DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 525 CS 501 032

AUTHOR O'Grady, Gerald
TITLE The Spectrum of Cinema.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Conference for Librarians on Programing the Independent and Feature Films (New York City, March 7, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Factors; *Film Libraries; *Films; Higher Education; *Library Materials; Mass Media; *Research Tools; *United States History; Visual Literacy

ABSTRACT

Cinema emerged about 1900, and as the twentieth century ticked by, the cinematic process was recognized as a model for the thought processes of the human mind--of both the unconscious dream process and of the stream of conscious thought--and also as a model of the historical process. Film not only is an experiential process and a physical substance generating a complex physical system in the midst of a commercial culture, but it also gathers to itself on-going developments in impressionism and cubism, melodrama and mechanics, opera and the pulp novel, and other artifacts of the popular culture. Film is also a means of communicating and a tool to use in understanding man. It is, therefore, the responsibility of librarians to recognize film as a new addition to the media repertoire of mankind and to become leaders in mankind's movement from literacy to mediacy. (RB)

Gerald O'Grady

THE SPECTRUM OF CINEMA

by

GERALD O'GRADY

(Gerald O'Grady is Director of the Instructional Communication Center and of the Center for Media Study at the State University of New York at Buffalo and of Media Study/Buffalo. He delivered this talk to Library System Directors and Film Librarians from New York State at the Donnell Library on March 7, 1975 for a day-long meeting presented by the Film Program of the New York State Council on the Arts.)

I would like to begin with some comments on the experiential process of cinema. Cinema emerged from the womb of time about 1900, and as the years of the twentieth century tick by, the cinematic process has gradually been recognized as a model for the thought processes of the human mind, of both the unconscious dream process and of the stream of conscious thought, and also as a model of both the historical process through which we live and, finally, of the very life of the universe which we inhabit.

Insofar as dream is concerned, you are not unaware, I am sure, that Sigmund Freud's great work of 1900, The Interpretation of Dreams, is co-terminus with the emergence of cinema. And you also know that there are titles on your own bookshelves, such as Hortense Powdermaker's Hollywood: The Dream Factory and Hollis Alpert's The Dreams and the Dreamers. Jean Cocteau had written in his diary: "Long live the young muse cinema, she who is privy to the mystery that is a dream."[1] P. Adams Sitney would later claim that the explorations of the late American avant-garde, the early films of Maya Deren, Kenneth Anger, and Stan Brakhage, were each structured as trance films or psychodramatic cinema.[2] Ingmar Bergman, in his testament about cinema, "Each Film Is My Last," wrote: "With the whole stunted hunger of a child I seized upon my medium and for twenty years, tirelessly and in a kind of frenzy, I supplied the world with dreams."[3] And years earlier, the philosopher Susanne K. Langer, had said: "Cinema is 'like' dream in its mode of presentation: it creates a virtual present, an order of direct apparition. That is the mode of dream."[4] And Calvin Hall, the psychologist,

having defined dream as "a succession of images, predominantly visual in quality, which is experienced during sleep," added: "It resembles a motion picture .... in which the dreamer is both participant and observer."[5] Stan Vanderbeek, the American experimentalist, has been presenting eight-hour long (11:00 p.m. through 7:00 a.m.) image-flows, called "Newsreel of Dreams," in various planetaria around the country.

Just as the cinematic process has been recognized by some as the model of our unconscious mental activity, another group of filmmakers and scholars, again from a variety of disciplines, have come to conceive of cinema as a model for the stream of conscious thought. Let me refer to a few books on the shelves of still other sections of your libraries. Aron Gurwitsch, writing on "The Intentionality of Consciousness" in a book on Husserl's phenomenology, says:

> Hume expressly likens consciousness to a theatre, but it is, so to speak, a theatre without a stage. In modern terminology, one could compare consciousness with a perpetual succession of kinomatographic pictures - a unidimensional sphere of being, whose fundamental structure consists only and exclusively as temporality.[6]

