture got no build-up. My own opinion of the picture coincides fully with that expressed by Mr. Musselman. It was excellent musically and dramatically. Mr. Musselman states that the producers learned by the experience and that now there is always some romance in Deanna Durbin's pictures. The result is that she now draws huge audiences in Louisville and almost everywhere else. Mr. Musselman also says that plays made from popular novels have much appeal, and that biographical and historical

pictures are dead in Louisville. He gives as his most popular recent pictures: March of Time (the popularity of these pictures was immediate and is increasing constantly; the public likes drama with its news, and also enough of one subject to really mean something), Bringing Up Baby, Snow White, The Road to Singapore, My Favorite Wife, Irene, Primrose Path, and all Deanna Durbin pictures.

The Rialto recently made an interesting experiment in regard to the public's opinion of double features. The management asked all patrons of the theater for one week to tell whether they preferred single or double features. Fifteen per cent more declared in favor of single features than double. So the theater adopted a policy of single features. Immediately its attendance fell off greatly. It then reverted to double features, and the attendance went up. Mr. Musselman said that with single features his balcony was empty; with double it is usually full. His interpretation is that young men can take their "dates" to a double feature in the balcony for sixty-six cents, and that when the show is over it is too late to have to go any place else and spend more money. He says that from the producers' angle there are two main reasons for double features. One is that in many cities, as Louisville, the public has become accustomed to good pictures and is not satisfied with mediocre ones, but that it is impossible to produce enough really good ones to supply the theaters with

the large number necessary with single features. Another reason is to give some experience and publicity to rising players, which was formerly done through the legitimate stage. The Mary Anderson is the only theater in Louisville which regularly shows single features.

Mr. Buechel, manager of the Mary Anderson, reiterates that the public is now demanding comedy. He too feels that several stars and also a good play are requisite to the box-office success of a picture. He states, however, that when Bette Davis is in a picture, nothing else is needed to attract a good audience. He notes, though, that most of her pictures have had good stories. He says that to the average Louisville audience, the ending is the all-important part of the story. He seems to believe even more strongly in the popularity of the action picture than does either Mr. Hunt or Mr. Musselman. He disagrees with most of the other managers in regard to the present popular appeal of the musical film. He says that they were popular, but that now "musical comedy has died a horrible death." He attributes its decease to the fact that there has been too much sameness in the stories of the musical comedies--they are all either back-stage stories or stories of the sudden rise of a radio star. He is even more emphatic than the other managers that the biographical movie is dead. He cites as evidence poor houses for Zola and the Magic Bullet.

Mr. Buechel's comments on Louisville's reaction to

"heavy classics" is enlightening. He says that the critics, the Better Films Council and the intellectuals generally ask for higher type pictures, so the producers and exhibitors provide them at enormous cost. Then they play to nearly empty houses. He gives as an example Mid-Summer Night's Dream. Its reviews were excellent and several local groups, notably the schools, agreed to support it. The results of their aid were meagre. Only thirty tickets were sold through the University of Louisville and only sixteen through the Atherton High School. Yet, the few people who saw the picture were enthusiastic. It is interesting to note that on the legitimate stage Louisville has for many years received Shakespeare well. Mr. Harry Martin, former manager of Macauley's and the Brown, and present manager of the Columbia Theater, says that Shakespeare on the legitimate stage is profitable in Louisville unless done by a poor company. Southern and Marlowe brought packed houses, Robert Mantel and Fritz Leiber very good houses. According to Mr. Martin, Macauley's and the Brown always made it their policy to have one Shakespearean engagement every season. The fact that Shakespeare in Louisville is better attended on the legitimate stage than in the moving pictures probably means simply that the masses, who compose the bulk of the movie audiences but not of stage audiences, are not attracted by Shakespeare. It indicates nothing in regard to the

culturally elite.

Mr. Buechel gives as some of his most popular recent pictures: Elizabeth and Essex (crowds due to Bette Davis and Errol Flynn), Dodge City, Union Pacific, and All This and Heaven Too.

Mr. Field, assistant manager of the Strand, agrees in essentials with the opinions expressed by the other managers. He differs, however, from Mr. Buechel in that he says that musical pictures take very well indeed in Louisville. He feels too, even more than other managers, the importance of the star. Apparently he does not even feel that more than one star is necessary. As he words it, "The star sells the picture." He certainly feels that the biographical picture is not taking well here, and cites as an example a miserable house for Abe Lincoln in Illinois. This picture, in a private showing for a group of civic-minded citizens, elicited most enthusiastic comments, as it did from the critics. Yet it did not attract the masses and consequently was a box-office failure. Mr. Field points out, however, that there are usually specialized groups which are greatly interested in various biographical pictures. He says that local medical groups are now asking for the return of Pasteur, the Citadel and the Magic Bullet. He designates most of the classics as "sleepers," which means a picture which attracts only a small audience at first, but pleases the audience to the extent that it advertises the

picture, and its attendance increases gradually. He finds that the most striking example of a "sleeper" was the Count of Monte Cristo. The Blue Bird had a fairly good audience at the Strand in spite of Shirley Temple's recent decline in popularity. This was undoubtedly partly due to an exceptionally good B feature (a semi-musical comedy) and a very attractive cartoon picture shown on the same program. Mr. Field gave no definite list of recent popular pictures. In fact he says there has been an attendance slump in Louisville since about February. Other managers say the same thing but somewhat more mildly.

The Brown is a first-run theater but shows only hold-overs. Mr. Greenwell, its assistant manager, states that the Brown is in a rather different position from other Louisville moving picture theaters not only because it has hold-overs but because it has a slightly different clientele. For one thing, it gets many transients from the Brown Hotel. He says that the local patrons of the Brown are rather more discriminating than those attending the other first-run houses as it is composed to a considerable extent of people who do not go to see a picture until they are reasonably sure it is good. Consequently, a "sleeper" which is financially disappointing in the theater where it is first shown can be a box-office success at the Brown.

Mr. Greenwell agrees on most points with the other managers, but differs slightly in one instance. He alone of

all the Louisville managers says that the historical picture takes well here. But he makes it clear that he means epic or action pictures, not the ordinary historical biography. Even biographies go well when they have action. He finds that all comedies have great popular appeal here now, but that by far the most popular type is the comedy of words. He too believes that our audiences at present want nothing provoking serious thought on world conditions. Mortal Storm did not draw well at the Brown. Mr. Greenwell gives as recent "best-sellers": The Hardy Family pictures (all of them), Kentucky, Ninotchka, The Road to Singapore, My Favorite Wife, Irene, Drums Along the Mohawk, Northwest Passage, Jessie James, Union Pacific, and Lillian Russell.

Mr. Simon Swito, manager of the Kentucky, states that the pictures shown in his theater, a down-town second-run house, are popular in the same degree that they were in the first-run houses.

The same thing is true of the neighborhood theaters, with a few variations. The audiences of the neighborhood houses are composed largely of two extremes in ages--children and old people. Both children and old people like child actors, therefore Jane Withers, who has poor audiences in the down-town theaters, plays to capacity houses in the neighborhood houses. The Blue Bird had packed houses at the Uptown. The thriller naturally goes well in the neighborhood houses, but is usually shown as the B feature. At the Uptown,

parents seem to exercise some supervision over the shows which their children attend. Mr. Boswell, the manager, says he receives many telephone calls from parents inquiring if the picture he is showing is suitable for their children to see. But apparently, in most localities, children see what they please. Of course the cartoon is an important part of the program in the neighborhood houses. Mr. Boswell also senses a strain of sentimentality in his audiences. He says that many people, especially middle-aged or elderly women "love to have a good cry." In most instances, however, pictures are popular in the neighborhood theaters in about the same degree as they were in the first-run houses.

