DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 907   CS 507 347

AUTHOR   Burns, Gary
TITLE   Introduction to Film.
PUB DATE   Oct 89
NOTE   20p.
PUB TYPE   Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)
                 -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Course Descriptions; *Course Objectives; *Course
                 Organization; *Film Study; Higher Education;
                 Introductory Courses; Scheduling; Textbook Content;
                 *Textbook Selection; Units of Study
IDENTIFIERS   Film Aesthetics; Film History; Film Viewing

ABSTRACT
                 There are numerous ways to structure the introduction
to film course so as to meet the needs of the different types of
students who typically enroll. Assuming there is no production
component in the course, the teacher is left with two major
approaches to choose from--historical and aesthetic. The units in the
course will typically be built around certain categories recognized
as forming the canon of films: (1) primitives--something by the
Lumieres, Melies, and Porter; (2) D. W. Griffith's films; (3) silent
comedy; (4) Soviet Classics; (5) German Expressionism; (6) Renoir;
(7) Italian Neorealism; (8) French New Wave; (9) Alfred Hitchcock;
(10) recent American films; (11) documentaries; and (12) experimental
films. Film textbooks provide a glimpse of the canon as well as
demonstrating some ways to organize the subject of film either
historically or aesthetically. The best way to select a textbook is
to compare the organization and look briefly at which films are
selected for detailed analysis in each text. Film textbooks typically
differ significantly from each other and thus prcvide the teacher
with distinct alternatives. The teacher must also decide which films
to show, in what order, and in which of the various available film
and video formats. Scheduling feature-length movies weekly can wreak
havoc on fairly rigid university class schedules. Such a course is
sometimes frustrating to teach, but the opportunity to put together a
program of films, watch them for the dozenth time, and talk about
them to a mostly eager audience is a most rewarding classroom
experience. (RS)

Introduction to Film

Prepared for the book <u>Teaching Mass Communication</u>, ed. Mike Murray

October 1989

Gary Burns, Assistant Professor

Communication Studies

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, IL 60115

815-753-7108

Introduction to Film

During the late 1890s and early 1900s, when film was very young, it was not quite clear whether film was an entirely new art or merely a sort of "theatre without words." Before long, filmmakers such as D.W. Griffith, Charles Chaplin, and Sergei Eisenstein demonstrated that film was not only a new art, but one with power to move millions of people as they had never been moved before. Despite its great popularity, or perhaps because of it, film has seldom held a secure place in the school curriculum, either at the college or secondary level. This has changed somewhat in the past twenty years or so, to the point that a 1980 study by the American Film Institute reported that 227 four-year colleges offered bachelor's degrees in film, with another 209 schools offering courses in film (or television) but no degree. The same study reported that there were 12,526 film majors, with about 200,000 students taking film or television courses every semester.[1]

In almost every film curriculum, there is probably a course called "Introduction to Film," or something similar. It is the one course to have if you have only one, and it is the course most students should take first in a well developed film curriculum. Thus the course must often serve two purposes--(1) to provide a thorough overview of film for the student who will never take another film course, and (2) to provide a foundation for students who will take other film courses. Along with these purposes often comes an imperative to emphasize film's importance among the arts and humanities, since the course carries general education credit at many colleges.

There are numerous ways to structure the Introduction to Film course so as to meet the needs of the different types of students who typically enroll. The most basic structural issue is whether the course will have any production component. Some teachers favor including a film production assignment in order to integrate theory and practice.[2] And it cannot be

denied that one of the best ways to learn about film is to make a film. Reasons one might decide _not_ to use a production exercise include the expense of equipment and film stock, large class size, availability of film production elsewhere in the curriculum, and the fact that (for better or worse) practical experience would not at most universities be considered a form of humanistic inquiry.

Another issue has arisen recently in discussions of the place of film production in the curriculum, namely whether film production should be taught together with video production, separately from video production, or not at all.[3] This controversy is too complicated to explore here, but it is something that a teacher might have to address if he or she intends to teach film production, either in Introduction to Film or elsewhere.