Gérard Granel, in another book on Husserl's phenomenology, says: "Phenomenology is an attempt to film, in slow motion, that which has been, owing to the manner in which it is seen in natural speed, not absolutely unseen, but missed, subject to oversight."[7] Film critic Annette Michelson, in essays on Stanley Kubrick and Michael Snow in Artforum[8] has used the same analogy, and filmmaker Hollis Frampton, in a recent interview about his Clouds of Magellan, which he calls his Finnegan's Wake, talks about the "vast metaphor for consciousness that film is slowly becoming."[9]

The cinematic process has not only become an analogue of unconscious and conscious mental activity, but of the flow of history which we alternately sleep through and wake up to. The philosopher-humanist, José Ortega y Gasset, noted that: "When history is what it should be, it is an elaboration of cinema. . . The true historical reality is not the datum, the fact, the thing, but the evolution formed when these materials melt and fluidify."[10]

Finally, Buckminster Fuller has compared the cinematic process, which I have been investigating, to "universe" as an evolutionary process. He writes:

> A thought is a system, and is inherently conceptual - though often only dimly and confusedly conceptual at the moment of first awareness of the as yet only vaguely described thinking activity. Because total universe is nonsimultaneous, conceptuality is produced by isolation, such as in the instance of one single static picture held out from a moving-picture film's continuity, as scenario. Universe is an evolutionary-process scenario without beginning or end, because the shown part is continually transformed chemically into fresh film and reexposed to the ever self-reorganizing process of latest thought realizations which must continually introduce new significance into the freshly written description of the ever-transforming events before splicing the film in again for its next projection phase.[11]

Besides being imagined as a cinematic process, film can also be considered as a physical substance, a surface (as we say a body of water has a film of oil), a filmy coating which is photo-sensitive and records patterns of light.

Film, so considered, is part of a larger physical system. In addition to the processes of recording (which need not always be done with a camera) there are the processes of processing, processes of editing or physically cutting and splicing, glueing pieces together, processes of printing, and processes of projection. We can observe cameras, projectors and other pieces of equipment and their parts and their parts' functions (shutters, focussing mechanisms, etc.). We can observe the emulsions before and after exposure, the sprocket holes, the frames, etc. We can observe the physical effects of light <u>on</u> film and, likewise, we can note the effects of light <u>passing through</u> the film and illuminating a reflective surface, itself made up of many varied physical materials.[12]

Some of the most exciting developments in the experimental film world in the 1960's and 1970's were done by a group of filmmakers who concentrated their attention, in radically minimal ways, on one or other aspects of the physical system I have described. Malcom LeGrice has outlined them in a long essay on which I shall draw here.[13]

Some filmmakers like Michael Snow, Larry Gottheim, Andrew Noven and others concerned themselves with the limitations and extensive capacities of the camera as a time-base photographic recording apparatus. The limitations included frame limits, lens limits such as focus, field, aperture and zoom, and the shutter. The extensions included time lapse, ultra high speed, and movements such as panning, tracking, etc. Another group, of whom Peter Kubelka is the best known representative, concerned themselves with the editing process and its abstraction into conceptual, concrete relationships of elements.

Ken Jacobs, Pat O'Neill, Stan Lawder, Jon Rubin and others concerned themselves with printing, processing, re-filming and re-copying procedures, exploring the transformations possible in the selective copying and modifications of materials. Stan Brakhage, Peter Gidal, Annabel Nicolson, Paul Sharits and George Landow manipulated the celluloid, its scratches, its sprocket holes, its frame lines, its grains, and even its accumulated dirt. Sharits, Tony Conrad and others concerned themselves with the projective apparatus and the fundamental components of sequential image projection: lamp, lens, gate, shutter, claw and screen. A very minimal feature, the flicker, proved itself adaptable to a great variety of interpretations.

I would urge you, as librarians, to constantly remember and to illustrate by the exhibition of filmic equipment and materials and by providing the printed book and journal resources to explore their unending implications, that film is a physical system, the product of the late nineteenth century Western technology, merging discoveries and inventions in the physics of light and optics, in the mechanics of movement, in the chemistry of emulsions, in electricity and much else.