Some pictures which have had notable city-wide success are: Kentucky, which had the all-time record run for Louisville. It showed continuously for six weeks and two days in the down-town theaters alone. The picture with the second longest run was Sunny Side Up, in 1929. It showed continuously for six weeks. Other outstanding successes were Snow White, Gone With the Wind, Naughty Marietta and One Night of Love.

When summarized, the gist of the statements of our motion picture theater managers seems to be as follows: Louisville audiences are fairly discriminating in their appreciation of a film, but have not reached the highest level of appreciation, as is evinced by mass fear of the

"high-brow." Nevertheless, it appears that our public is afraid of the word highbrow rather than of the actuality, for the few who saw Romeo and Juliet, Mid-Summer Night's Dream and They Shall Have Music liked them. Unquestionably, comedy at present holds first place in Louisville, but it must be good comedy. Action pictures come next. But in either type, this city wants human appeal and usually romance. The biographical picture is not popular here. The star, or stars, mean much to our public. A good story, especially one from a popular novel whether old or new, helps a picture greatly. It seems that this city likes good music in a picture more than it will admit. For example, our masses avoided Stokowski or Heifetz, but greatly enjoy really good music when lured to it by Deanna Durbin or Nelson Eddy.

This city's predilection for comedy, action and stars, and its antipathy to serious thought or biography are shared by the nation at large. Its reaction to the "classics" and to musical films are Louisville's own.

CHAPTER III

MOTION PICTURES AND THE FINE ARTS IN LOUISVILLE

CHAPTER III

MOTION PICTURES AND THE FINE ARTS IN LOUISVILLE

We have seen how Louisville's taste is reflected through the type of motion pictures most popular in the city. Let us now examine the effect which these pictures may have upon the fine arts in Louisville. We shall first consider motion pictures and literature.

In the course of its swiftly moving history the moving picture industry has developed many types of films, of which the most important today is the photoplay. We have already traced the high points of its development in Chapter One. In nature the photoplay resembles both the novel and the stage play, yet differs from both. It resembles the stage play in that it is a direct presentation of action and dialogue by actors whom we both see and hear. It is like the novel in its limitlessness and in its mobility of time and setting. Both the novel and the photoplay can carry their public to any part of the globe and can utilize flash-backs and parallel action. The photoplay is, therefore, a combination of the play and the novel.

But it differs from both in several vital respects. For one thing, it is much shorter. The length of the average photoplay is ninety minutes. Another great difference is that the motion picture is ephemeral in nature. The average

audience is through with a moving picture when it has seen it once. A small portion of our audiences see a picture twice, and occasionally there are revivals of old films, but the large majority of people see a picture only once.¹ On the other hand, the play or novel can be read and reread, studied and conned over, wholly or in parts. Another difference is that the moving picture has more complicated mechanics and technique than any other form of art. It is the result of innumerable mechanical inventions--cameras, Klieg lights, sound recording, color photography and the coming stereoscope, or three dimensional effect. Some of these have been well mastered; one, color, partially so; and one, the stereoscope, is still in the conceptive stages. Each invention brings its problems of technique which must be mastered before artist²'s creation can result. Then, when each problem has been mastered separately, there remains the task of blending them into one well-integrated whole--which is an art in itself.

Probably the most important point of difference between the photoplay and the stage play or novel is that the former is primarily a business enterprise. This fact is freely admitted by both producers and exhibitors.² Of course the novel and stage play have their business angles, but to nothing like the extent of the motion picture. The

1. Will Hays Report, March 27, 1939.

2. Statement by Mr. Hunt, Manager of Loew's Theater.

really great novelist or dramatist writes primarily to express himself. When he writes for more mercenary reasons his works become pot-boilers, and are not great--are rarely even good. When it comes to production, a publisher can afford to publish a novel which will sell only to the intellectuals because the initial cost is not too great.¹ A stage play always expects to reckon its audiences in thousands only. But a motion picture, because of its enormous production costs, must attract its millions. Therefore, it is conditioned at every turn by the necessity of catering to popular taste.

There are certain esthetic principles which either a stage play, a novel, or a photoplay must observe to be good literary art. They are unity, coherence and proportion, proper emotional appeal, and truth and reality. Let us see how the photoplay compares in these respects with the stage play and novel.

In the observance of unity, coherence and proportion, the motion picture is subject to some peculiar temptations. For one thing, when a producer is featuring a popular, high salaried star, he is frequently tempted to give more prominence to the character portrayed by that star than the perfect whole warrants, as for example, Errol Flynn's role in the Prince and the Pauper. This danger was one of the reasons given by some of the early producers for combating

1. Statement by Mr. W. K. Stewart.

Carl Laemmle's idea of promoting stardom. Another serious temptation is to emphasize unduly some particular scene, especially spectacular scenes as the arena events in the Sign of the Cross. This temptation arises from two major causes--first, the expense involved in producing the scene, and second, that audiences long remember very vivid scenes. Also, all too often in color films, some scenes are overdone for the sake of color alone, notably desert scenes in the Garden of Allah. But in making a smoothly running plot, the photoplay has the advantage over either the stage play or novel. The motion picture is limited by neither time nor setting. It can utilize fade-outs, fade-ins, flashbacks and close-ups. Hence its advantages over the stage. In a novel, several minutes of reading are often required to describe an action which really occurs in only a few seconds, but which the picture shows in its actual time. From the beginning of the motion picture industry American producers have shown considerable skill in handling plot. As mentioned in Chapter One, the real pioneer in this line was the Biograph Company, under the directing of David Wark Griffith. Today, American films are noticeably better than most foreign films, especially English films, in plot manipulation.

But this very facility in handling plot tends to produce a weakness in another esthetic principle--that is, in the proper handling of emotion. The fact that in a photoplay

action succeeds action so rapidly produces tenseness and a high degree of emotionalism--often too high a degree. It is a distinct tendency of motion pictures to overdo emotional appeal in other ways too. This is usually more true of American pictures than of foreign films. It is probably done for two main reasons. One is because it is so easy to do. For instance, fire scenes can be made vivid by sights and sounds natural to a fire, and by the addition of photographic oddities, and even musical accompaniments. The second motive which a director may have for heightening emotional scenes is that audiences usually like them. We have already noted the present nation-wide desire for the wholesome emotion of humor. Then, considerable segments of American audiences (especially children) desire thrills; others delight in pathos and sentimentality; still others, unfortunately, wallow in cruelty. Dr. Walter Barnes says of directors:

Their reason for presenting the horrible is that their audiences eat it up. No doubt we 'reel back into the beast' easily enough, no doubt we retain vestiges of ancestral savagery, of delight in pain and anguish. But the artist, the well-balanced, well-rounded artist, while he may explore those nether depths, does not exploit them, does not pander to our bestial passions, does not seek to revive primordial emotions which have no 'survival value' The photoplay directors and the novelists who revel in sadism, mainly because there is a market for it, are perilously close, in attitude and purpose, to the Caesars who staged gladiatorial combats to make Roman holidays.¹

1. Barnes, Walter, Ph.D., Professor of the Teaching of English, New York University, The Photoplay as Literary Art, Newark, New Jersey, Educational and Recreational Guides, Incorporated, 1936, p. 33.

Practically everyone over fifteen wants romance in movies--and gets it. But there is very little sexual indecency in American moving pictures. There is nothing in them today to arouse lust, in fact the whole matter of sex is handled with much greater delicacy and restraint in moving pictures than in either the stage play or novel. This is due partly to censorship, and partly to the fact that moving pictures attract such mixed audiences as to make care in the handling of sex matters a necessity. In other words, our movies give us romance, but not sex. The two worst sins of which the photoplay is guilty in its treatment of sex is its tendency to put romance in pictures where it has no place, as in Kidnapped, and to make it too trivial. Otherwise, to quote Dr. Barnes again, "We could regard the photoplay presentation of love as at its best beautiful and satisfying and at its poorest innocuous, unimportant, and, under the present circumstances, necessary."¹

The photoplay, however, has one great superiority over the stage play in the handling of emotional scenes. In a stage play which has many performances, an actor can scarcely be expected to play his emotional scenes equally well at every performance. But a photoplay will make as many retakes as necessary until a really satisfactory result is attained and recorded for all times.