For purposes of this chapter, I will assume that there is no production component in the Introduction to Film course. This leaves the teacher two major approaches to choose from--historical and aesthetic. The historical approach presents a canon of films in chronological order, whereas the aesthetic approach focuses on the structural components or processes of film (script, lighting, sound, editing, etc.) and on major ways of looking at film critically (genres, authors, movements, feminism, etc.).[4] In practice, the historical and aesthetic approaches may yield very similar results, primarily because it is difficult to deviate very far from the canon of films accepted as important by the academic community.

Citizen Kane is the clearest case in point. Students arrive having seen the latest installment of Friday the 13th, but not Citizen Kane. They must see Citizen Kane, regardless whether the course is structured historically or aesthetically. Thus one strikes a blow for cultural literacy, although perhaps not of the sort E.D. Hirsch and Allan Bloom had in mind.

Beyond <u>Citizen Kane</u>, the "touchstones" are somewhat contestable, as
they should be, but there is nonetheless a canon that, if not built on specific
films, at least acknowledges certain categories:

1. Primitives--something by the Lumières, Méliès, and Porter; perhaps
    Edison/Dickson, Hepworth, Cohl, etc.

2. Griffith--<u>The Birth of a Nation</u>, <u>Intolerance</u>, <u>Broken Blossoms</u>, <u>Way
    Down East</u>, or a short or two for those more "intolerant" of silents.

3. Silent comedy--<u>The Gold Rush</u> or something else by Chaplin, something
    by Keaton.

4. Soviet classics--often <u>Battleship Potemkin</u> (sometimes only the Odessa
    Steps sequence).

5. German Expressionism--<u>The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari</u>, <u>Metropolis</u>, etc.

6. Renoir--<u>The Rules of the Game</u>, <u>Grand Illusion</u>.

7. Italian Neorealism or second wave--something by Rossellini, DeSica,
    or Fellini.

8. French New Wave--often something by Godard or Truffaut.

9. Hitchcock--<u>North by Northwest</u>, <u>Psycho</u>, etc.

10. Recent American film--<u>Bonnie and Clyde</u>, <u>The Graduate</u>, etc.

11. Documentary--<u>Nanook of the North</u>, <u>Triumph of the Will</u>, <u>Night and Fog</u>,
    <u>The River</u>, etc.

12. Experimental--<u>Un Chien andalou</u>, <u>Meshes of the Afternoon</u>, etc.

The units in the course will typically be built around film screenings,
so that the scheme above, plus <u>Citizen Kane</u>, would yield thirteen units, each
of which would normally represent one week in a college course. Some units
can easily be combined--for example, one might easily show a few primitives and
a Griffith, Chaplin, and Keaton short all in one screening, although my
preference is to use an entire week for each unit as listed above.

In a semester course lasting fifteen weeks, two more units would be needed to round out the list of thirteen given above. Normally I use an American genre film from the studio years (usually My Darling Clementine) and a theatrical adaptation (such as Welles's Macbeth). Students, of course, prefer films that are fictional, in color, with sound, in English, recent, American, and in a familiar genre. It is entirely appropriate to take this into account and also to include personal favorites. Classes are better when students and teacher alike enjoy the material that is under consideration. Thus teachers who wish to make the class as accessible as possible to impatient or finicky students will probably prefer to use more American studio films than I have listed. This skirts the canonical system, since American studio films tend not to be included in the canon, with occasional unexplainable exceptions, such as The Searchers. Selection criteria for studio films might include such general matters as whether the film is critically well regarded, maintaining a balance of films from different historical periods, and avoiding excessive duplication of genres or authors while still allowing for a certain amount of comparative analysis.

