

## THE CINEMA NEEDS STORIES — NOT SUBSIDIES



### RESISTANCE TO THE AMERICAN INVASION

Jean-Claude Carrière, France's leading screenwriter and president of the Paris film school FEMIS, complains that

American films, or rather American audiovisual products, movies and TV combined, are spreading across the globe and slowly annihilating local production. ... Its promoters consider film a consumer product like any other, of no particular cultural importance. ... It is a rational enterprise aimed at depriving all other countries, across the board, of their cinematic voice. "Movies are us," runs the American message, clear-eyed and uncompromising. "Why don't you make something else?"<sup>1</sup>

He describes the dispute between the US and French delegations at the GATT talks, in which

the constant watchword of American negotiators was "free competition." ... The term is a nineteenth-century formulation that masks boundless economic greed. Or, as someone put it: "A free fox in a free henhouse." ... In the name of "liberalizing the market" (and not always foreseeing the danger) producers and authors have lowered their guard. And the fox has come in through the front door, bringing with him basketfuls of images and sounds, but also a whole gamut of products — clothes, drinks, cereals, vehicles, cigarettes, right down to the most basic items of everyday life — all represented and often glorified by those same images.<sup>2</sup>

He complains that the domination of US films is "Americanising" large parts of the world:

In some cases, film actually blinds us to who we are, to our country and our culture. Quite often in France suspects hauled into police stations ask to see an "attorney." They use the English word, behaving as if they were in a film. Ignorant of French judicial practice, they observe American law and procedure. One reality drives away another. And here too, error wins out.<sup>3</sup>

He argues that

The French production system — probably the world's most sophisticated, since it permits a mix of public and private money — represents the last square of resistance to the American invasion. If it collapses, not only French cinema will disappear, but with it the last vestiges of European cinema ... [a]nd along with them every maker of ambitious, poetic, innovative cinema (cinema still coproduced on the French model) across the world. ... By defending ourselves we defend them too. Far from being "chauvinists," we are defending the right to exist of different concepts of film, wherever they may arise.<sup>4</sup>

The problem for Carrière is the simple fact that audiences worldwide want to see American films, and not European ones. Continental European states have responded with the same method they use for addressing every question: increase state control at the expense of the free choices of individual consumers. They have

increased taxpayer subsidies to domestic producers and distributors, imposed quotas which dictate the minimum proportion of domestic product which cinemas and broadcasters must show, and imposed discriminatory tariffs against American imports through the European Union. The result has been a deluge of dreadful, tedious Continental films which play to practically empty houses and negligible television audiences. It is worth asking how this situation has arisen, and how it could change.

### SOFTENING THE HARD LIFE OF THE PLAIN CITIZEN

Although France became the birthplace of cinema with the showing of the Lumière brothers' films in Paris in 1895, it was the Americans who developed the medium into the most popular and influential form of mass entertainment of the twentieth century. The most important figure in this respect was D. W. Griffith, who began his career as an actor, writer and director in the theatre, where, in direct contact with the audience, he learned how to manipulate its emotions through minute variations in pacing and performance. He took these lessons into the film industry, where from 1908 to 1914 he directed 488 short films for the Biograph company of New York, in which he developed practically all of the editing techniques which became known as "the grammar of the film language". In 1914 he set up his own company, and directed the American Civil War epic *The Birth of a Nation* (US, 1915). This film, based on the Reverend Thomas Dixon's novel *The Clansman*, showed the Ku Klux Klan as heroes saving white Southerners from the evils of Reconstruction, and caused enormous controversy, being banned or restricted in several American jurisdictions, although Griffith himself was not a doctrinaire racist. Nevertheless, the film was a popular sensation, transforming the cinema as an art form, a business and a social phenomenon.<sup>5</sup> In answer to critics who denounced the supposedly harmful effects of the cinema in general and *The Birth of a Nation* in particular, Griffith wrote of the new medium that

It is softening the hard life of the plain citizen with beauty and sweetness; it keeps men away from saloons and drink, because it gives them a place of recreation in pleasant surrounding; it brings to the poor who are unable to travel away from their own dingy surroundings the beauty and poetry of moving foreign scenes, of flowers, waving grasses, the beauty of up-lifted mountain crests, and the wonders of nature.

