THE COMPILATION FILM: PRINCIPLES AND POTENTIALS OF A DOCUMENTARY GENRE

By

HARRIS JAMES ELDER

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July, 1976

Thesis
1976
E37c
cop. 2

THE COMPILATION FILM: PRINCIPLES AND

POTENTIALS OF A DOCUMENTARY GENRE

Thesis Approved:

Peter Rollins
Thesis Adviser

David S. Berkeley

N. N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

953306

PREFACE

My first exposure to compilation films was through television in the 1950's. To this day I recall my reaction to these exciting images, now conspicuous documents of the Cold War. Since then, the use of archival footage has increased--but not always with increased responsibility. The question of how a compilation can be assembled responsibly is one that must be asked by anyone who expects an intelligent response to films viewed.

In approaching compilation film study in this manner, I am indebted to Prof. Peter Rollins for providing constructive criticism at all points in the study. Appreciation is also expressed to Prof. Mary Rohrberger for suggesting the broader literary and artistic implications of the subject; and to Profs. David S. Berkeley and Douglas D. Hale for offering helpful suggestions on revising the manuscript. Finally, I thank Marsha L. Elder for encouraging me toward the completion of what seemed an interminable project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

THE COMPILATION FILM: PRINCIPLES AND POTENTIALS OF A DOCUMENTARY GENRE 1

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 42

THE COMPILATION FILM: PRINCIPLES AND POTENTIALS OF A DOCUMENTARY GENRE

Very early in the history of filmmaking, editors and film librarians discovered an interesting and exciting fact: old strips and reels of film which had accumulated from a number of sources could be joined together into stories. Edwin S. Porter, a technician in the early Edison studio, was probably the first to discover this quality in stock footage. Edison's film library contained a great quantity of film concerned with fire departments and their operations. Challenged by the idea of piecing the fragments together in order to tell a story, Porter set about constructing the first compilation film, _A Day in the Life of an American Fireman_ (1903).

The Edison library contained a host of materials, few shot at the same location or with a story idea in mind. Rather, the library housed unvarnished actualities of fire stations, of fire equipment, of firemen in their beds, of engines _en route_ to fires. After surveying the holdings, Porter pieced together the following story: A neighborhood fire box is rung. Sleeping firemen rush from their beds to the engines to answer the call. Their race to the fire is long and exciting. At the scene, they discover a mother and child trapped on the second floor of a small home. The firemen carry a ladder to the window and a particularly heroic fireman helps mother and child to safety. Eventually, the fire is put out.

The story of A Day in the Life of an American Fireman is prosaic in the extreme. It is the simplest of narratives. Yet in the evolution of film, Porter's discovery that existing footage could be exploited to tell stories and to communicate ideas was revolutionary.[1] It also marked the beginning of a rich and varied history of a subgenre of documentary film. Russian filmmakers of the 1920's made intensive studies of the ideological potential of compilation films. These Soviet innovators were impelled by two motives. First, the Russian revolutionary movement needed a medium which would excite and move the inchoate masses of a new nation. But there was also a matter of expediency: the Soviet Union was under embargo by the western powers, and films were scarce. Filmmakers learned many of the principles later applied to compilation films as a result of their attempts to recut imported works of D. W. Griffith. As they toyed with such films as Intolerance (1916), cutting and recutting new stories each night, the filmmakers acquired new insights into the potentials for compilation film. As the experiments multiplied, so the potential of this medium for political purposes expanded in the eyes of Dziga Vertov, Esther Schub, and others.