Furthermore, as Thomas H. Guback has shown in his book, The International Film Industry, the physical system of film more than any other art form, except television of course, is located and grounded in the configuration of

contemporary industrial society. In a recent essay, he writes:

> We can examine films, of course, as stylistic, symbolic, individual statements of artist. But we also need to consider them as outputs of complicated industrial marketing systems because films, in fact, represent the assembling of production resources, such as capital, manpower, skills, and equipment.[14]

Film is not only an experiential process and a physical substance generating a complex physical system in the midst of vast interlocking economic sectors of commercial culture, but it may also, as Guback indicates is in fact the usual route to understanding, be considered as a form. Film, as a symbolic cultural form, grows like an errant weed in the rag and boneshop at the heart of human culture. A recent book, which I am reading now and recommend for immediate purchase by all librarians, John Fell's Film and the Narrative Tradition,[15] points out its bastardly "polyglut" origins in the nineteenth century novel and entertainments of the theater, fairground and parlor, early comic strips and magazine illustrations, the most popular of popular literature, as well as the experiments of impressionism and cubism.[16] It gathers to itself on-going developments in engraving, lithography, photography and painting, and like a magnet, attracts ephemera as diverse as stereographic sets, peep shows, song slides, postal cards, shadow plays and wax museums. It is a matrimony of melodrama and mechanics, a wedding of the magic lantern, the daguerreotype, and devices like the zoetrope and phenakistascope with vaudeville, the Wild West Show, opera and the pulp novel. You would hardly have a book library large enough to keep up with it all.[17]

And then, one of its earliest children, suddenly emerges to elevate, dignify and purify it all. His name was Sergei Eisenstein and he wrote:

> It is only on the basis of the closest contact with the culture of literature, theatre, painting and music, only in the most serious examination of the newest scientific disclosures in reflexes and psychology and related sciences, that the study of cinema specifics can be coordinated in some constructive and workable system of instruction and perception.[17]

Eisenstein's recognition of the culture of literature and theatre unveil film's relationship to form in the classic Aristotelian sense, the imitation of life. Film, considered as a symbolic cultural form, as we approach it in this part of the paper, opens itself to the discussion of narrative methods, character development, thematic structure, the evolution of acting styles and many other such concerns. The translation or transposition of dramas and novels and short stories into film form is a particularly rich investigation and is an obviously important one for librarians to foster.[18]

The symbolic forms of contemporary films are very rich mines. I have been studying a film by Ingmar Bergman, released here under the title of The Passion of Anna, but in Sweden as The Passion. It concerns itself with passion in at least three senses - passion as a psychological state in a love affair, the passion of Christ, and passion as opposed to action, i.e., patience. Its form incorporates the elements of traditional staged action following a written script, and includes extempore interviews of the actors and actresses, appearing as their actual selves to discuss the roles of the characters they are portraying, as well as factual newsreel material from Vietnam, interpolated dream sequences, and clips from Bergman's earlier films. A close viewing and interpretion of it involves a thorough knowledge of the Christian gospel story, of the myth of the hanged god as elucidated by James Frazer in The Golden Bough and alluded to by T. S. Eliot in The Wasteland, and of a whole shelf of other readings.

Godard's Alphaville is another case in point. Michael Benedikt writes this about it:

> What I have to say here is that, in considering the background of a major creator like Godard, it seems improper to restrict consideration to the medium in which such a creator happens to be operating. Just as it is no longer possible to take a literary criticism seriously which cuts itself off from the film and other media, it is no longer possible to view a creator like Godard as operating solely, or even primarily, out of a background of the visual arts - even the cinematic - developments of the past few years. It seems to me that

> Alphaville is an excellent place from which to launch a new series of fresh confrontations.[19]

He goes on to show that one cannot fully understand Alphaville without a knowledge of Paul Eluard's poems and the philosophy of the surrealists. Other interpreters have pointed out Alphaville's allusions to (and thus dependence for meaning on) the drama of Oedipus Rex, the fable of Orpheus, the biblical story of Lot, and modern detective fiction as well as Nosferatu, the early Saturday-afternoon serials and other films.[20] It is a good thing that we have libraries!