The purest expression of the canon appears every ten years in the critics' poll published in Sight and Sound magazine.[5] But one can get a sense of what the "classic" films are by reading practically any film textbook. Despite scholars' frequent protestations that ten-best lists and similar projects are exercises in futility and pedantry, it is no surprise that practically every film textbook devotes considerable space to Citizen Kane (the best film of all time, according to every Sight and Sound poll since 1962), plus suitable coverage to "runners-up" and historical milestone films (The Rules of the Game, Battleship Potemkin, The Birth of a Nation, etc.). The development of such a canon, formal or informal, is inevitable and in

fact useful, for without it there would be no "mainstream" and therefore no way to position oneself, as teacher or student, in support or opposition with respect to it. Even in order to make sense of avant-garde film (which, paradoxically, has its own canon), it is necessary to be aware of the kind of system the avant-garde is supposedly reacting against.

In addition to providing glimpse of the canon, practically every film textbook demonstrates some way to organize the subject of film either historically or aesthetically. Thus there are two main categories of textbooks that the teacher of Introduction to Film should look at. On the one hand there are the History of Film textbooks. These, of course, are designed for the course called History of Film--which at many schools would be a follow-up course or sequence to the Introduction to Film course. However, if the curriculum does not separate Introduction from History, a history text might be a wise choice in the Introduction to Film class, at least as a supplementary text. All the majc, history texts give some attention to aesthetics, and the teacher's lectures can fill in any important aesthetic details omitted in the books.

The major History of Film texts include Arthur Knight's The Liveliest Art. Jack Ellis's A History of Film, John Fell's A History of Films, Gerald Mast's A Short History of the Movies, and David Cook's A History of Narrative Film.[6] These are all useful as reference works for the teacher, and Knight and Ellis in particular are worthy of consideration as principal or supplementary texts in the Introduction to Film course.

Knight's The Liveliest Art is not really a textbook, since it is devoid of such scholarly trappings as footnotes and is available as a pocket-sized paperback. Nonetheless it is a substantial book at a low price and has been in print so long that it is something of a classic. It is ideal as a supplementary

history text to back up an aesthetically oriented text. Coverage of the 1960s
and later is skimpy.

Ellis's A History of Film begins with a chapter about aesthetics and
repeatedly returns to this subject throughout its very readable historical
narrative. The chapters on Soviet film and Italian Neorealism, for example,
are especially strong in identifying the aesthetic significance of these
historical moments. Among the various history texts, Ellis is probably
the one that could best stand on its own as the principal text in the
Introduction to Film course.

Fell's A History of Films is very broad in scope and has the most
detailed and useful filmographies of any film textbook. The scope is probably
too broad for Introduction to Film, and Fell's consideration of aesthetic
matters is not as thorough as many of his competitors'.

Mast's A Short History of the Movies is quirky in ways that will please
some and infuriate others. Mast says practically nothing about documentary,
for example, but devotes more than ample attention to some of the less familiar
national cinemas and individual foreign directors. His approach is more
auteurist than most, while in discussing aesthetics Mast is not systematic
enough to be of much help in this important area of the Introduction to Film
course.

Cook's A History of Narrative Film is the best and most scholarly
of the history texts, but generally too weighty for an introductory class.
Every film teacher should own this book for its unparalleled combination
of detail, careful scholarship, and original insight. Although the "Cook
book" cannot be very enthusiastically recommended as a text in Introduction
to Film, it is the best of all the history texts in providing historical--and
aesthetic--material the teacher can use in lectures to fill in the blanks

left by whatever text is used.

The preceding discussion of history texts notwithstanding, it is more customary in the Introduction to Film course to select one of the aesthetically oriented textbooks. There are numerous such books, of which some of the best are Louis Giannetti's Understanding Movies, Bordwell and Thompson's Film Art: An Introduction, James Monaco's How to Read a Film, Bruce Kawin's How Movies Work, and the Sobchacks' An Introduction to Film.[7] Giannetti and Bordwell/Thompson are probably the dominant texts, but not nearly to the degree that Head/Sterling dominates in Introduction to Broadcasting.[8]

Although nominally "introductory," the five books mentioned above are all (with the probable exception of the Sobchacks) "substantial texts"-- that is, they are serious, significant works of film criticism as well as surveys for the uninitiated. That these works succeed on both levels is remarkable and a testament to the high quality of teaching and scholarship prevalent in film studies.