World War II marks the next highlight in the history of compilation film.[2] With an entire world in conflict, national leaders felt a need to convince large numbers of people that the cause espoused by their leaders was just. Nazi Germany drew heavily on a sophisticated film industry to make documentary and propaganda films that would sway both domestic and foreign audiences. Great Britain also relied on the strengths of its documentary film industry. Because the documentary film movement in America came late to the scene and had never developed

extensively, there was no large group of propagandists at hand.[3] As a result, Americans learned about the war from a series of famous films compiled under the direction of feature film director Frank Capra. The *Why We Fight* series was amply budgeted and enlisted the services of some of Hollywood's finest editors, writers, and technicians.[4] This series of compilations was designed to sway the American nation from isolationism to a spirit of involvement--indeed, bellicosity. As examples of the exploitation of expressiveness inherent in historical footage, these films rank with any previously produced. Like the Russian compilations by Esther Schub, Lev Kuleshov, and Sergei Eisenstein, the *Why We Fight* series was concerned with communicating ideas and emotions, of maximizing the expressive potential of library film. Yet the American propagandists were not always as sophisticated as their communist predecessors.

The advent of television in the 1950's brought compilation films to a larger audience and a smaller screen. Robert Sarnoff, then executive vice president of NBC, was convinced that an exciting compilation series could be assembled to dramatize Samuel E. Morrison's multi-volumed history of naval operations in World War II. A team of filmmakers and researchers was assembled around Morrison's assistant, Henry Salomon. With an unusually large budget, Salomon (producer), Isaac Kleinerman (film editor), Robert Russell Bennett (orchestration), and Richard Hanser (narration writer) constructed the 26-episode compilation epic, *Victory at Sea* (1952-53).[5] The series was so successful that the Salomon team was dubbed the *Project XX* group, and commissioned to create a series of some eighteen major films, all compilations, all on historical subjects. Films such as *Nightmare in*

Red, The Twisted Cross, The Great War, and Three, Two, One, Zero reached millions of viewers and helped to enshrine the compilation film as a standard genre for television.

More recently, a new era of compilation seems to have begun. Historians and students of culture are discovering that film can serve them as a medium of expression. In England, a consortium of British universities has pooled resources with the goal of producing historical compilation films for which historians not only do book research. In addition, these films involve the contribution of historians at every phase: from the survey of archival materials to final editing of visual and aural images. Through essays, pamphlets, and films the British Universities Consortium group has advocated that trained scholars take control of compilation from those who like Project XX are often entertainment-oriented professionals. Film scholarship has recently burgeoned in the United States as well. The increasing numbers of film journals and university-oriented filmmakers testify to this growth.

One of the best examples of this scholarly experiment in the compilation medium is Cadre Films' award-winning Goodbye Billy: America Goes to War, 1917-1918 (1971). With the support of the American Historical Association, two historians and a musicologist approached the visual and aural documents of the World War I era. Before assembling their film, they took stock of the compilation heritage. They were actively concerned about the superficiality, blandness, and outright inaccuracy of compilations in the Capra-Salomon tradition. On the other hand, they reached back to many of the principles of compilation discovered by the Russian pioneers. Cadre Films used the

Capra-Salomon examples as negative references; they employed as positive guides the techniques developed by Schub and Kuleshov; and they added the special ingredient of historical scholarship. These general directions make it possible for all filmmakers to be more honest in seeking the truth within the raw materials of compilation. Such a basic approach helps the filmmaker probe and then communicate to his audience through montage the unfamiliar and surprising contained in familiar footage. Yet these principles of the compilation film apply most effectively only when the filmmaker respects the principle of credibility. Applying these criteria to the productions of Why We Fight, Project XX and Cadre Films will demonstrate how Goodbye Billy has taken the compilation film one step further in its evolution.

No compilation film is an objective portrait of the past just as no documentary film can be objective. For the broader class of documentary film to be objective, filmmakers would have to transcend the natural limits imposed by their equipment. The camera eye is located at a single point, directed toward some objects rather than others, affected by light conditions, and subject to the conscious or unconscious interests of the cameraman. Thus even prior to the editing of a documentary film, a number of selections and choices have been made about what to record.

In the case of compilation films, what is often called the "subjectivity" of footage is magnified exponentially. Images selected from an archive have been shot by different cameramen with different interests and access to the events and people recorded. Further subjectivity is added if the compilation filmmaker selects his footage from documentary, propaganda, or fiction films which have already been

processed by an editor. All of the editing decisions with respect to the length of shots are thereby transferred from the archival film into the compilation under construction. As the Russian filmmakers stressed, this problem of pace and rhythm significantly affected "compositional content," for all editors know that shots often have a "natural" length. Especially if they are too short, their effectiveness for communicating ideas or emotions can be seriously impaired.