From the comments of the managers of our local

1. Ibid., p. 35.

moving picture theaters, quoted in Chapter Two, it seems clear that Louisville audiences do their full share in demanding such emotional atrocities as excitement, sentimentality and romance-at-any-price. But they also seem to demand the wholesome emotion of humor, and in an intelligent form. It can also be said, to their great credit, that while they like plenty of action, they show no great desire for cruelty. Not one theater manager in Louisville mentioned a horror picture as among his most popular.

In the presentation of reality and truth, in some phases the motion picture is vastly superior to the novel or stage play, but in most phases it is at present inferior. It is usually superior in settings. Obviously a moving picture can present many scenes which a stage play cannot, as storms at sea, battles, air-plane flights, and so forth. In historical photoplays, not only the scenery but all the properties, settings and costumes are presented correctly, as the result of long research by well-qualified workers. Of course the novel can describe scenes and settings truly and often beautifully, but psychologically no written description can produce the clarity and vividness of impression as does the actual visible presentation of the scene.

In other types of films too, moving pictures today are making a great effort to present reality. An example is the popular Hardy Family pictures. Before this series was begun such questions were asked as "how many people

compose the typical American family?" "In what sort of town would such a family live? in what sort of house?" Research workers were sent to many towns in the Middle West to see the towns and houses.¹ The results have been that the Hardys are so typical of the American family that almost anyone, either above or below the Hardy family's level, can understand it and see his own family reflected in some phase of the Hardys.

Often, however, human nature is distorted in a photoplay. One usual manner of doing so is found in the moving picture's habit of altering the ending of a novel, which frequently results in changing characterization, as in Alice Adams. Another is the insertion of romance where it does not belong. A third is due to the star system, as sometimes a director will alter the character portrayed to suit the personality of the star. An extreme case of this sort is the character of Sara Crewe, as altered to suit Shirley Temple. A still greater defect of the photoplay in the portrayal of character is that it cannot possibly admit the author's discussion of character. It cannot even include much dialogue which might reveal character because of the brevity of its time. For the first three defects popular demand is often responsible. Certainly the managers of the Louisville theaters feel that

1. Letter from the Will Hays Office of Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

their audiences demand romance and happy endings, and like to see their favorite stars.

Nevertheless, in many films characterization is very well done. For instance, both generalization and subtleties of character were excellently portrayed in Elizabeth and Essex, Captains Courageous and A Star Is Born. In Gone With the Wind certainly the characters were not altered to suit the stars--to the contrary, long and arduous search was made for stars who would suit the characters. Some producers, too, are beginning to realize that it is a mistake to make changes in plays or novels which they are making into pictures. David Selznick says:

I don't believe in reconstructing a story. I believe, if there are faults in construction, it is better to keep them than to try to change them around, because no one can certainly pick out the chemicals which contribute to the making of a classic. And there is always the danger that, by tampering, you may destroy the essential chemical. . . . The biggest job in adapting a well-beloved work is that of getting it down to the length of a feature film. And I have discovered that the public will forgive you any number of omissions--particularly of subordinate material which is not connected with the main plot--but it won't forgive you deliberate alterations. For that reason I find it best to make bridging scenes which span omissions as suggestive as possible. That is, by picking up dialogue and even phrases from other parts of the book, the audience is given the illusion of seeing and hearing that with which they are already familiar.

In the presentation of general truths the photoplay is weak in comparison with the stage play or novel. It cannot enter into discussions because of its brevity.

1. Ibid.

Moreover, owing to its very inclusive audiences, it cannot deal with controversial matters, such as contemporary politics, denominational religion and sex problems. These questions, if included in a photoplay at all, must be treated with great restraint and evasiveness. The motion picture cannot attempt to ferret out the truth concerning them.¹ In dealing with social problems the motion picture is somewhat more successful, but it is still limited by its necessity for neutrality, and at present, it has the serious handicap of the public's aversion to thought-provoking films.

So we see that in many respects the photoplay as literary art does not rank very high. Why then, do we take it seriously? For one reason, because it has potentialities of greatness, and is rapidly improving. If we doubt this we have only to compare a "revival picture" such as the Sheik, considered of the best in its day, with a 1940 production, such as All This and Heaven Too. But the process of improvement is circular in nature--producers and exhibitors provide better films when the public wants them, and public taste is improved gradually by seeing better films. So progress is gradual, but it has been steady. Another reason for taking moving pictures seriously as literary art is because so many people see them. These people, through the films, become familiar with at least the general ideas,

1. Statements by Mr. Hunt, Mr. Buechel and Mr. Musselman.

stories and characters of many plays and novels. Moreover, in spite of its ephemeral nature, the influence of a film upon the literary ideas of our audiences carries over beyond the confines of the moving picture theater itself. In Louisville, as elsewhere, films made from good plays or novels greatly stimulate reading.

The Louisville Public Library reports¹ that the moment advertisements appear of a motion picture based on a well-known play or novel, it has many calls for that book. It does not matter whether it is a modern book or an old one--all copies are borrowed immediately and calls for it continue for several weeks after the picture has been shown in Louisville. Moreover, the library usually has many calls for other books by the same author. It also has some calls for books on allied subjects. For example, after Marie Antoinette was here many people wanted books on the French Revolution, and Lives of a Bengal Lancer and Gunga Din brought requests for books about India. The library here cooperates with the motion picture theaters by displaying posters of worth-while pictures, and by giving out book-marks advertising outstanding features. These book-marks are issued to libraries all over the country by the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, from the Will Hays office.

1. Information furnished by Miss Winifred Hutchings, Head of the Open-Shelf Room, Louisville Free Public Library, main branch.

Mrs. Mary Sublett of the University of Louisville library made a tabulation of reading connected with moving pictures. She gave out a questionnaire to one hundred and twenty-four students. Their answers showed that less than half of the students had read a single novel or play as a result of having seen the movie. She suggests as the main reason for this variation from the norm that the students have no time for recreational reading. However, the part of the questionnaire based upon photoplays dealing with historical events shows that quite a bit of reading has been done as a result of students having seen the movie. Many read biographies of characters in the pictures. The encyclopedias were drawn upon for events connected with most of the films. Mrs. Sublett summarizes thus: "These results seem to indicate that movies have stimulated reading of biographies and supplementary books more than the reading of the books themselves."¹

1. Mrs. Sublett gives the following statistics, based on the answers to 124 questionnaires sent to students from freshmen to seniors.

Books read after the student had seen a picture were:

<u>Anthony Adverse</u>	17	out of	51
<u>Count of Monte Cristo</u>	15	" "	50
<u>David Copperfield</u>	15	" "	65
<u>Green Light</u>	13	" "	39
<u>Tale of Two Cities</u>	14	" "	84

Mrs. Sublett adds: "A goodly number were inspired to read Marie Antoinette by Zweig . . . Scientists such as Pasteur and Madame Curie were read about either in biographies or in collections of biographies. The novels of Zola and the poems of Francois Villon were read by several students.

"The encyclopedias were drawn upon for references to historical events centering around the times of In Old Chicago, Parnell, Suez, Lloyd's of London (one person looked up the De Lesseps family in all the encyclopedias)."