Film is also a tool of exploration, a means of information and a historical record or document.

Its use as a tool of exploration has created a new subgroup in our own culture. A Commission headed by James Coleman recently completed a report on youth to the President of the United States and indicated that a new distinct subgroup had come to existence in American society, noting: "There is one major change in society in recent years that is more responsible than any other for the increased deviation [from earlier adult norms]. This is the change in communication."[21] Hitherto, young persons' communication with one another had been largely restricted to face-to-face contacts and the occasional letters of "pen pals," but in the past decade, super-8 and 16mm film (and half-inch videotape of course) have suddenly blossomed into use to research, explore, investigate and analyze the self and society. In the past few years, a variety of serious filmmakers/teachers have begun to engage students in programs which encouraged them to be total makers - conceivers, camerapersons, editors - of their own films; to explore themselves not only through personal forms like autobiography and advocacy reportage, but in cerebral forms which might self-reflexively lead them to investigate the very process and materials and techniques of making itself; and to pursue modes evolved from sophisticated psychological and anthropological

and even cybernetic and bio-energetic theories of life-styles. I urge you to consider Seth Feldman's advice, in the most recent issue of your journal, to stock your shelves with handbooks on filmmaking, to serve as a bulletin board of your community's resources for equipment access, developing labs, and film barterings and rentals, and to offer a forum for the screening and discussion of works made in your own districts and regions.[22]

The consideration of film as a means of information can be best brought to your attention by quoting Professor Robert Wagner's description of a visit to one of your own functions. It was published in a Voice of America Forum Series and thus can be distributed only outside this country and is not available for your own libraries. He reported:

> Recently I attended the 13th Annual Film Festival in New York City where a great number of new films from all over the world were screened and awards were then presented by the Educational Film Library Association. . . . Here I saw a film on Family Life in Malaysia, with no narration, that is a truly international experience; a detailed documentary on The Great Barrier Reef made by a major television network; a poignant, powerful film about the relationship of man to other animal life, titled Say Goodbye; a scientifically detailed and beautifully photographed film titled Snails; and another on The Life Cycle of the Parasitic Flatworm. And there were films on nearly every art from ballet to the lost skill of building a birch-bark canoe.[23]

The possibilities for the distribution of information through film are nearly endless, and since these are usually not the kinds of films shown in theatres, museums, art centers, etc., you might consider making these part of your special province. I would especially draw your attention to the selections made for the International Film Celebration at the American Library Association Conference in July, 1974.

Since its origin, film has been used for the purpose of historical documentation and record, and I know that last night (March 6), some of

you viewed the first public television airing of the 8 millimeter footage of the Kennedy assassination, shot, quite accidentally, by Abraham Zapruder on November 22, 1963. Many of you here probably know that it had already been incorporated into a remarkable film which the Donnell Library has purchased, Bruce Connor's Report. The Zapruder film is a dramatic example of film as document and of the kinds of information which film documents, as we have seen in its treatment in the Warren Commission Report. Take just these two examples:

> The President's location, established through the Nix and Muchmore films, was confirmed by comparing his position on the Zapruder film. This location had hitherto only been approximated, since there were no landmarks in the background of the Zapruder frame for alinement purposes other than a portion of a painted line on the curb. Through these procedures, it was determined that President Kennedy was shot in the head when he was 230.8 feet from a point on the west curbline on Houston Street where it intersected with Elm Street. The President was 265.3 feet from the rifle in the sixth-floor window and at that position the approximate angle of declination was 15° 21'.[24]

In another part of the Report, the film was used to compute the speed of the President's limousine.