The motion picture will help as no other art has done in this work, if it is given a chance. We understand that all new things must go through an inquisitorial gate. Why not make the passage of the moving picture less brutal than has been that of all the other arts?<sup>6</sup>

Griffith's films feature sympathetic leading characters, with whom the audience can identify, who find themselves facing a crisis. Through heroic action, these characters defeat almost overwhelming odds in order to overcome the crisis and achieve their goals. The "happy ending", in which the hero or heroine gains or keeps some value, and, in most cases, also finds true love, is central to Griffith's films. In *Way Down East* (US, 1920), which was based on a successful play, Lillian Gish plays a young woman who has an illegitimate baby by a cad who refuses to marry her. As a result, she is expelled from her Puritanical New England village. In the film's saddest moment, the baby dies in a squalid boarding house, but the heroine recovers and eventually finds true love. In the climax, the hero rescues her as she lies unconscious on a slab of ice flowing rapidly down a river towards a waterfall.

### AN IDEALIZED AMERICA ON THE SCREEN

Griffith's conception formed the artistic foundation of the Hollywood studio system which was established around 1920. All of the heads of the Hollywood studios, except Walt Disney, were Jewish immigrants from Russia or eastern Europe who had risen from poverty to wealth in various businesses before entering the film industry. Under their control, Hollywood films manifested the values of immigrants who wanted to assimilate into American life. The American film historian Neal Gabler explains that

The Hollywood Jews embarked on an assimilation so ruthless and complete that they cut their lives to the pattern of American respectability as they interpreted it. ... The Jews also had a spe-



#### Cultural Notes No. 42



ISSN 0267-677X ISBN 1 85637 428 9

An occasional publication of the Libertarian Alliance,  
25 Chapter Chambers, Esterbrooke Street, London SW1P 4NN  
www.libertarian.co.uk email: admin@libertarian.co.uk

© 1998: Libertarian Alliance; David Botsford.

David Botsford is a freelance writer and therapist.

The views expressed in this publication are those of its author, and not necessarily those of the Libertarian Alliance, its Committee, Advisory Council or subscribers.

Director: Dr Chris R. Tame

Editorial Director: Brian Micklethwait Webmaster: Dr Sean Gabb

**FOR LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY**

cial compatibility with the industry, one that gave them certain advantages over their competitors. For one thing, having come primarily from fashion and retail, they understood public taste and were masters at gauging market swings, at merchandising, at pirating away customers and beating the competition. For another, as immigrants themselves, they had a peculiar sensitivity to the dreams and aspirations of other immigrants and working-class families, two overlapping groups that made up a significant proportion of the early moviegoing audience. The Jews were their own best appraisers of entertainment. “They were the audience,” a producer told me. “They were the same people. They were not too far removed from those primitive feelings and attitudes.” ... Within the studios and on the screen, the Jews could simply create a new country — an empire of their own, so to speak — one where they would not only be admitted, but would govern as well. They would fabricate their empire in the image of America as they would fabricate themselves in the image of prosperous Americans. They would create its values and myths, its traditions and archetypes. It would be an America where fathers were strong, families stable, people attractive, resilient, resourceful, and decent. ... What is amazing is the extent to which they succeeded in promulgating this fiction throughout the world. By making a “shadow” America, one which idealized every old glorifying bromide about the country, the Hollywood Jews created a powerful cluster of images and ideas — so powerful that, in a sense, they colonized the American imagination. No one could think about this country without thinking about the movies. ... Ultimately, American values came to be defined largely by the movies the Jews made. Ultimately, by creating their idealized America on the screen, the Jews reinvented the country in the image of their fiction.<sup>7</sup>