But merely because all compilation films are interpretations need not lead the critic to a flabby relativism. There are credible examinations of the past which observe standards of truthfulness and respect for the documents examined and cited. The analogy here would be to a scholarly paper where the student considers all available evidence and then reports his findings. Surely historians are never objective in the manner which Ranke and the scientific school proposed, but there are gradations within the spectrum of subjectivity. As a general rule, it can be said that a compilation retains its integrity in direct proportion to its respect for the sources examined.[6] If the filmmaker takes shortcuts, if the press of time tempts him to smuggle in fiction footage or reenactments without notifying the viewer, then he has violated a procedural rule of compilation. The result may often be flashy and smooth from a passively visual point of view, but the full potential of the medium has not thereby been explored.[7] Compilation filmmakers who write scripts first and then consult archives weaken the documentary power of their work.[8] Those who "fake" events either by utilizing false actualities (i.e., not really from the scene, time, life examined) or filmmakers who introduce entertaining fiction footage to cover the story build a serious fault into their work. Thus while

all compilations interpret the past, there are procedural guides first articulated by the Russian pioneers and later codified by critics such as Kracauer, Balázs, Leyda, and others.[9] Violators of these rules not only endanger the credibility of their work, they threaten the potential of the entire compilation medium.

The Russian pioneers in compilation filmmaking also quickly stumbled upon a crucial distinction concerning the "content" of archival film. Edwin S. Porter, the compiler of A Day in the Life of an American Fireman, had simply wanted to tell a story. He was pleased by his ability to find the right shots to establish a linear sequence from the ringing of a fire alarm through a heroic rescue. Porter was attentive only to what the Russians learned to call the "informational content" of archival footage. That Porter went no further in his analysis of the basic building blocks made him the first in an American tradition of narrative montage.

But the Russian filmmakers wanted to use compilation films for more potent ends. They hoped to communicate ideas and to forge a national consciousness among the disparate peoples of the new communist state. In working toward this goal, they discovered that they needed to be attentive to a more subtle dimension of the footage, a dimension which they called "compositional content." Every available shot was examined by Esther Schub and Dziga Vertov for its aesthetic potential. Contrasts of light and darkness, the relationship of vertical to horizontal shapes, the varying motions and directions of motions, elements such as camera angle, movement, and proximity to the subject matter were all scrutinized. The goal of this minute examination of the formal elements of individual shots was to discover the likenesses and

differences among them. Both Schub and Vertov performed experiments which they believed demonstrated that shot relationships were as significant in the cumulative emotional and intellectual development of a film as the obvious pictorial content of the shots. Since the Russian filmmakers were intent on communicating an ideology, this deeper potential for swaying audiences became paramount.[10]

The difference between compilations with sensitivity to compositional content and those for which it was lacking soon became as obvious to film critics as it was to the Russian ideologues. Describing a Berlin workers' film society production of 1928 which had reassembled newsreel footage along compositional principles, Siegfried Kracauer underlined the success of the Berlin discoveries: The Ufa newsreels had been

> transformed, through mere editing procedures . . . into a red-tinged film that stirred Berlin audiences to clamorous demonstrations. The censor soon prohibited further performances, even though the Volksverband based its protest upon the demonstrable assertion that the film contained nothing but newsreel shots already shown in all Ufa theaters without scandalizing anyone.[11]

Thus, ideas and attitudes could be conveyed entirely through the ingenious arrangement of newsreel images. The need to be aware of the implications and moods of the separate shots was stressed in 1953 by Nicole Vérdès, who supervised the editing of Paris 1900 (1948):