> William Greer, operator of the Presidential limousine, estimated the car's speed at the time of the first shot as 12 to 15 miles per hour. Other witnesses in the motorcade estimated the speed of the President's limousine from 7 to 22 miles per hour. A more precise determination has been made from motion pictures taken on the scene by an amateur photographer, Abraham Zapruder, Based on these films, the speed of the President's automobile is computed at an average speed of 11.2 miles per hour. The car maintained this average speed over a distance of approximately 136 feet immediately preceding the shot which struck the President in the head. While the car travelled this distance, the Zapruder camera ran 152 frames. Since the camera operates at a speed of 18.3 frames per second, it was calculated that the car required 8.3 seconds to cover the 136 feet. This represents a speed of 11.2 miles per hour.[25]

I myself am more interested in the subjective history involved in Mr. Zapruder's own testimony about the film, given in Dallas on July 22, 1964. He tells Mr. Liebeler, the Commission's assistant counsel: ".... what I saw you have on film ....," but a historian would have to ask the question: is this ever phenomenologically true, i.e., possible. I doubt it. Later, Mr. Zapruder, shown the 255th frame of his movie, responds: "... I know this - I have seen it so many times. In fact I used to have nightmares. The thing would come every night - I wake up and see this." The picture record had objectified a moment of history and brought it back into the cameraman's unconscious. And think of another bit of history, the effect that seeing the pictures again on that day had on Mr. Zapruder. He broke down in tears during his testimony, and says at its conclusion:

> Well, I am ashamed of myself. I didn't know I was going to break down and for a man to - but it was a tragic thing, and when you started asking me that, and I saw the thing all over again, and it was an awful thing - I know very few people who had seen it like that - it was an awful thing and I loved the President, and to see that happen before my eyes - his head just opened up and shot down like a dog - it leaves a very, very deep sentimental impression with you; it's terrible.[26]

The first eighty-five pages of Volume 18 of the Report is Commission Exhibit Number 885, an "Album of black and white photographs of frames from the Zapruder, Nix and Muchmore films."[27] One does not really see the President's head "opened up."

Another kind of documentation about John Kennedy, the recording of an attitude toward him, is to be seen in Years of Lightning, Day of Drums, produced by the United States Information Agency. Still another kind of documentation is available in the films which he himself shot. I have heard the story told that, when he died, he had left a half-finished roll

of film in his camera and that it was completed by an independent American filmmaker and that it will sometime see the light of darkness.

Over five years ago, in August, 1969, John Phillips wrote a fascinating review, "Bobby," about three books which must be on your shelves, David Halberstram's The Unfinished Odyssey of Robert Kennedy, Jack Newfield's Robert Kennedy: A Memoir, and Jules Witcover's 85 Days: The Last Campaign of Robert Kennedy. He compares his sense of Bobby realized from the books with those he learned from home movies shot by friends or his brothers when he was 12. He writes:

> Intermittently throughout the campaign I would remember some old movies I'd watched six years before in the house of a man who went to Harvard with Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Jones, my host, was a proficient amateur, even in those days when Kodachrome home movies were a novelty; he used to visit the Kennedys on college holidays and bring his camera along.[28]

He talks of a sequence where the "twelve or so years old RFK is seen advancing in an intense frolicking manner toward the head [of a diving board], snapping a wet bathtowel," and says: "I read these books in May. What impressed me was their ephemeral nature.... Bobby on his father's diving board snapping the bathtowel taught me more than anything else." And in the final paragraph of his long essay, he wrote:

> Since he was doing and saying things described in these books, I read them over again, and still they didn't explain the apparation I had seen .... God love him, you are sure of him there on the screen.