### THE SPECTATOR SPENDS NO SUPERFLUOUS ENERGY

The extraordinary popularity of American films was noted by the Russian film-maker Lev Kuleshov, who began studying the cinema in 1914. After the Bolshevik revolution he ran the “Kuleshov workshop” at the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (VGIK), which was set up in 1919 in Moscow. In 1922 Kuleshov argued that montage, or creative editing, was the essence of cinema:

The public is especially receptive to American films. A successful move by the hero, a desperate chase, a daring fight causes whistles of delight, howls and whoops in the cheap seats. ... *The success of American films lies in their maximum degree of cinema specificity, in the maximum amount of movement, in primitive heroism, in an organic link with contemporary life.*

Secondly: the Americans, thanks to the way of life in their country and to their particular commercial methods, try to show how much plot you can get into a very short film and they strive to achieve the maximum number of scenes and the maximum effect with the minimum waste of film. ... [T]he Americans have found a means of resolving complex scenes simply by shooting only the element of movement without which the necessary action would not take place at a particular moment, and the camera is placed in such a position vis-à-vis nature that the very theme of a particular movement is conveyed more rapidly and in a simpler and more intelligible form to the audience and perceived by them. (The ‘close-up’ is an individual cell of film.) ... *This kind of method is technically known as ‘American shots’ and joining together the fragments that constitute the film is called MONTAGE. Genuine cinema is a montage of ‘American shots’ and the essence of cinema, its method of achieving maximum effect, is montage.*<sup>8</sup>

Vsevolod Pudovkin, a student of Kuleshov, describes an example from *Intolerance* (US, 1916), directed by Griffith:

Here there is a scene in which a woman hears the death sentence passed on her husband, who is innocent of the crime. The director shows the face of the woman: an anxious, trembling smile through tears. Suddenly the spectator sees for an instant her hands, only her hands, the fingers convulsively gripping the skin. This is one of the most powerful moments in the

film. Not for a minute did we see the whole figure, but only the face, and the hands. ... Thus the spectator spends no superfluous energy. By elimination of the points of interval the director endows the spectator with the energy preserved, he charges him, and thus the appearance assembled from a series of significant details is stronger in force of expression from the screen than is the appearance in actuality. ... Griffith probably imagined, he may even have actually seen, dozens of despairing women, and perceived not only their heads and hands, but he selected from the whole images only the smile through the tears and the convulsive hands, creating from them an unforgettable filmic picture.<sup>9</sup>

### “A MONTAGE OF ATTRACTIONS”

Montage, used in different ways, formed the basis for early Soviet cinema. In *The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks* (USSR, 1924), directed by Kuleshov, an American senator visiting Russia undergoes various misadventures. Kuleshov used American comedy and editing techniques to satirise Western attitudes to the Soviet Union. *Zvenigora* (USSR, 1928) and *Arsenal* (USSR, 1929), both directed by Alexander Dovzhenko, used the experience of dreams and poetry to give an “impressionistic” account of events in the Ukraine: in the former film, various historical events which occurred in a certain locality are assembled in a way which transcends time, space and causality; in the latter, horses talk and a bare-chested Bolshevik is impervious to the bullets of a counter-revolutionary firing-squad. Pudovkin’s films created a powerful effect by breaking down the action to the smallest components and re-assembling them to convey maximum impact. In *Mother* (USSR, 1926), based on the novel by Maxim Gorky, an apolitical middle-aged woman joins the workers’ struggle in tsarist Russia after her son, a Bolshevik, is killed by tsarist troops. In *Storm Over Asia* (USSR, 1929), a Mongolian fur-trapper kills a Western merchant who tries to swindle him and joins Bolshevik partisans who are fighting British troops during the Russian civil war. Sergei Eisenstein developed the concept of cinema as a “montage of attractions”:

It is this path that liberates film from the plot-based script and for the first time takes account of film material, both thematically and formally, in the construction. ... An attraction ... is in our understanding any demonstrable fact (an action, an object, a phenomenon, a conscious combination, and so on) that is known and proven to exercise a definite effect on the attention and emotions of the audience and that, combined with others, possesses the characteristic of concentrating the audience’s emotions in any direction dictated by the production’s purpose. From this point of view a film cannot be a simple presentation or demonstration of events: rather it must be a tendentious selection of, and comparison between, events, free from narrowly plot-related plans and moulding the audience in accordance with its purpose.<sup>10</sup>