Our local book stores also report greatly increased sales of books made into moving pictures. This is true of books for children as well as for books for adults--and of different priced editions. Quite naturally, some of these books have greater sales than others. Mr. W. K. Stewart, in discussing the type of book which sells well after a moving picture production, seems to echo the words of our local theater managers in regard to public taste. He says that books of romance or action usually sell best, regardless of the age in which they were written. His sales records for all times were broken by Wuthering Heights which sold in huge quantities in all sorts of editions, from twenty-five cent paper backs to the best de luxe. The picture had good audiences, but not extraordinary ones. Other books which Mr. Stewart found had sales greatly stimulated by moving pictures are The Good Earth (in the dollar edition--the twenty-five cent edition was not available when the picture was in Louisville), Grapes of Wrath, Of Mice and Men, Captains Courageous, Kidnapped, Gone with the Wind, Phantom Crown (picture Juarez), All This and Heaven Too, Snow White and Pinocchio. Of Mortal Storm, he sold only one copy and that was returned the next day. It had sold very well when it was first published. Mr. Stewart says that while some of these sales are to his regular customers, the majority of them are to people whom he never sees in his store at any other time.

The experiences of the Wilderness Road Book Store are in the main those of the W. K. Stewart Company.

Wuthering Heights, at the time the picture was here, broke all records. Other notably good sellers after the presentation of a picture in Louisville were: The Good Earth, All This and Heaven Too, and Mortal Storm. The only apparent reason why the Wilderness Road alone of all Louisville book stores did well on Mortal Storm after the picture is its proximity to Loew's and the Brown theaters where the picture was shown, and to the Brown Hotel, whence it may have gotten some transient trade. But this seems an inadequate explanation. Mr. Morton Joyes of the Wilderness Road, says that he had a poor sale of the Magic Bullet, but that practically all other books made into moving pictures sell well. He adds that practically everyone wants the moving picture edition of a book when there is one. He believes that the reason is that illustrations made from a picture which the reader has seen give added vividness to his or her visualization.

Other book stores agree essentially with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Joyes. It is interesting to note, too, that many stores which are not primarily book stores now handle twenty-five cent editions of books made into moving pictures. Some of these stores are the Readmore News Stand, all the ten cent stores and dollar stores, and many drug stores. They all report thriving sales, and in the same proportion of

popularity as given by Mr. Stewart. Therefore, we reach the definite conclusion that the motion picture is stimulating good reading in Louisville.

While the photoplay is the most usual and probably the most important type of moving picture, there are other types to be considered. One is the musical film. There are many musical comedies, though not so many as spoken comedies. Then there are a number of spoken comedies into which several popular musical numbers have been introduced, as The Road to Singapore. Both of these types, especially the latter, are popular in Louisville but have little if any cultural value. The next grade of musical film is the Deanna Durbin type-- pictures which have entertaining stories, stars with pleasing personalities, and four or five really good musical numbers. Other performers who have made this type of picture are Jeanette MacDonald, Nelson Eddy, Grace Moore, Gladys Swarthout, and Martini. In regard to both compositions and execution of music this type of picture is a distinct cultural advance over the last mentioned sort of musical film. They have great popularity throughout the country, and even more in Louisville than elsewhere. Next, there is the musical where there is some story, but where the real reason for the picture is to feature some first class musician who is known solely as a musician, not as an actor. Examples are: They Shall Have Music, with Jascha Heifetz, Moonlight Sonata, with Paderewski, and Life and Loves of Beethoven, with Harold Bauer.

The last two are foreign films. In fact, there are very few films of this type, because they have not met with popular favor in Louisville or anywhere else in America.

That moving pictures stimulate the composition of music is seen from numbers especially composed for many pictures, as Snow White and Gulliver's Travels. The use of original compositions is quite recent. It should be interesting to observe its development. Incidental music is used in practically all feature films and in many shorts. It is interesting to note that this incidental music is usually by the best composers--selections from Beethoven, Tchaikowsky and Liszt are among those most frequently used. It is invariably well performed. But it is used only to heighten the emotional effect of a scene, never for its own sake.

In fact there has been virtually no attempt by moving picture producers to treat music for its own sake. In the very early days of sound pictures a number of famous musicians made shorts, but that type of picture was soon discontinued, the basic reason being that music alone does not utilize the essentially pictorial possibilities of the moving picture and can be quite satisfactorily presented by radio. There is still an unexplored field awaiting the motion picture producers in the presentation of opera. The motion picture should be able to produce something really great in this line. It is capable of exquisite scenic

effects and it could produce better acting than can ever be achieved on the operatic stage for this reason--the sound track can be made at one time and the action at another with only sotto voce singing, which allows the performer to concentrate on acting. This is done now in most musical pictures. There have been frequent rumors that one or another producer is about to undertake an opera, but so far, none has appeared, doubtless because such pictures would be subject to the same public attitude as the "heavy classics."

Nevertheless, reports from Louisville's music stores indicate that moving pictures are having some desirable influence on the musical taste of the city. All music stores which handle phonograph records or printed music report that sales in these articles are stimulated by moving pictures. Of course more of the popular type are sold than of the classical--still the sale of the latter is gratifying. Mr. Paget of the Baldwin Piano Company says that after They Shall Have Music was shown in Louisville he had many calls for Heifetz records of Tschaikowsky's Violin Concerto in D, and of Horra Staccato, which were used in the film. He says also that after the showing of any Deanna Durbin picture he has large sales of her songs, such as Gounod's Ah, que je veux vivre, and Schubert's Ave Maria. He finds that a musical film stimulates the sale of sheet music and phonograph records much more than do the "operas" presented in the

Iroquois Amphitheater. It is his opinion that public taste in music is being gradually raised by moving pictures. As he words it, "The public sees and likes movies with popular music, then it goes to music of the Strauss waltz class--and after that the next step may be the highest."

It is interesting to note, too, the effect of moving pictures on music for children. All sheet music counters now have attractive children's editions of music from well-known moving pictures, such as the Famous Music Corporation's book, Gulliver's Travels. This book has in it all the songs from the picture, arranged simply enough for very young musicians to sing or play on the piano. The arrangements, while very simple, have good harmony and make excellent studies for beginners. Each selection has an illustration from the moving picture. The book has sold very well in Louisville.

However, we must take into consideration that Louisville today is a music-loving city. This can be seen from the fact that there are more Steinway pianos per capita in Louisville than in any other city in the world. For the last ten years the Steinway agents here have maintained their position as third among the Steinway dealers of the world. This applies not to per capita sales, but to straight number of sales.¹

In the realm of art, we find similarities to the

1. Information furnished by Mr. Robert Shackleton, of the Shackleton Piano Company.

films' use of music, in that there is a great deal of incidental art, but very little art for art's sake. This is due to the essential moving nature of the moving picture. Still, there is a large amount of art work in every photoplay made today. Every one has its art director, who makes sketches for all sets. He even sketches the location of shadows, and the lighting effects of the film are arranged so as to produce the shadows desired by the art director. So every scene in a feature picture has some artistic value. Perhaps the effect produced is beauty, perhaps it is realism or horror--but it is art if we agree with Salamon Reinach that the object of art is "not to satisfy an immediate need, but to evoke a sentiment, a lively emotion--admiration, pleasure, curiosity, sometimes even terror."¹

The only motion picture which as yet has attempted to deal with a real art subject is Rembrandt the Man, taken from Van Loon's book, The Life and Times of Rembrandt van Rijn. It gave an excellent idea of Rembrandt as a man and as an artist. It portrayed well his artistic ideals, and gave the spectator understanding of some of his works, especially the so-called Night Watch.

Of course the color film has given a great impetus to art in motion pictures. In the early days of color, reds

1. Reinach, S., Member of the Institute of France, Apollo, an Illustrated Manual of the History of Art Throughout the Ages, translated from the French by Florence Simmonds, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 1 and 2.

and greens predominated. Then, in an effort to correct this error, films showed principally blues and yellows. But the three-color process made greater variety possible. Walt Disney, in Wynken, Blynken and Nod, made color into a plot. Many of his and other cartoon pictures deal with color largely for color's sake. It is interesting to know that one of Disney's original pictures of the witch from Snow White is now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Of course it is impossible to tell now whether this picture will stand the test of time as a great work, but at least it is significant as an innovation in the field of art. In Louisville, the Sign of the Pine Tree Art Store displayed with great pride at its opening a number of Walt Disney originals.