It must be pointed out, by the way, that historians use films not only for historical evidence of documentation, but as visual aids and as indicators of social and intellectual history, as Stuart Samuels and Robert Rosen made clear in a paper written a few years ago,[29] and Morton Jackson edits a journal, Film & History, established by the

Historians Film Committee in 1971.[30] In America, a book like William Stott's Documentary Expression and Thirties America begins to sort out the uses of the documentary, propaganda and film art for the historian, and, in England, A.J.P. Taylor has given a course in which the World War II battle footage of various European countries was seen.

go to page 13

Film is also a medium and one which, more than any other, is multivalent and polysemous. That is, much is going on at once. It offers a complex semiology. Meaning or significance is being simultaneously indicated or expressed by intensity of light, the rate of motion, the composition of spaces, the sizes of objects, their shadings of color, their angle to the camera, the natural, musical, speech, and special-effects sound patterns, and much else. In his recent report on "The Arts in Higher Education" for the Carnegie Commission, James S. Ackerman wrote: "Film could be the focal field in future arts education and in American artistic culture or the crossroads at which the visual and theatre arts, dancing, music and writing come together."[31]

In this consideration of film as a medium, I think that it is especially the duty of librarians to recognize it as a new addition to the media repertoire of mankind in the evolutionary journey of the development of human consciousness, and to become leaders in mankind's movement from literacy to "mediacy." I would like to present three reasons for espousing this position.

If we acknowledge media to be all of the codes of human expression and communication (including their materials, equipment and technological systems), then their study is absolutely necessary (a sine qua non) of human culture and this study would properly involve all of the ways in which these codes interact with and influence each other in "instructing" human consciousness on its evolutionary journey. There is an analogy here to the ways in which the chemical codes of genes and chromosomes "spell out" the instructions that condition development and function in all living beings.

We must reimagine what the code of language or speech meant to human development. In his Anthropological Linguistics, Joseph Greenberg wrote: "The radically new type of adjustment that speech made possible clearly qualifies it as an evolutionary emergent of fundamental significance in that it initiated a dis-

tinctly new stage of development, comparable to the genesis of life itself and to the first appearance of intelligence." [32] When, centuries later, this oral code was itself symbolically encoded in print, there took place the profound revolution described at length in Marshall McLuhan's The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man. Within our own century, the codes of the moving images of film and television must be recognized as cultural emergents of equal importance, components of the evolutionary phenomena of the twentieth century which has led to the vastly increased power of individuals to affect their environments and one another.

Unless one has mastery or competency in using and understanding the codes of communication of his own era, one cannot adequately participate in decisions involving his life. One is simply not free. A prime example is a child; the word "infant" literally means "unable to speak." After the establishment of the first political democracies in the late eighteenth century, there was common agreement that literacy, the ability to read and write, was an absolute need for human freedom. The human need and educational and cultural prerequisite of freedom in the twentieth century is mediacy: the ability to use, understand, and have access to the codes and modes of expression, communication and information transfer in contemporary society. All citizens have access to their culture and their societies, not just by language and print, but by a variety of other codes, especially those of the moving image, which are already pervasive.

We know that a contemporary American student will spend on the average of 10,000 hours in school by the time he is 18, yet he will have seen over 15,000 hourse of television, 5,000 of them before he goes to school at all. He will have read 50 to 100 novels, but he will have screened over 500 feature films. His life in the 21st century, when he is middle-aged, will undoubtedly depend on his being able to cope with, understand, use and not be manipulated by the media. An immediate task is to bridge the gap that has developed between the

culture of the media and the culture of the institutions like schools and libraries. In "Education for Real,"[33] John McHale argues that our traditional, so-called cultural education i.e., literacy, is now, at best, inadequate and, at worst, a form of creative disenfranchisement for our students from our emergent planetary culture which already possesses the means of transmitting any event in visual and aural codes to every being on multiple planets in real time, i.e., simultaneously.

Not only do the media codes give gene-like structuring to the human negotiation with the environment throughout history and not only do the understanding of and access to them provide a basic freedom for social interchange and contribution to a participative society, but as Jerome Bruner and David Olson have demonstrated in a recent essay, "Learning through Experience and Learning through Media,"[34] the human brain and related sensory organization is so structured that each of us perceives and structures the world according to the media by which he or she apprehends it. It is now clear that the naive psychological concept that a human learns the same "information" about a thing irrespective of hearing it orally, reading about it, or seeing a film about it is wrong and misleading, and that one is "in-formed" differently by each medium. The logical implication is that we must keep the full body, all of our senses, available and open to the channels and codes of all media which we have evolved to pursue knowledge.