> One must not explain or describe. Quite the contrary. One must go, as it were, through the outer appearance of the selected shot to feel and, without insistence, make felt that strange and unexpected 'second meaning' that always hides behind the surface of the subject. This bearded gentleman--a politician--though very smiling and briskly walking, seems sinister. Or rather, he does not, but the picture does. Why? Maybe only because he walks from right to left. . . . And this landscape--why does it seem agreeable, even quite soothing. . . . Why is this interior scene extremely elegant. . . . Perhaps it is only by the way, on

> this old piece of celluloid, the blacks and whites have fallen into place!
>
> So you take two or three metres of the bearded gentleman with appropriate music (or silence) and place him just at the moment (1913) when rumours of war have been first indicated. And the soothing landscape can be used just as the word 'hope' is spoken--and the 'interieur raffiné'--but only two metres of it--can just follow a hint of Marcel Proust.[12]

Discovery of the maximum potential of images, skillfully blended with respect for the film documents as evidence, could evoke previously unperceived meanings in familiar materials.[13]

Jay Leyda, a student of the Russian movement, claims that the essential ideal of compilation filmmaking can be linked to the maximum "credible" use of compositional content. His belief--one which the Russians shared--is that filmic materials have almost infinite expressive possibilities and that "there is a limitless potential waiting for any artist with something he needs to say."[14] The gifted compilation filmmaker has an eye which can identify these possibilities and scissors which can evoke them:

> Any means by which the spectator is compelled to look at familiar shots as if he had not seen them before, or by which the spectator's mind is made more alert to the broader meanings of old materials--this is the aim of the correct compilation.[15]

The makers of _Why We Fight_, _Project XX_ films, and _Goodbye Billy_ met with different success in probing the compositional depths of the archival materials available to them. And while attentiveness to compositional content is an important criteria, it is not a principle that can be applied in isolation.

The more obvious characteristics of Russian montage can be found in any textbook on film history or film aesthetics.[16] For this discussion of compilation film, however, a basic distinction must be made

between narrative and intellectual montage.

Edwin S. Porter's Great Train Robbery (1903) demonstrated the effectiveness of narrative montage. D. W. Griffith further developed the cinema syntax of establishing shot, medium shot, and close up. In retrospect these inventions seem obvious, but all students of film know how revolutionary Griffith's development of narrative montage appeared to his contemporaries. Professional filmmakers scoffed at his idea of transforming film into a special medium and fought every suggestion by Griffith that a special assemblage of unlike shots could be related to tell effective stories.

Russian filmmakers followed an entirely different direction with respect to this vital principle of montage. As with their attentiveness to compositional content, these developments were directly related to their goals of swaying the Russian masses. In contrast with the narrative ideal of respecting the natural principles of time and space, the Russians stressed that images be wrenched from their natural settings and juxtaposed in "unnatural" ways to provoke the viewer. Esther Schub's celebration of the Russian school's use of intellectual montage is representative rather than unique:

> This montage must serve as an eloquent illustration of the fact that any available acting method for the historical film, no matter how good or talented, has only an ephemeral value in comparison with the chronicle [her term for compilation] film, which possesses a conviction that can never pale and can never age.[17]

Since the compilation film interprets reality, the principle of montage is always available to evoke ideas. Here again, however, other criteria must be applied simultaneously: a montage which is inattentive to compositional content will have less than its intended effect;

one that smuggles in fiction footage will endanger the film's credibility; images interrupted or clumsily reinforced by inappropriate music or narration will have impaired ability to communicate new ideas. As the compilation has evolved, filmmakers have responded differently to these principles.

Even the so-called "silent" films of the Twenties were connected with the sound of music.[18] Many filmmakers were aware of the power which music could add to their productions. But as with every other potential in the compilation genre, music was subject to less than full exploitation. Most often, it served as a transition for the filmmaker to move from image to image or scene to scene. In the pre-sound days of Schub and Vertov, filmmakers were forced to work more with visual transitions, moving their compilations forward with compositional relationships. Following the advent of sound, many filmmakers depended less on this element and relied on weak visual logic combined with musical support to carry an audience.