Of course the cartoon pictures are drawn and painted--they are not color photography. The photoplay done in natural color photography still has technical difficulties to overcome. For example, it is exceedingly difficult to make blues and reds register with equal veracity in the same scene, and close-ups of flesh tones are still unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, much is being accomplished in sheer artistry of color photography. Two films noteworthy in this respect are The Garden of Allah and Robin Hood. The former had its true raison d'etre in the color effect of desert scenes, especially at sunset. Weak in plot and sound, it was an artistic triumph. It was the art of strong contrast, and brilliant

colors--gorgeous effects at their best. The color effects in Robin Hood are of an entirely different type. They are far more subdued than those in The Garden of Allah, and are a real study in subtlety. One of Louisville's well-known teachers of art, Mrs. Hildegard Whitney O'Bannon, encouraged all her pupils to see Robin Hood as a study in nuance in color.

In regard to applied arts, there is abundant evidence that moving pictures influence public taste in interior decorating and clothing. This topic will be discussed more fully in Chapter Four.

The general effect of moving pictures upon the fine arts in Louisville seems to be as follows: In literature, people of the lower cultural levels are deriving real benefit from motion pictures. It is true that few of them as yet go to see Shakespearean pictures, but they do see and like pictures made from such books as Kidnapped, Captains Courageous and Gone with the Wind, which are a distinct cultural advance for people of little or no culture. Sometimes, it is true, they get a distorted idea of the original, as in the Shirley Temple version of Wee Willie Winkie, but usually they get at least the author's general idea, some familiarity with characters of whom they would never have heard otherwise. Probably, too, many of these people are among those who buy the cheaper editions of the books from which the pictures are made. People of the middle cultural levels are receiving

considerable literary stimulus from motion pictures, both through attendance at the film, and through reading the originals and other books by the author, and books on allied subjects. People of the upper cultural levels are apparently little affected by motion pictures.

Very much the same conclusions can be reached in regard to the influence of the motion picture upon the musical taste of Louisville. The lower cultural levels are lured to good music by the personality of a Deanna Durbin or a Nelson Eddy--and find they like it. For both lower and middle levels, Mr. Paget's remarks cover the situation concisely. People of the highest cultural levels in music, however, are little affected by motion pictures.

In art, again the same general conclusions seem to be true--except that in this field, through attention to the artistic effect of every scene, moving pictures exert a continuous, though largely subconscious, influence towards artistic appreciation. As Margaret Farrand Thorp expresses it, "Movies are not only creating a hunger for art, they are making art for millions of Americans a necessary and natural part of life."¹

1. Thorp, Margaret Farrand, op. cit., p. 270.

CHAPTER IV

MOTION PICTURES AND EDUCATION IN LOUISVILLE

CHAPTER IV

MOTION PICTURES AND EDUCATION IN LOUISVILLE

It is true that those motion pictures which affect the fine arts are, in a general sense, educational. But in this chapter we shall consider as educational those pictures which convey information rather than those which give esthetic pleasure.

Of these informational pictures there are several classes. The first is the pedagogical film, designed strictly for class-room use; next, such pictures as news-reels and travelogues; and last, photoplays which convey incidentally considerable general information, such as biographical and historical films. There are also certain technical films, such as pictures of intricate machinery used in some industries to teach workers about their machines. These, however, we shall not consider here, as they are vocational rather than cultural.

In examining the influence of the pedagogical film in Louisville, we must turn to the schools. Throughout the country, schools have been slow in utilizing moving pictures, although where they have been thoroughly tested, it has been generally agreed that teaching by motion pictures has produced twenty-five per cent better results than any other kind

of teaching.¹ According to the census of 1930 there were approximately one hundred thousand school houses in the United States, and not more than ten thousand projectors, of which only about one thousand were sound projectors. Furthermore, slightly less than seven hundred were sixteen millimeter projectors.² This is important because sixteen millimeters is the standard size for pedagogical films. This means that throughout the country there is approximately one standard size sound projector for every one hundred and forth-three schools. Of twelve hundred teacher training institutions in 1937, slightly more than one hundred had courses in the use of films.³ Most of these statistics, it will be noticed, were compiled in 1930. More recent statistics are not available. The Will Hays office of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America believes that in the last ten years there has been some increase in the use of pedagogical films, but not a great deal, because of expenses involved.

According to Dr. Mark A. May, Director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, there are four main reasons for the slowness of our schools in adopting the use

-
1. Milestones of Progress-the Story of Moving Pictures, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America--summary of results of Payne Fund research work, p. 10.
 2. Statistics from Will Hays office.
 3. The Motion Picture in Education, prepared and published by the American Council of Education.

of moving pictures. The first, he says, is a general tendency of educators toward conservatism; the next and most important, is lack of funds; the third is the lack of teachers who are adequately trained in the use of films; and last, deficiencies in distributing agencies.¹ In 1930 there were about ten thousand educational films available. They were distributed by five hundred different agencies.

The only note-worthy progress which the last decade has produced in the field of education by moving pictures has been in the production of greater numbers of educational films and better teaching materials. Some of this work has been done by the research workers mentioned in Chapter One. Another achievement is the excellent pedagogical films produced by the Educational Research Productions Industry, generally known as the Erpi Instructional Sound Films. Their topics include social sciences, biographical sciences, physical sciences, music, art, athletics and teacher training. Still other films, shorts, have been made by the commercial producing companies, as the Vitaphone Company's See America First Series, and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer's Miniatures. Furthermore, at the instigation of Will Hays, the member companies of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America have opened their vaults of short

1. May, Dr. Mark A., Director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, "Educational Possibilities of the Motion Pictures," an address delivered before the National Educational Association Convention at Detroit, July 8, 1937. Mimeographed copy from the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

subjects to an advisory committee of educators, who were invited to come and see what there is there of educational value. There are about fifteen hundred of these films, which cover every conceivable subject. The reviewing and editing of them began on May 26, 1937, and is now nearly complete.

Good teaching material is now available for use in connection with both pedagogical and commercial films. Every pedagogical film is accompanied by a study guide. Excellent study guides are available for commercial films of literary or historic significance. The pioneer in this work was Dr. William Lewin. He is now Managing Editor of Educational and Recreational Guides, of which the General Editor is Dr. Max Herzberg, Principal of the Weequahic High School, Newark, New Jersey. They are sponsored by an official Committee on Photoplay Appreciation, appointed by the Division of Secondary Education of the National Education Association. As many as five hundred thousand of them have been sold for a single feature film.¹ There are also other study guides published by various teaching organizations, and there are several good texts on motion picture appreciation for use in high schools.

The use of educational films in Louisville compares favorably with that of the country as a whole, although there are many cities far in advance of Louisville in that respect.

1. Milestones of Progress, p. 11.

There are one hundred and forty-four schools in the city today.¹ The Board of Education owns three sixteen millimeter sound projectors. Four public schools own their own projectors, but only two of these four have sound tracks. Therefore, Louisville has one sixteen millimeter sound projector for approximately every twenty-nine schools--few enough, but above the national average.² Mr. Daugherty, who is in charge of motion picture work in the Board of Education, says that the projectors owned by the Board are almost constantly in use. The greatest handicap which the Louisville schools have now in the use of motion pictures is that they have absolutely no library of films. Each school must provide its own films by whatever means it can. Mr. Daugherty is greatly interested in remedying this situation. He feels hopeful, for, he says, interest in educational pictures here is enormous. He plans to begin in September to build up a film library. The selection of films will be placed in the hands of a committee of qualified teachers. He says that some of our schools, especially those which own projectors, sometimes show commercial films to raise money. The Board of Education is not interested in such enterprises. It will back the use of pedagogical films only. Furthermore, some schools have shown commercial historical or biographical pictures to their pupils. In

-
1. Information from Bureau of Statistics, City Hall, Louisville.
 2. Information from Mr. D. E. Daugherty, Louisville Board of Education.

some cases the results have been unsatisfactory. Pupils would remember that "Norma Shearer" was born in Austria, rather than that Marie Antoinette was. Where such incidents occurred it was because there had been no time for build-ups. But where build-ups were made, the results were excellent.