Since the books listed are all of high quality, the best way to select one is probably to compare their organization and to look briefly at which films are selected for detailed analysis in each text. If the text devotes a great deal of space to a particular film, it may become almost obligatory to show that film in class. Given the desirability of in-depth coverage of individual films shown in class, textbook selection can easily come down to the question of how closely the films discussed in detail by the textbook author correspond to the films the teacher would like to show in class.

In any case, precise coordination of the screening schedule with textbook readings is difficult or impossible. This is one of the biggest problems a film teacher faces. It will almost always be necessary to assign chapters out of sequence and to develop extensive lecture notes to cover

films screened in class but not discussed in the book.

The five Introduction to Film texts listed above differ significantly from each other and thus provide the teacher with distinct alternatives. All five books have glossaries, bibliographies, and indexes. Bordwell/Thompson and Kawin include suggested film screenings. Monaco includes a chronology.

The Giannetti book is organized around aesthetic categories but still works well with film screenings organized primarily according to historical chronology. There are detailed discussions of Citizen Kane, Persona, and North by Northwest (the latter in an appendix which includes the "reading script" and "shooting script"--i.e. a reconstructed storyboard--of the crop duster sequence, reprinted from Lehman's screenplay and LaValley's Focus on Hitchcock). The book is particularly strong in demonstrating the intimate relationship between film and the other arts (photography, theatre, literature).

Bordwell and Thompson's Film Art is the most formalistic of the five books, in keeping with the theoretical orientation associated with the authors. It is also the most scholarly book and includes an excellent "Notes and Queries" section at the end of each chapter, combining bibliographic citations with theoretical discussion. Film Art offers detailed discussion of numerous films, but many of these films are unusual choices and may not appeal to the teacher. The films include: Olympia, Part 2; The River; Ballet mécanique; Bruce Conner's A Movie; Citizen Kane; Our Hospitality; Grand Illusion; The Maltese Falcon; October; A Man Escaped; His Girl Friday; The Man Who Knew Too Much (1934); Stagecoach; Day of Wrath; Last Year at Marienbad; Tokyo Story; High School; Innocence Unprotected; Meet Me in St. Louis; The Crime of M. Lange; and Tout va bien.

Monaco's book is subtitled The Art, Technology, Language, History, and Theory of Film and Media. The author's attempt to be encyclopedic may

well disqualify the book as an Introduction to Film text in the eyes of many teachers. "Media," while actually only a minor focus of the book, does include print, broadcasting, and records--which are unlikely to be included in most Introduction to Film courses. Not counting this principal aberration, the book is a solid Introduction to Film text. Another possible problem, however, is that the book has only six chapters (which are necessarily large), and one of these is "Media." Spreading readings across a fifteen-week semester in some logical way may be difficult. There are no detailed discussions of individual films.

Kawin's How Movies Work is strong in its discussion of equipment, production processes, and industrial structure. About one-third of the book is devoted to "The Film Artist and the Movie Business." This unusual emphasis cuts into the space available for the more customary aesthetic matters, and also for history. Because of this, Kawin is likely a problematic choice unless technical and industrial concerns figure prominently in the course. Films discussed in detail include: Citizen Kane; Close Encounters of the Third Kind; Sunrise; Vertigo; King Kong (1933); Hiroshima, mon amour; October; The Godfather; The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari; The Birds; Flashdance; and High Noon.

The Sobchacks' An Introduction to Film attempts to meld the aesthetic and historical approaches by including seven "Historical Sketches" as interludes that interrupt the major chapters, which are derived mainly from aesthetic categories. The Historical Sketches cover the Image (i.e. cameras, film, etc.), Editing, Sound, Narrative Film (from Méliès to recent Australian film in fourteen pages!), Documentary Film, Experimental/Independent/Animated Film, and Film Reviewing/Criticism/Theory. The first chapter covers the film production process. The last chapter is a guide to "Writing College Papers

About Film"--thus the decision whether to use the book will probably be based in part on whether one intends to assign papers and whether one believes students will need or benefit from the instruction provided in this chapter. Its inclusion, along with the overall tone and style of the book, makes this text more elementary than the other four titles reviewed. There are no detailed discussions of individual films.