Plot having been thus eliminated, the proletarian mass itself became the hero of Eisenstein’s films *Strike* (USSR, 1924), *The Battleship Potemkin* (USSR, 1925) and *October* (USSR, 1928).<sup>11</sup> These films formed part of a tendency in which Soviet artists in all fields sought to create a new “proletarian and revolutionary” art which would replace “bourgeois” art. The Soviet art historian Yuri Davydov claimed that

*Potemkin* was important in that it set the artistic seal on the participation of the revolutionary masses, and consolidated this participation as a truly artistic phenomenon. ... The furthest the art of the past had been able to proceed in this direction, and in the works of its finest craftsmen at that, had been in the depiction of the masses in revolt. ... [T]he most that bourgeois art appeared capable of in this respect was the depiction of the restless crowd as an evil-doer, using it as a foil to represent its opposite, the heroic *individual*, in a positive light. ... For the first time during the entire history of world culture Soviet art set itself the basic task of portraying revolution as “the festival of the downtrodden and exploited masses” as Lenin put it. It portrayed the masses as capable of solving not merely negative tasks like the destruction of the old society but positive ones as well such as the creation of a new order. ... Soviet art repre-

sented the revolutionary deeds of the masses as an act in the name of liberty, depicting the masses through their needs, aspirations and ideals. ... Simultaneously with *Potemkin* Soviet revolutionary art became crystallised and raised to the level of the classical.<sup>12</sup>

### PLOT — NOT MONTAGE

Nevertheless, the mass-cinema failed to attract the masses. According to the Swedish film historians Leif Furhammar and Folke Isaksson:

Paradoxically, Eisenstein's films were never accepted by the people, in spite of their picture of mass heroism. He was the 'engineer' among revolutionary directors, and his work reveals a greater interest in the expressive possibilities of film rather than in the specific problems of making the characters comprehensible, of explaining reactions or clarifying political situations. He was therefore less popular both with the public and the party than Pudovkin whose psychological intuition allowed him to infuse his films to a far greater degree with a welcoming element of human interest. The calculation which can sometimes give a mechanical feeling to the more extreme montage films was softened in Pudovkin's work by a sympathy with individuals and their reactions. ... When Eisenstein complicated his theories even further by presenting 'intellectual montage', it would probably not be unfair to say that he failed completely, at least in his intention of reaching a broader public with his message.<sup>13</sup>

The films of Yakov Protazanov, who had not been a part of the Kuleshov school, were more popular than those of avant-garde directors such as Eisenstein and Dovzhenko. Under the tsars, Protazanov had directed such films as *The Last Days of Tolstoy* (Russia, 1912) and *The Queen of Spades* (Russia, 1916), based on a story by Pushkin. He developed screen acting out of theatrical prototypes and assisted in establishing a distinctive genre of Soviet comedy. His best-known post-revolutionary film was the science-fiction comedy *Aelita* (USSR, 1924), in which an inventor travels to Mars and assists in a workers' revolution on that planet. Under Stalinism he directed several adaptations of Russian literary classics.

In 1920 Lenin himself criticised the art forms which flourished in the years immediately following the revolution:

... you must understand that we are Communists. We should not stand by with our arms folded and let chaos develop in all directions. We should guide this process and mould its results fully and systematically. ... Why should we turn away from the truly beautiful, rejecting it as the starting point for further development merely because it is "old"? ... I however have the audacity to declare myself to be a "barbarian". I cannot bring myself to regard the works of Expressionism, Futurism, Cubism and the other "isms" as the highest manifestation of artistic genius. I do not understand them. I do not derive any pleasure from them.<sup>14</sup>