The human brain is the only thing in the universe that makes an effort to understand itself. The progress of this understanding is absolutely dependent upon competency in all of the media codes which we have devised to instruct the brain through the various senses. In the sense that every member of a society communicates information to other members of that society, every member is both a teacher and a learner, and in order that teaching and learning, those processes

absolutely central to our humanity, take place, it is essential that every member be able to use and understand all of the codes which we have evolved for this purpose. For a library, a center dedicated to learning, to neglect developing an area of serious activity in the codes of moving images would not only be illogical but totally irresponsible.

We have looked on cinema or film as a process, a physical substance generating a physical system in the context of an industrial society, a symbolic cultural form, a tool of exploration , a means of information, a historical record or document, and as a medium. These are some of the wavelengths in the "Spectrum of Cinema."

Film can also be observed as an "ecological" system of five parts. Once you have production or making, you must have preservation, and this in turn permits a continuing distribution, which allows for exhibition, and that is what finally enables understanding and study. A fourteen-person Committee on Film and Television Resources and Services has been preparing a report on the interdependency of these parts and its report, which will be ready in a few months, should be carefully read and responded to, as many of your fellow librarians have already been consulted about it.[35]

I think it will entertain and instruct you if I conclude with a little-known piece of history, the founding of a film library at Harvard University. It is recounted in a book called The Story of Films and its preface gives a justification in terms of a comparison between films and books.

> The circulation of a popular picture is immediate and world-wide. Twenty million people may witness it in a year. But the vast diffusion is paid for by a corresponding brevity. The scenario writer and the director see their finest work flash upon the screen and fade away, perhaps into oblivion; whereas some book, of which a bare handful of copies was sold while the author was alive, may be read and treasured a thousand years afterward.
>
> To prolong this abbreviated life, to rescue and preserve the best of these too perishable creations, some almost incredibly rich in

> significant beauty, is the avowed purpose of the Harvard Film Library.

In an appendix to The Story of the Films is published "The Announcement of the University" about the film library at Harvard, released to The Boston Transcript for an article by W. A. Macdonald on April 2, 1927. It includes this sentence: "The collection will undoubtedly be augmented eventually by the addition of cinematographic literature." The editor of The Story of the Films,[36] the man who was the moving force for the library, the man who gave the opening lecture of the published series to the students of the Graduate School of Business Administration - he was followed by Adolph Zukor, Cecil B. DeMille, William Fox, Harry M. Warner and many others - had graduated from Harvard University fifteen years earlier and was then the President of F B O Pictures Corporation, one of the half-dozen largest companies, and the father of a ten-year old son who would be the thirty-fifth president of the United States. His name was Joseph P. Kennedy.

FOOTNOTES

1. Jean Cocteau, Diary of a Film - trans. by Ronald Duncan (New York: Roy, 1950), p. 38.

2. P. Adams Sitney, "The Idea of Morphology," Film Culture 53-55 (Spring, 1972), 1-24.

3. Ingmar Bergman, "Each Film Is My Last," Tulane Drama Review 11, 1 (Fall, 1966), 94.

4. Susanne K. Langer, "A Note on the Film" in Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art (New York: Scribner, 1953), p. 412.

5. Calvin S. Hall, The Meaning of Dreams (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), pp.2-3, 216.

6. Aron Gurwitsch, "On the Intentionality of Consciousness" in Joseph J. Kockelmans, ed., Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Its Interpretation (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1967), p. 125.

7. Gérard Granel, Le Sens du temps et la perception chez Husserl (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1968), p. 108; cited and translated by Annette Michelson; see footnote 8.

8. Annette Michelson. "Stanley Kubrick's Space 2001" (also entitled "Bodies in Space"), Artforum (February, 1969), 54-63 and "Toward Snow," Artforum (June, 1971), 30-37.