In addition to the textbooks listed above, there are two reference sources I would recommend to every film teacher: Ephraim Katz's The Film Encyclopedia and Leonard Maltin's TV Movies and Video Guide.[9] The former is indispensible for its biographical entries, filmographies, and coverage of general topics such as national cinemas and film studios. The latter book lists thousands of films by title and gives, for each, such information as date of release, running time, alternate titles, director, stars, plot synopsis, and Maltin's critical rating. The book is accurate, fairly comprehensive, handy, and inexpensive.

Concurrently with selecting a textbook, the teacher must decide which films to show, in what order, and in which of the various available film and video formats. This raises uncomfortable technical, aesthetic, and economic questions with which every film teacher must grapple. The wildfire diffusion of the VHS video format in the past few years has made it possible for schools, even fairly impoverished ones, to acquire large libraries of films-on-tape. For a one-time expenditure of a few hundred dollars, a school can acquire the fifteen or twenty videotapes it takes to show the equivalent of one feature film per week in a semester-long Introduction to Film course. This has the advantage of reducing or eliminating the 16 mm film rental fees, typically $1,000-3,000 per semester, that were once a fact of life in the course. An additional advantage is

that the tapes, once purchased, remain available for additional viewing by students and faculty, whereas rented film prints must be returned to the distributor promptly after screening.

But VHS is no panacea. Even the economics of it are not as favorable as they might at first appear. In addition to the tapes themselves, the school must purchase playback and display apparatus. Playback is straightforward enough, but display of the video image is problematic. Two display choices are available--TV sets and video projectors. TV sets do not give the viewer a sense of watching a movie Video projectors are highly variable in quality, convenience, mobility, and reliability, and cost several thousand dollars. They also exacerbate any technical problems in the videotape being shown. For example, many foreign films have subtitles that are hard enough to read in their 16 mm versions. Dubbing ,he film to VHS makes the titles more illegible, and projecting the tape on a video projector, especially a bad one, compounds the problem even further. An additional complication is that the quality of video copies available varies over a wide range and is almost totally unpredictable. There is one rule of thumb--be especially careful when buying videotapes of films that are old or foreign.[10]

Although the changeover to videotape in film courses seems inexorable, some teachers object on aesthetic grounds, maintaining that films should be shown as films, not as TV. Despite the face validity of this argument, it is a position that is growing more and more difficult to maintain in the face of ever greater availability of film titles on videotape and a shrinking supply of 16 mm rental prints (which are also more expensive). Still, many schools own 16 mm prints purchased years ago (or continue to rent 16 mm prints, for whatever reason) and must therefore maintain 16 mm projection facilities as well as any VHS equipment they

are using. Generally, the 16 mm equipment must be available in the same classroom along with the VHS equipment. This adds to a problem already existent at many schools, that of film classes being offered in classrooms not designed for that purpose. For an Introduction to Film class taught using 16 mm prints exclusively, the ideal classroom would have a projection booth with two projectors, good sightlines, and a good sound system. For economic reasons, it would also be necessary in most cases for the room to hold a large number of students--several dozen to several hundred, depending on the specific case. If a video projector must also be available, several important issues arise--will the projector be permanently mounted in the room? If so, will it be mounted on the ceiling, or elsewhere? How will this affect sightlines or the throw of the 16 mm projectors? Additional problems, too complicated to address here, include providing some apparatus to enable the teacher to play back excerpts of the film for discussion, preferably with controls located at the front of the room; and handling any other formats that may, for one reason or another, be needed in the course--slides, overhead, Beta, Umatic, video disc, 35 mm movies, etc.