The University of Louisville, in its 1940 summer session offered a course in visual education. This course included study of available educational films, how to teach the films, care of equipment, and how to operate a projector. Among students enrolled in the course were thirteen school teachers. The course was conducted by Miss Lillian McNulty, who is well known throughout the country in connection with visual education. She has produced several educational films of outstanding merit. She says of educational films, "The test of any picture is what it leads into. If a picture dies with the seeing of it, it means nothing."

Some of our schools, especially the junior high schools, have utilized the educational possibilities of commercial films by teaching motion picture appreciation. This has been done sometimes in regular classes, sometimes through motion picture appreciation clubs. Some of the most successful clubs were those of the Barrett Junior High School, the Eastern Junior High School and Halleck Hall. A typical club is that of the Eastern Junior High School, under the direction of Miss Mary Barrett. The club, with from twenty-five to thirty members, meets weekly. As a group, its

members attend only "top-notch" pictures--about three a term. They leave the school at the beginning of the last period; therefore attendance at the movies is partly on school time. Members attend other pictures in small groups, or as individuals. At the club meetings, the programs consist chiefly of discussion of study guides of current films. They are studied for both enjoyment and criticism. If as many as four or five members have seen a picture, they vote on whether or not it should be put on the club's list of recommended films in the school paper. As these lists are compiled by pupils, not teachers, they influence other children in the school in their choice of pictures. Sometimes the local theaters will give a few passes to pupils or teachers who wish to see a film which they are considering recommending for group attendance. The first instance of this kind in Louisville was when Loew's Theater gave four passes to David Copperfield, in 1935, to representatives of the Barrett Junior High School. The theater management was agreeably surprised to find that the four returned with a group of one hundred pupils. Unfortunately, some of the moving picture appreciation clubs have recently been discontinued. The reason was not failure of the clubs, but that the present policy of most of our public schools is to discontinue all clubs. However, much the same type of work is being done in many of the English or social science classes.

It will be noted that the work just discussed applies only to our public schools. The Catholic schools pay little or no attention to motion pictures, except, in some cases, to make available to pupils their lists of recommended films. None of Louisville's non-denominational private schools utilize pedagogical films. All, however, occasionally show travel films and pictures of college life provided by the colleges themselves. One private school, the Kentucky Home School for Girls, does considerable build-up and follow-up work with commercial pictures.

Most of Louisville's schools of secondary grade or above, encourage their pupils to attend French films brought here by the Louisville branch of the Alliance Francaise. Since the advent of sound pictures, the Alliance Francaise has brought two French pictures to Louisville every year. They are usually presented at the Towers, in two performances each. On these occasions, the theater, which has a seating capacity of twelve hundred and forty-three, is usually about three-fourths filled. The major portion of the audience consists of students. These films are carefully selected by the French government for exhibition in foreign countries, but have little propaganda. They are selected from among the best French productions of the year. However, because of the great inferiority of French to American films in technical effects and directing, only two of these pictures have been worth seeing purely as photoplays. But

they help somewhat in familiarizing the student with French speech. They are of great benefit to advanced students who have acquired a good understanding of the language and wish to retain it. Of course these pictures are not primarily educational in France, but they become mainly that when shown in Louisville.

Another type of motion picture which is definitely pedagogical is the films used by the Louisville Board of Health in its program of public health education. These pictures are used sometimes in the city schools, but more frequently in daily vacation Bible schools and play grounds, where they are shown in a trailer. They deal with such subjects as The Story of Milk and Tuberculosis.

A great deal of information is conveyed to the public through commercial shorts which are not pedagogical. By far the most usual and popular of this type of film is the news-reel. In Louisville as throughout the country, news-reels were popular in the very early days of motion pictures, then lost somewhat in popularity as the feature play developed, but regained and increased their popularity with the introduction of sound. As was mentioned in Chapter Two, the March of Time pictures are very popular in Louisville--rather more so here than in most places. Probably these pictures have more educational value than the ordinary news-reel because they go more thoroughly into their subject. Also, their dramatic presentation gives them

a vividness which makes them remembered longer. It has been argued that news-reels of any sort do little to increase public information because the audience already knows from news-papers and radios all about what the news-reels contain. It is certainly true that the majority of the public already knows about most of the contents of the news-reel. But there is always some information in a news film which is still news to many, and a great deal which is news to a few. To illustrate: Loew's theater recently had a news-reel in which the Republican convention was shown. Naturally, there were elephants everywhere. Two girls in the audience were commenting on the picture. The girls were about fifteen years old. Finally when some living elephants were shown, one girl said to the other, "I believe elephants must have some connection with the Republican party." Then the picture showed some soldiers embarking for Alaska. When the commentator said they were bound for the city of Anchorage, the girls exclaimed, "Have they got a town named Anchorage in Alaska too?", and "Anchorage! Well what do you know about that?" In case these comments seem extreme, it is well to remember that a large part of our motion picture audiences is composed of the masses. But to even that portion of the audience to which the news-reel conveys little new information it certainly adds vividness to the subject, and thereby makes it more impressive. Moreover, through the news-reels, many

Americans who lack opportunities to travel become familiar with the appearance of famous cities and buildings all over the world, such as the Champs Elysees, the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, the British Houses of Parliament, etc. Today, there are few Americans indeed who are not familiar with the appearance of the New York shore-line and the National Capitol, thanks to the news-reel.

In addition to the news-reel, there are innumerable other types of informational shorts shown in Louisville. Some of these are the Popular Science Series and Unusual Occupations, both of which are very educational and fairly popular in Louisville. The Crime Does Not Pay Series contains some information, but is of value chiefly for its possible social effects. However, the value of their social effects is extremely doubtful. The findings of the psychological research work done by Professors Dysinger and Ruckmick indicate that emotional response is to incident rather than to ideas--and that retention of exciting scenes is far greater than of the final outcome of the picture. Therefore the public is much more apt to remember robberies, murders, etc., than the fact that the criminal pays in the end.

There are also many informational shorts not in series. Loew's recently exhibited an example of this type of picture--a film called Spots before Your Eyes. It was a lively comedy in which was demonstrated the scientific

methods of removing ink spots, grease spots and berry stains.

All of these various types of informational shorts convey a great deal of information. Much of it is specific rather than cultural. But it all helps the cultural development of the city in that it broadens general knowledge and interests.

There is also a wealth of general information obtainable from films designed primarily for entertainment, such as the photoplay or even the musical comedy. From attendance at the movies one can learn something of every phase of life, in every age and locality. Obviously the historical and biographical pictures convey much information. Sometimes it is erroneous. The moving pictures' chief aim in this respect is the telescoping of events or otherwise altering the time sequence in order to make a well constructed plot of only ninety minutes' duration. But this tendency is rapidly decreasing, and undoubtedly the movies have an enviable reputation for accuracy in settings and costumes. Strictly modern plays too give considerable general information. They portray life in every conceivable setting--hospitals, English schools, large cities, small towns and in the country. One can get some idea from the movies of practically every social strata and of every occupation. That these are often executed with verisimilitude can be seen from the approval of various professional

groups, such as the medical groups which desire the return of The Life of Pasteur and The Citadel. Furthermore, the audience can gain specific skills from pictures--how to skin a fish, build an igloo, pack a circus--almost anything. An immense store of knowledge concerning geography and local customs can be acquired through the movies. Moreover, the masses can gain from the movies a good deal concerning good manners and proper living--such as how to enter a drawing-room, what to do with a butler, and even something of how to dress.