Filmmakers generally have complained about the deleterious effects of music on the visual inventiveness of the craft. Especially, music was expected to add more than "atmosphere." Composer Paul Dessau believed that music could specifically serve the compilation's goal of giving broader meanings to visual images: "It is never the purpose of the music to 'underline' a mood, a method that was practised perhaps too often in the past. The music aims, rather, to be a critic or judge."[19] Comic music, for example, could accompany a pompous individual and transform his figure into a ridiculous one. Second, irony could be achieved by playing funereal music while soldiers march into battle, suggesting that they are being driven to their death. Finally,

once moods have been established, leitmotivs could play on previous visual associations, embodying them with fresh symbolic value. Shots of military hardware, for example, embody little symbolic meaning alone. But when orchestrated to traditional patriotic music, they could rapidly, almost simultaneously, symbolize the nationalistic muscles flexed during wartime. Such creative uses of music must be a part of the compilation filmmaker's vocabulary as they can help reveal new and unfamiliar significance to archival images.

As with music, narration has been used with varying success through the history of compilation filmmaking. Obviously words can introduce concepts which will add implication and meaning to visual images. Films of ideas must have a certain ingredient of verbal material to move viewers to accept the political views or historical interpretation of the filmmaker.

But words can be misused, especially if there are too many of them. A properly assembled compilation film sensitive to composition and montage can and should be allowed to tell its story through the visual element. Only the most visually illiterate viewer craves the narrator who verbally articulates what is visually obvious. More often, this style of redundant narration obtrudes itself between the viewer and the film. The viewer does not have to become involved with the film's visual rhetoric. Instead, he can passively accept the report of the narrator. Such films will neither communicate nor profoundly persuade. Certainly, such cases of what Jay Leyda calls "sound conservatism"[20] mistakenly surrender the full impact of the medium.

A second misuse of narration is perhaps even more irritating to the sophisticated viewer. Here the filmmaker uses shots unrelated to his subject simply as a visual "cover." We all know of cases where Rommel's great desert battles are discussed while the camera minutely inspects an irrelevant palm tree. This sort of abuse occurs most frequently when a script has been written prior to a survey of the film archive. As a result, the researcher is tempted to find any available footage--relevant or not--to fill the screen while the obligatory lines are uttered. Although unavoidable time exigencies can affect such choices, it can be said that compilation films are in their most debased state when they resort to such extravagant artificialities.[21]

While the compilation filmmaker strives to maximize impact through the use of compositional content and the montage of aural and visual images, he must at all times keep in mind the principle of credibility. As films of ideas and persuasion, compilations strive to win over their audiences to a special perspective of the past. Russian compilationists Schub and Vertov strove to portray the justice and inevitability of the communist revolution. Frank Capra's Why We Fight series attempted to impose a framework of interpretation on the political developments of the 1930's with an eye for enciting American soldiers and civilians to a fighting spirit. Project XX films often portrayed the world as divided between an East bent on world domination and a West which embodied the principles of freedom. And more recently, Goodbye Billy sought to evoke the shifting moods of America as the tide of World War I flared over it.

To convince a viewer and to retain that conviction, the filmmaker must resist the temptation to use footage which does not really belong

to the scene. While footage with spectacular camera movement or excellent lighting or unusual composition might elicit the greatest impact from archival holdings, selection of footage on this basis alone can threaten the credibility of an entire production. As Jay Leyda explains,

> As little as five fictional feet in an otherwise scrupulous compilation can shake a spectator's belief in the whole film, including its ideas. He has been led to expect actualities. Even though he does not identify a shot as false, merely to sense that something is wrong, to get a whiff of arrangement, can poison for him the whole setting of the tiny falsehood. Such false fragments as I have seen in responsible compilations were not worth the risk. The little that they provided in effect was more than offset by the loss of belief.[22]

It is significant to add that even actuality footage can be used to the detriment of a compilation film if the footage selected comes from scenes or actions other than those which are under consideration. Many viewers are familiar with the stock shot of a burning, twisting Japanese Zero which has appeared in countless films of World War II vintage. If a viewer realizes even subliminally that the compilation filmmaker is merely slapping such images together, employing cinematic "filler," the filmmaker and his goals are in jeopardy. Thus credibility competes with the other guidelines for compilation discovered in the form's earliest days, and applies to all historical examples of the genre.