The move to videotape may easily influence course content, since films not readily available on tape, or the taped versions of which are technically flawed, will tend to be used less. Thus the old and foreign will be de-emphasized, as will avant-garde and experimental films. Many recent experimental films one might want to show are not available on tape. Many of the older avant-garde films of interest are available, but only on compilation reels that also include films one might want to skip over--thus, using these reels at all is at best inconvenient.

A beginning teacher may very well inherit equipment and films selected by someone else, in which case the principal concern becomes that of trying to find the best fit between the existing inventory and one's aspirations for the course. On the other hand, the teacher may be faced with the necessity to specify which equipment and films will be purchased. This heavy and heady responsibility requires the teacher to make decisions on numerous matters previously discussed in this chapter. Outside of the aforementioned caveat concerning old and foreign films on videotape, perhaps the best advice that can be given at this point is that it is possible to obtain an acceptable picture on a portable video projector, using VHS tapes. The picture will not be as sharp as a projected film image, but it will be large and bright enough for a class of 100 to watch it comfortably. In order to obtain this salutary result, it is essential to get the right video projector (such as a Sony Super Bright VPH 1040Q, currently priced at about $2,500) and to operate it properly.

There are several other logistical concerns that make film courses rather difficult to fit into the standard way of doing things at colleges. The usual practice in a film course is to screen a feature film (or its equivalent in short films) every week. Because films vary in length, the screening period must be scheduled to last at least two hours, even though the majority of screenings will last only about ninety minutes. There must also be time for lectures and discussion--at least fifty minutes per week, and preferably seventy-five minutes or even longer, depending on the degree of scheduling flexibility possible at the institution. A typical and fairly satisfactory arrangement is a Tuesday-Thursday schedule with the film screening on Tuesday and lecture-discussion on

Thursday. Generally there is much more to say about a film after it is

shown than before, although occasionally the teacher will be obliged to

warn the class in advance of things to watch for in the film.

Of course, a two-hour class period on Tuesday combined with a

75-minute period on Thursday is difficult for university computers to

understand and also plays navoc with students' attempts to fit

other courses into their schedules on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

This may significantly lower enrollment in the course unless it is required.

Scheduling as late in the day as possible seems to ameliorate this problem

slightly.

One method of scheduling that is generally not desirable is to

hold class meetings only once a week, with discussion immediately following

the film. This leads to 2½- to 3-hour class periods that too heavily

tax endurance. Another approach, impractical at commuter campuses and

perhaps inconvenient for the teacher, is to hold the screenings at night,

with lecture-discussion sessions in the day.

One last alternative is the "lab section" approach, with screenings

scheduled at four or five different times for students' convenience. My

experience with this method has convinced me that students unfortunately

do not find that this helps them much in their scheduling of classes. Since

class scheduling at colleges often adheres to a fairly rigid formula and

since, increasingly, students seem to pick classes based on time of day

rather than course content, it is probably best to try to conform to

the school's prevailing scheduling system as much as possible. The lab

section approach, while attractive in theory, seems to have mainly

negative effects in practice--more wear on videotapes and students' anger

upon being closed out of their preferred sections.

Film classes are often large, and Introduction to Film is normally
the largest of all. With thousands of dollars being spent on film rentals,
there was originally an economic incentive to recover that cost through
tuition or "lab" fees. This may gradually change because of the conversion
to video, but the course will probably continue to attract mass enrollments
by majors, would-be majors, and students seeking whatever general education
credit is available. Moreover, since the mass lecture approach seems
somewhat more poetically just in a film course than in many other subjects,
Introduction to Film will probably remain a mass lecture course at many
colleges. This means that discussion is limited, papers are impractical,
and "objective" tests are encouraged. This leaves much to be desired as
a way to teach the humanities (or any subject), but such a course can still
educate and inspire the student. The teacher must give a bravura
performance as a lecturer and must work hard from year to year to adjust
and update lectures and develop interesting handouts, slides, film excerpts,
and so forth. Ultimately, one wants to make the student look forward to
lecture day as much as to movie day.