In these lines, some segments of the audience are much influenced by the actors themselves, and by commercial enterprises allied with the moving pictures. Certainly actresses affect styles. After Romeo and Juliet, Norma Shearer's method of hair-dressing swept the country. Makers of beauty products spend huge sums in advertising that movie actresses use their products. In fact, commercial companies of all kinds connect their products with moving pictures. One hundred and forty-seven different concerns or individuals are licensed to manufacture two thousand one hundred and eighty-three different novelty products based on Snow White. In 1930,¹ Mr. Bernard Waldman of the Modern Merchants Bureau, began to use tags in garments labelled "Cinema Fashions." The principal agency for them

1. Correspondence with Mr. Milliken, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

is Louisville is Kaufman-Straus.

The taste of the Louisville public in interior decorating is plainly influenced by moving pictures. According to Mr. Frank Morris, of the furniture department of Kaufman Straus, black and white films have little effect upon public taste, but the influence of color films is considerable. He says customers frequently ask for furniture and draperies like those in some current film. This was particularly true of Gone with the Wind.

There are several agencies in Louisville as elsewhere which are active in helping the public to get the most from its motion picture attendance. The pioneer here, as in most of the United States, was the Catholic Church, in its moving picture clean-up campaign. Today, the most outstanding of these agencies in the city is the Better Films Council of Louisville and Jefferson County. In 1933 the Federation of Women's Clubs invited representatives of known organizations to a meeting which resulted, in 1934, in the formation of the Better Films Council of Louisville and Jefferson County. The original officers were: Mrs. Emmet Horine, president; Mrs. Lawrence Speckman, first vice-president; Mrs. John L. Woodbury, second vice-president; Mrs. Ben Kohn, corresponding secretary; Miss Margaret Flynn, recording secretary; Mrs. Raymond Clark, treasurer. Headquarters were at 532 W. Main Street, and monthly meetings

were held at the Brown Hotel.¹ The time of the formation of the Louisville Better Films Council was the era of the lowest ebb of morality in motion pictures, as discussed in Chapter One.

The object of the Better Films Council, according to Mrs. Horine, is solely to guide the public, especially parents and guardians, in their choice of films. She made it clear that the council is not a censorship organization, and is not concerned with morals as such. It hopes "through a process of enlightenment and education, to develop a desire for better movies."² She put the blame for the poor moral tone of motion pictures of that time on the public rather than on producers or exhibitors when she said, "Much has been said, and in rather loud terms, of the demand for better pictures in Louisville. Current reports indicate that some of the best clean pictures have met with poor success in Louisville, while those depicting crime, delinquency and other objectionable features have crowded our theaters."³ The council began immediately to publish lists of recommended films in the Louisville papers and is still doing so. These films are classified as for mature audiences, family, or young people. The council also established a library of books on films, and a speakers' bureau. Furthermore, it encourages the public to make inquiry by telephone

1. Courier-Journal, Aug. 26, 1934.

2. Ibid., Nov. 14, 1935.

3. Ibid., Sept. 28, 1934.

concerning films. It also encourages the use of a little weekly paper, The Motion Picture and the Family, which contains comments on current films written by educators and community leaders.

The Better Films Council of Louisville and Jefferson County soon became well known among the Better Films Councils of the country. At a two-day conference at the Brown Hotel, January 30 and 31, 1935, it had as a speaker, Dr. Edgar Dale, Director of Educational Research at Ohio State University. He said that the appreciation of moving pictures was being taught admirably in Louisville. He asked that the results of a film study project conducted by Miss Mary Hodge in the Barrett Junior High School be sent to him for publication in educational journals.¹

By 1938, twenty-six organizations, civic, social, educational and religious, had become associated with the council.² In 1939, the council, under the presidency of Mrs. Harry E. Sibley, undertook to contact the junior high school appreciation clubs. The present officers of the Better Films Council of Louisville and Jefferson County are: Mrs. Marie Dickson, president; Mrs. W. H. Kinnard, first vice-president; Mrs. Roy Gabbert, second vice-president; Mrs. Howard Smith, corresponding secretary; Miss Margaret Flynn, recording secretary; and Mrs. Harry Sibley, treasurer.

1. Ibid., Feb. 1, 1935.

2. Ibid., May 15, 1938.

Another source of information concerning motion pictures in Louisville are our newspaper critics. Of course, our papers, as those all over the country, publish some articles which are intended solely to arouse interest in movies, as the articles by Sheilah Graham in the Times and those by Louella Parsons in the Courier-Journal. But the comments of our own critics are plainly honest opinions of the films they are reviewing. Moreover, the reviews of two of our critics, Boyd Martin of the Courier-Journal and A. A. Dougherty of the Times, are of exceptionally high calibre. Both of these critics voted in the national annual poll to select the ten best pictures of the year.¹ Mr. Martin's name is known to movie-goers throughout the country as a critic of unusual discernment.²

It is questionable to what extent the Louisville public is influenced by the appreciation agencies. Undoubtedly the junior high school movie appreciation clubs influence pupils in the school in their choice of films. Many parents read the Better Films Council's classifications, but just how many cannot be determined. The attitude of children toward these classifications is doubtful. When the pupils of one of our private schools

-
1. Film Daily Year Book, 1937-1938, Published by Jack Alicoate.
 2. Correspondence with Mr. Milliken, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

were asked if they ever read the lists, most of them replied that they did, but said that they avoided the pictures listed for young people, as they were usually boring. However, our moving picture theater managers, especially in the neighborhood houses, feel that these lists have some effect on child attendance, probably due to parental authority. But our managers do not feel that newspaper criticisms materially affect their box-office receipts. They say that criticism is essentially for the intellectuals, who read and enjoy them, but that the masses from whom the major part of our audiences comes, rarely read reviews. An illustration is Our Town, which had very favorable reviews, but poor audiences. This is a nation-wide condition.

In summarizing the relation of motion pictures and education in Louisville, we can say that Louisville, as most cities, has a large, fertile, but chiefly unplowed, field before it in the use of pedagogical films. But, little as Louisville is doing in this line, it is still somewhat in advance of the average of the country. From commercial films which convey general information, it is again our lowest cultural levels which are deriving very considerable benefit. The middle cultural levels probably learn something, but the upper cultural levels are practically unaffected. The reverse is true in regard to newspaper criticisms.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The first general conclusion to be drawn from this study is that motion pictures are having a considerable influence upon the American public, culturally as well as in other ways. This is true for three main reasons: first, because a very large number of people attend moving pictures; second, because moving pictures deal with a great variety of subjects; and third, because, as shown by reliable psychological tests, motion pictures influence the thought and sometimes the behavior of those who see them. Evidently motion pictures are having as great an effect upon the people of Louisville as upon the people of the United States as a whole, because, first, there is no reason to think that our people are an exception to the usual psychological effects of motion pictures, second, because our exhibitors furnish the city with a great variety of subjects, and third, because the average motion picture attendance for Louisville is at least as large as that for the country as a whole.

In appraising the cultural tastes of the people of this city as reflected in the type of motion pictures which they attend, we must consider that the bulk of our audiences consists of the masses. Undoubtedly some of our most intellectual and cultured citizens attend the movies, but

they are numerically a minor part of the audience. Therefore our moving picture audiences represent the city as a whole, not merely its upper strata. And in consideration of that fact, we find the cultural tastes of our city gratifyingly high. It is true that at present the loudest demand of our public is for comedy. But it wants chiefly comedy of words, or of real, human characters--not the slap-stick variety. The next most popular type of photoplay here is the action picture. In this connection, let us note with pride that horror and cruelty draw lesser audiences in Louisville than throughout the country as a whole. Most pictures made from good books have good audiences in Louisville, which seems to indicate that the public is interested in good literature. The popularity of the musical film gives evidence of a city-wide appreciation of good music. Of course the music in the musical comedy type film has no cultural value, but the music in the pictures of Deanna Durbin and others of similar kind has some value, and these pictures are very well attended in Louisville. Louisville audiences show considerable interest in many strictly informational pictures. It will be remembered that Mr. Musselman of the Rialto lists the March of Time as among his most popular films. Popular Science and Unusual Occupations also go well here, which seems to indicate some intellectual curiosity on the part of our public.