9. "Zorns Lemma and Hapax Legomena," - Interview with Hollis Frampton by Simon Field and Peter Sainsbury, Afterimage 4 (Autumn, 1972), 77.

10. José Ortega y Gasset, "On Point of View in the Arts" - trans. by Paul Snodgrass and Joseph Frank in Morris Philipson ed., Aesthetics Today (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 129.

11. R. Buckminster Fuller, Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969), pp.64-65.

12. I have drawn here on an introductory lecture to a course in film production at Antioch College. Paul Sharits, "Words Per Page," Afterimage 4 (Autumn, 1972), 33.

13. Malcolm LeGrice, "Thoughts on Recent 'Underground' Film," Afterimage 4, (Autumn, 1972), 78-95.

14. Thomas H. Guback, "Film and Cultural Pluralism," Journal of Aesthetic Education 5,2 (1971), 51. See also his essay, "Cultural Identity and Film in the European Economic Community," Cinema Journal 14,1 (Fall, 1974), 2-17.

15. John L. Fell, Film and Narrative Tradition (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974).

16. Standish D. Lawder, The Cubist Cinema (New York: New York University Press, 1974).

17. Quoted in Fell, Film, p.2.

18. For an example of this kind of study, see Gerald O'Grady, "The Dance of the Misfits: A Movie Mobile," Journal of Aesthetic Education 5,2 (April, 1971), 75-90.

19. Michael Benedikt, "Alphaville and Its Subtext" in Toby Mussman, ed., Jean-Luc Godard: A Critical Anthology (New York: E.P. Dutton Co., 1968), p. 220.

20. I have tried to provide a rationale for these kinds of analyses of symbolic cultural forms in "The Preparation of Teachers of Media," Journal of Aesthetic Education 3,3 (1969), 113-134.

21. James C. Coleman, Youth, Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1974, p. 119.

22. Seth Feldman, "Expanding: A Nationwide Program for the Study of Film," Film Library Quarterly 7, 3 and 4 (1974), 38-39.

23. Robert W. Wagner, "The Motion Picture in U.S. Education" in Donald C. Staples, ed., The American Cinema (Washington, D.C., Voice of America Forum Series, 1973), p. 353.

24. Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 110.

25. Report, p. 49. Note Zapruder's testimony about the frame speed of the camera in Hearings, Volume VII, p.576.

26. Hearings before the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy (Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1964), Volume VII, pp. 570, 575, and 576.

27. Hearings, Volume XVIII, p. v.

28. John Phillips, "Bobby," New York Review of Books, Vol. 13, No. 3 (August 21, 1969), 6, 8, 10.

29. Stuart Samuels and Robert Rosen, "Film and the Historian," American Historical Association Newsletter 11,2 (May, 1973), 31-37.

30. For further information, write to History Faculty/ New Jersey Institute of Technology/ Newark, New Jersey.

31. See Carl Kaysen, ed., Content and Context: Essays on College Education (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), p. 248.

32. Joseph H. Greenberg, Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 6.

33. John McHale, "Education for Real" in Edwin Schlossberg and Lawrence Susskind, edd., Good News: A Curricula of Ideas to be Implemented, p. 5. The essay also appears in the World Academy of Art and Science Newsletter (June, 1966) and is anthologized in Richard Kean, ed., Dialogue on Education (New York: 1967), pp. 120-125.

34. Jerome S. Bruner and David R. Olson, "Learning through Experience and Learning through Media" in George Gerbner et al., edd., Communications Technology and Social Policy: Understanding the New "Cultural Revolution" (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973), pp. 209-228.

35. A free copy of the report may be obtained by writing to the Committee at: 10 Granger Place, Buffalo, New York 14222. Copies of the report will be automatically distributed to a composite mailing list gathered by all members of the Committee.

36. Joseph P. Kennedy, ed., The Story of the Films - As Told By Leaders of the Industry to the Students of the Graduate School of Business Administration/ George F. Baker Foundation/ Harvard University (Chicago: A.W. Shaw Company, 1927), pp. vi-vii, 359.