From 1928, the party encouraged socialist realism as the officially approved style within the arts, and a new generation of Stalinist film-makers began to challenge the cinematic avant-garde such as Eisenstein and Dovzhenko. Furhammar and Isaksson summarise this movement's approach as follows:

They wanted Soviet films to be dominated not by the masses and montage, but by the individual and the actor. ... [T]hey wanted to replace 'no-story' films about anonymous revolutionary masses with films about the individual in the mass: the new society demanded a new cinema, social realism.<sup>15</sup>

In 1930-32 Eisenstein was in Hollywood, aiming to direct a film for one of the studios. The British film-maker Ivor Montagu, who accompanied him, recalls that he and Eisenstein were invited to visit the legendary Sam Goldwyn:

We sat down around the office and I introduced everybody. Then Sam addressed us — he spoke to me, seeming to be under the misapprehension that Eisenstein needed an interpreter.

"Please tell Mr. Eisenstein," he said, "that I have seen his film 'Potemkin' and admire it very much. What we should like

would be for him to do something of the same kind, but rather cheaper, for Ronald Colman."<sup>16</sup>

In 1934 socialist realism was imposed as the only permitted artistic style in the Soviet Union. According to Furhammar and Isaksson

the Soviet cinema was drained of its artistic vitality, because everything different, personal, or formally avant-garde, was identified and stamped out. Stylistic and ideological conformity was enforced through party directives. Films ceased to be the expression of freely creative minds. ... The positive hero — 'the new Soviet man' — was virtue personified; a solid, resourceful leader in a responsible position whether in the factory, the kolkhoz or the party, an omniscient being who solved every problem with courage, wisdom and socialist enthusiasm. ... The greatest of all positive heroes was Stalin.<sup>17</sup>

In the years 1945-53 the "cult of personality" reached its zenith in such films as *The Fall of Berlin* (USSR, 1949), directed by Mikhail Chiaureli, which was denounced by Khrushchev in his "secret speech" of 1956 for its idolisation of Stalin. This film, shot on Sovcolor colour stock, is a second world war epic featuring such figures as Hitler, Churchill and Roosevelt, in which Stalin (played by Mikhail Gelovani) is shown as a godlike genius single-handedly directing the Soviet military victory and solving the problems of ordinary people whom he encounters.

The plot, in short, proved just as central to Soviet as to American cinema. Montage was recognised as a technique by which the story could be told more dramatically, rather than as the foundation of cinema itself, as the Kuleshov school had believed.

### STORY IS THE HEART OF THE MATTER

The journalist Michael Harrington recently asked what makes a Hollywood film successful. He found that it was neither stars, nor size of budget, nor special effects:

What unites *Titanic* to *Ben Hur* and *Rear Window* is story value and story-telling skill. A story to a film is what a good tune is to an opera or a symphony. It is a sequence of events arranged into a dramatic conflict which grips the imagination.

Hollywood has never been short of money or stars or the power to create illusions, but it has always been short of stories, which is why they make the same pictures over and over. There are more than 90 film versions of *Dracula* and over 60 *Jekyll and Hyde* films, though they are extreme examples. Story is the heart of the matter. It is much harder to make up a good story than it is to show the end of the world.<sup>18</sup>

This observation is hardly novel. In the 4th century BC, Aristotle wrote that

every tragedy has six constituents, which will determine its quality. They are plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, and song. ... Of these elements the most important is the plot, the ordering of the incidents; for tragedy is a representation, not of men, but of action and life, and happiness and unhappiness — and happiness and unhappiness are bound up with action. ... [I]t is their characters, indeed, that make men what they are, but it is by reason of their actions that they are happy or the reverse. ... The plot, then, is the first essential of tragedy, its life-blood, so to speak, and character takes the second place.<sup>19</sup>

The great Swiss psychologist Carl Jung argued that the "collective unconscious" includes "archetypes", or fundamental symbols, common to all humanity, which pre-date the development of the conscious mind:

One can perceive the specific energy of archetypes when we experience the peculiar fascination that accompanies them. ... [A]rchetypes create myths, religions, and philosophies that influence and characterize whole nations and epochs of history. ... The universal hero myth, for example, always refers to a powerful man or god-man who vanquishes evil in the form of dragons, serpents, monsters, demons, and so on, and who liberates his people from destruction and death. The narration or ritual repetition of sacred texts and ceremonies, and the worship of such a figure with dances, music, hymns, prayers, and sacrifices, grip the audience with numinous emotions (as if with

magic spells) and exalt the individual to an identification with the hero.