On the other hand, our motion picture attendance reveals some cultural deficiencies. One is our public's present aversion to thought-provoking pictures. However, this is perhaps a pardonable fault, in view of present world conditions. But other defects which cannot be so easily excused are the desire on the part of a considerable portion of our audiences for romance-at-any-price and happy endings. We may also regret the present lack of enthusiasm for historical or biographical photoplays. Furthermore, the highest types of pictures, such as Romeo and Juliet, Mid-Summer Night's Dream and pictures featuring Heifetz and Stokowski, have small audiences here. But let us remember that the few of our masses who saw these pictures liked them. Therefore the conclusion seems to be that the taste of our masses is more "high-brow" than they are willing to admit, and that, while it is not of the highest possible level, it is gratifyingly high.

What conclusions can we reach in regard to the effect motion pictures are having upon the culture of Louisville? In regard to literature, we can say that they do not have the highest possible effect because they cannot, or do not, probe general truths or controversial issues. But they do stimulate good reading, and directly give many people some familiarity with the general contents of works of literature of which, otherwise, they would remain ignorant. Sometimes these ideas are distorted, but the

general trend of moving pictures is toward closer and closer adherence to the author's idea. In the realms of music and art moving pictures are having a slow but steady upward influence on our populace. In regard to all the fine arts, it seems that the moving pictures tend to raise the lowest cultural levels considerably, the middle levels slightly, and the highest levels not at all.

In the educational field, there seems to be much yet to be accomplished in the effective use of pedagogical films--but no more here than in the United States at large. Commercial informational films seem to be greatly raising our lowest cultural levels, slightly raising the middle levels and leaving the highest levels essentially unaffected.

In comparing the city's culture as affected by, and reflected in, motion pictures we see that the process of improvement is circular. Our exhibitors give us better pictures when our audiences demand them, and gradually, by seeing better pictures, our audiences learn to want them. The whole history of moving pictures in Louisville indicates continuous improvement in both the quality of pictures and the taste of the audience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alicoate, Jack, editor, The Film Daily Year Book of Moving Pictures, Nineteenth Annual Edition, 1937.
- Alicoate, Jack, editor, The Film Daily Year Book of Moving Pictures, Twentieth Annual Edition, 1938.
- Barnes, Walter, Ph.D., Professor of the Teaching of English, New York University, The Photoplay as Literary Art, Newark, New Jersey, Educational and Recreational Guides, Inc., 1936.
- Beard, Charles A., and Mary R., America in Mid-Passage, Vol. II, Chapter XII, pp. 577-652, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1939.
- Charters, W. W., Director, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, Motion Pictures and Youth, A Summary, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1933.
- Drinkwater, John, Life and Adventures of Carl Laemmle, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, The Knickerbocker Press, 1931.
- Dysinger, Wendell S., Department of Psychology, State University of Iowa, and Ruckmick, Christian, Professor of Psychology, State University of Iowa, The Emotional Responses of Children to the Moving Picture Situation, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1933.
- Griffith, Mrs. D. W., When the Movies Were Young, New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1925.
- Hampton, Benjamin B., A History of the Movies, New York, Covici-Friese Publishers, 1931.
- Hays, Will, See and Hear, A Brief History of the Moving Picture and the Development of Sound, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, November, 1929.
- Holaday, Perry W., Indianapolis Public Schools, Getting Ideas from the Movies, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1933.
- Lewin, William, Photoplay Appreciation in American High Schools, National Council of Teachers of English, 1934.

Perlman, William J., compiler and editor, The Movies on Trial, the Views and Opinions of Outstanding Personalities Anent Screen Entertainment Past and Present, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Ramsaye, Terry, A Million and One Nights-A History of the Moving Pictures, Vols. I, II, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1926.

Rotha, Paul, The Movie Parade.

Thorp, Margaret Farrand, America at the Movies, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1939.

Papers and Pamphlets

Hays, Will, President of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Annual Reports, 1937, 1938, 1939, (mimeographed copy).

Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 10, 1916; Oct. 6, 1921; July 2, 1933; Feb. 9, 1923; Apr. 3, 1927; Apr. 4, 1927; Aug. 26, 1928; Aug. 20, 1933; Feb. 1, 1935; Nov. 14, 1935; 1937-1940.

Louisville Herald-Post, Oct. 2, 1923; Aug. 12, 1928; Sept. 2, 1928; Sept. 21, 1928; Feb. 1, 1930; Feb. 15, 1931; Feb. 21, 1931.

Louisville Times, 1937-1940.

May, Mark A., Director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, Educational Possibilities of the Motion Pictures, an address delivered before the National Educational Association Convention at Detroit, July 8, 1937. Mimeographed copy from the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Milestones of Progress, the Story of Moving Pictures, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Sterner, Alice and Bowden, Paul, A Course of Study in Motion Picture Appreciation, Newark, New Jersey, Educational and Recreational Guides, Inc., 1936.

Study Guides to current pictures, Newark, New Jersey, Educational and Recreational Guides.

The Motion Picture and the Family, published weekly by
Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Variety, published weekly by Variety, Inc., 1937-1940.

(Correspondence during a period of three years with Mr.
Carl E. Milliken, Secretary, Motion Picture Producers
and Distributors of America.

Persons Interviewed

- Mr. Carl E. Milliken, Secretary, Motion Pictures and Dis-
tributors of America, New York.
- Mr. George Hunt, Manager of Loew's theater, Louisville.
- Mr. Johnson Musselman, Manager of the Rialto Theater,
Louisville.
- Mr. Simon Swito, Manager of the Kentucky Theater, Louisville.
- Mr. Buechel, Manager of the Mary Anderson Theater.
- Mr. McCoy, Manager of the Strand Theater, former manager of
the Uptown.
- Mr. Field, Assistant Manager of the Strand.
- Mr. Greenwell, Assistant manager of the Brown Theater.
- Mr. Boswell, Manager of the Uptown; ^{managers of the} Towers, Baxter and Ritz.
- Mr. Dennis Long, Fourth Avenue Amusement Company.
- Mr. Harry Martin, Manager of the Columbia Theater, former
manager of the Brown and Macauley's theaters.
- Mr. Paget, Baldwin Piano Company.
- Mr. Robert Shackleton, Shackleton Piano Company.
- Clerks in phonograph record departments of Wurlitzer's,
Hole in the Wall, and Stewart Dry Goods Company.
- Mr. W. K. Stewart, W. K. Stewart Book Company.
- Mr. and Mrs. Morton Joyes, Wilderness Road Book Shop.

Clerks in book departments of Stewart Dry Goods Company, Kaufman Straus, Readmore News Stand, all down-town Ten Cent and Dollar Stores, and three Walgreen Drug Stores.

Miss Winifred Hutchings, Head of the Open Shelf Room, Louisville Free Public Library, main library.

Miss Evelyn Schneider and Mrs. Mary Sublett, Library of the University of Louisville.

Miss Lillian McNulty.

Mrs. Hildegard Whitney O'Bannon, Teacher of Art.

Miss Helen Boswell, Supervisor of Music, Louisville Public Schools.

Mr. D. E. Daugherty, Louisville Board of Education.

Miss Mary Barrett, Director of Moving Picture Appreciation Club, Eastern Junior High School.

Mrs. Emmet Horine, former President of the Better Films Council of Louisville and Jefferson County.

Miss Margaret Flynn, Recording Secretary of the Better Films Council.

Father Pitt, Supervisor of Education, Catholic Church, Louisville.

Mr. Frank Morris, interior decorator at Kaufman Straus Company.