This brief overview has covered at least some of the major problems
and possibilities inherent in the Introduction to Film course. It is
sometimes a frustrating course to teach, but, ultimately, the opportunity
to put together a program of films, watch them for the dozenth time, and
talk about them to a somewhat eager audience is a most rewarding classroom
experience. This is an ideal place to begin to infect students
both with a love of important films and with the desire to understand
what makes them important.

Notes

[1] The American Film Institute Guide to College Courses in Film
and Television, 7th ed., ed. Charles Granade, Jr. (Princeton, NJ: Peterson's
Guides, 1980), p. 13. While some readers may take these figures as
evidence that film has finally "arrived" in the college curriculum, it
must also be remembered that film per se is losing ground on many fronts
to video and television.

[2] See, for example, Peter Lev and Barry Moore, "Introduction to
Film--An Integrative Approach," Journal of Film and Video, 38, No. 2
(Spring 1986), 81-87.

[3] See the following "debate" in Feedback, 27, No. 6 (Fall 1986):
John David Viera, "Integrated Mediums: Converging Film and Video in
Teaching Production," 14, 34-36; Gary Burns, "A Response to 'Integrated
Mediums,'" 15, 36-39; and John David Viera, "Sharing Concepts: Viera's
Rejoinder," 39-40. These articles also explore the differences between
"video" and "television."

[4] For two examples of the aesthetic approach, see Betsy A. McLane,
"Introduction to Film, Approach I," AFI Education Newsletter, March-April
1981, pp. 4-7; and David Bordwell, "Introduction to Film, Approach II,"
AFI Education Newsletter, March-April 1982, pp. 4-7,.9.

[5] "As the Critics Like It," Sight and Sound, 22 (October-December
1952), 58-60; "Top Ten," Sight and Sound, 31 (Winter 1961/62), 10-14;
"Top Ten 72," Sight and Sound, 41 (Winter 1971/72), 12-16; and "Top Ten
1982," Sight and Sound, 51 (Autumn 1982), 242-246. See also Gavin
Lambert, "As You Like It," Sight and Sound, 22 (July-September 1952),
18-19, for a report on the "Brussels Referendum" of film directors that
precipitated the critics' polls.

[6] Arthur Knight, The Liveliest Art: A Panoramic History of the Movies, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1978; rpt. New York: New American Library, 1979); Jack C. Ellis, A History of Film, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985); John Fell, A History of Films (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979); Gerald Mast, A Short History of the Movies, 4th ed. (New York: Macmillan; and London: Collier Macmillan, 1986); and David A. Cook, A History of Narrative Film (New York: Norton, 1981). There are several other history texts available. I am listing here the books I think are best and most relevant to the Introduction to Film course.

[7] Louis Giannetti, Understanding Movies, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987); David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson, Film Art: An Introduction, 2nd ed. (New York: Knopf, 1986); James Monaco, How to Read a Film: The Art, Technology, Language, History, and Theory of Film and Media, rev. ed. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); Bruce F. Kawin, How Movies Work (New York: Macmillan; and London: Collier Macmillan, 1987); and Thomas Sobchack and Vivian C. Sobchack, An Introduction to Film, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987). Again I am listing only the books I think are best. Many other titles are available and no doubt many of these are worthy of investigation by the teacher.

[8] Cf. Douglas Gomery, "Radio, Television and Film: The State of Study in the 1980s," Feedback, 27, No. 2 (Fall 1985), 12-16.

[9] Ephraim Katz, The Film Encyclopedia (New York: Putnam, 1979); and Leonard Maltin, ed., Leonard Maltin's TV Movies and Video Guide, 1988 Edition (New York: New American Library, 1987).

[10] For further guidance in selecting tapes and equipment, an outstanding source is John P. Smead, "Video Projection in the Film Curriculum," paper presented to the University Film and Video Association,

August 1987.   Smead teaches in the Department of Communication, Central

Missouri State University.