If we try to see such a situation with the eyes of the believer, we can perhaps understand how the ordinary man can be liberated from his personal impotence and misery and endowed (at least temporarily) with an almost superhuman quality. Often enough such a conviction will sustain him for a long time and give a certain style to his life. It may even set the tone of a whole society. ... The fact is that in former times men did not reflect upon their symbols; they lived them and were unconsciously animated by their meaning.<sup>20</sup>

In the popular enthusiasm directed towards such stars as Rudolf Valentino, Marilyn Monroe, James Dean, Brigitte Bardot, Sean Connery, Clint Eastwood and Bruce Lee, we can recognise the phenomenon which Jung identifies.

### THE SATISFACTION OF THE AUDIENCE

Julian Friedmann, of the Blake Friedmann Literary, Film and TV Agency of London, argues that the principles recognised by Aristotle are the key to the revival of European cinema:

The European film industries may ... have been hampered by the existence of dominant and self-perpetuating cliques of elites. Because film finance in Europe is so difficult to come by, those who have greatest access to the money are those who tend to get their films financed. They are also dependent on the subsidy system which is so prevalent. Take the subsidies away and film-making in some European countries would almost grind to a halt. ... A fragile peace exists between the EU and the USA over GATT and the exporting of American films into Europe. European politicians frequently seem to feel the need to be protectionist, however. This is understandable, but it is ultimately a futile and misguided attempt to prop up the European film industry, which gain[s] no long-term benefit from this. ... [T]here is a fairly constant complaint that the Americans dump cheap programmes into our markets. While they certainly do this, European audiences are not protesting. ... [W]e should perhaps consider why the Americans make films that are so popular all over the world. ... The answer lies, simply and starkly, in the way they tell their stories. ... [I]t is clear from the worldwide sales of tickets to American films that in virtually all countries there are enough people who want positive messages from their visit to the cinema. These audiences have had good experiences watching American films and this makes them susceptible to the appeal of new ones. ... European writers, producers, directors and critics complain constantly about the invasion of American movies and American television. The cinema owners and distributors don't worry about it too much because it's where they make most of their money. ... While we [Europeans] are concerned with fostering creative expression on the part of writers and directors, they [Americans] are concerned with fostering the satisfaction of the audience.<sup>21</sup>

He notes that the average American film has approximately two-thirds of the dialogue of the average European film, and that the average scene in an American film is about half the length of the average European scene. He continues:

American movies also play up emotion and sentiment; we criticize them for them. But think about why they do it: it's because all the evidence suggests that this is what the largest audiences go to the movies for. Why do you think that Hollywood will pay \$4 million for a script and \$1 million for a rewrite? It's because there's so much money to be made out of the movies. Rewriting is far more common and extensive in America than in Europe because investing in development has been shown to produce profits. ... Over 600 films are made in a year in the European Union, as opposed to about 300 in America. Yet the American films take 80% of the EU box office, and the bulk of that goes on relatively few films, usually with high budgets.

The assumption that if only Europeans could make films with equally high budgets they would also have big hits is erroneous. ... A big budget European movie without the script will fail. But small budget European movies, with brilliant scripts,

like *The Crying Game* or *Four Weddings and a Funeral*, were a huge success. ... We should be filled with admiration for the American film industry ... because they are succeeding in a competitive market where we are failing. We can compete with them more effectively if we choose to, but only if we respect the audience that goes to the cinema.

Whatever the story you wish to tell, tell it in such a way that it will be accessible to the widest number of viewers. This means having to tell it visually. ... You have to appeal to those characteristics of audiences which we know to be dominant, namely their wish to have emotional experiences, their wish to feel rather than think when they go to the movies.<sup>22</sup>

### SUBSIDIES ARE NOT CULTURAL LIFE-GUARDS

Friedmann's suggestions for change are drastic but realistic:

in a Europe without subsidies the film industry would disappear in its present form. However, it might also re-emerge leaner but healthier. If you removed the subsidies, it would change the way films are made. We would have to compete more seriously with the Americans. Some people would see this as lowering our cultural standards. ... [M]uch of what is written, funded by subsidy money, is not geared to any particular audience or market. ... By encouraging more editorial and development work on scripts, our cultural integrity would not be jeopardized and our films would compete better. The result might be to greatly strengthen and promote our cultures.

In other words, subsidies in Europe are not the all-important cultural lifeguards many politicians and film-makers think they are. To some extent they have the opposite effect. Less energy spent chasing subsidy money, and more on storytelling might be a way to improve matters. ... This is a bleak outlook for writers because the European industry shows no signs of industrial lift-off, not only because of the success of American 'cinema imperialism', but because the players in our industry, including writers, do not seem able to escape their own cultural elitism. ... If Europe invested half as much as the Americans do in development and in scripts, Europe might create an industry worth investing in.<sup>23</sup>

### NOTES

1. Jean-Claude Carrière, *The Secret Language of Cinema*, translated by Jeremy Leggatt, Faber and Faber, London, 1995, p. 192.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 195.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 196-197.
5. I discussed Griffith and his influence in *Collectivism versus Romanticism in the Early Cinema: Sergei Eisenstein and the "Mass-Hero"*, Cultural Notes No. 25, Libertarian Alliance, London, 1991, and *Romanticism and Its Enemies in Twentieth-Century Cinema*, Cultural Notes No. 30, Libertarian Alliance, London, 1992.
6. Quoted in Richard Schickel, *D. W. Griffith*, Pavilion/Michael Joseph, London, 1984, p. 300.
7. Neal Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own*, W. H. Allen, London, 1988, pp. 4-7.
8. Lev Kuleshov, "Americanism", document 22 in Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (editors), *The Film Factory*, translated by Richard Taylor, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1988, p. 73.
9. Vsevolod Pudovkin, *Film Technique and Film Acting*, edited and translated by Ivor Montagu, Vision Press, London, 1954, 1968 edition, pp. 93-95.
10. Sergei Eisenstein, *Selected Works*, vol. I, Writings, 1922-34, edited and translated by Richard Taylor, British Film Institute, London, 1988, pp. 40-41.
11. I discussed Eisenstein in *Collectivism versus Romanticism in the Early Cinema*, op cit.
12. Yuri Davydov, *The October Revolution and the Arts*, translated by Bryan Bean and Bernard Meares, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, pp. 347-351.
13. Leif Furhammar and Folke Isaksson, *Politics and Film*, translated by Kersti French, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1971, pp. 16-18.
14. Lenin, "Art Belongs to the People", interview with Clara Zetkin, document 11 in Taylor and Christie (editors), op cit, p. 50.
15. Furhammar and Isaksson, op cit, p. 20.
16. Ivor Montagu, *With Eisenstein in Hollywood*, Seven Seas Publishers, East Berlin, 1965, 1974 edition, p. 122.
17. Furhammar and Isaksson, op cit, pp. 20-21.
18. *Spectator*, 3rd October 1998, p. 34.
19. Aristotle, "On the Art of Poetry", first published 4th century BC, in Aristotle, Horace and Longinus, *Classical Literary Criticism*, translated by T. S. Dorsch, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1965, 1986 edition, pp. 39-40.
20. Carl G. Jung, "Entering the Unconscious", in Carl G. Jung (editor), *Man and His Symbols*, 1964, Pan Books, London, 1978, pp. 68-69.
21. Julian Friedmann, *How to Make Money Scriptwriting*, Boxtree, London, 1995, pp. 53-54.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 59.