Among the most persuasive documentaries to come out of World War II were Frank Capra's seven orientation films known as they Why We Fight series. According to an account in Capra's autobiography, Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall told him that "to win this war we must win the battle for men's minds."[23] The Army Bureau of Public Relations had prepared lectures for this purpose, but Marshall believed

they were "unsatisfactory because of the mediocrity of presentation."[24] Convinced that film was the most effective medium, Marshall asked Capra to make a "series of documented, factual films that will explain why we are fighting and the principles for which we are fighting."[25] According to _Why We Fight_'s library researcher Richard Griffith, the series was "specifically intended to give the fighting man an account of world history from the Treaty of Versailles to America's entry into World War II, since it was found that the general knowledge of the average draftee on any subject was poor indeed."[26] In his ambitious effort to teach modern history using motion pictures, Capra based _Why We Fight_ directly on the Army's lectures. His production unit scrutinized newsreels, documentaries, fiction films, and enemy footage that would illustrate the lectures' verbal assertions.[27]

By approaching compilation film work in this manner, Capra violated the procedural rule of compilation filmmaking.[28] _Why We Fight_ incorporates a mixture of sources[29] with no indication of their varying levels of subjectivity. Capra's staff developed their ideas not from the film they used for assembly but instead wrote a script that determined their use of visual materials. When accurate visual materials were not available for illustration, the filmmakers used any footage that would support the predetermined story. This approach tends to weaken _Why We Fight_'s credibility as a documentary whose argument is based on film evidence.

Although _Why We Fight_ contains this variety of sources, the individual films demonstrate an awareness for compositional content.[30] To depict clashing political, military, and ideological forces, the graphic content of images is made to conflict. _Prelude to War_ (1943)

contrasts the freedoms Americans have in their country with the destruction of freedom in Italy, Germany, and Japan. Shots of children playing harmlessly in an American suburb are juxtaposed with staged shots of German and Japanese children playing at warfare. The Axis children march to a deafening drumbeat while their elders look on in a daze. The American children move gently, fluidly, and in relatively soft focus and lighting compared to the stacatto mechanical movements of the enemy's children seen in harsh high-contrast lighting. By accentuating the regimentation of these children to further the ends of enemy militarism, the filmmakers have created a new awareness for the footage's implications. In The Battle of Russia (1944), German and Soviet armies clash. Nazi troops that advance uniformly and inexorably from right to left begin to confront the seeming disorder of the Russian resistance which repels them in a general left to right movement. When the invaders are eventually defeated at Leningrad and Stalingrad, the order of the German advance is transformed into confusion by the Soviet forces that now swarm relentlessly about their enemy in a variety of directions across the screen. This rich exploration of graphic conflict helped the filmmakers shatter the legend of Nazi invincibility and dramatize the heroism of the Russian people. Graphic conflict also helps to make an important point missed by the Germans: generals may win campaigns, but peoples win wars.

Russian film director and theoretician Vsevolod I. Pudovkin admired Prelude to War's "direct, bold, and broad use of montage methods that were discovered in the period of the silent film."[31] In one sequence of goosestepping Nazi soldiers, images repeat until the columns appear to have enlarged. The armies march mechanically as if

sleepwalking, but the repetition of images simultaneously emphasizes their concentrated power and breadth. Repeated shots of hordes of German, Italian, and Japanese civilians, selected from footage that shows only indistinguishable faces, show how fascist leaders have driven the people to hysterical ecstacy. These cohorts parading across the screen bring the viewer closer to those "fascist stooges led by dictators" who have regimented the masses into "just plain old-fashioned militarism." Pudovkin's remark on Why We Fight's montage applies to other episodes. In Divide and Conquer (1943), which records the high point of the Nazi Blitz, we see a series of speeches delivered by German officials. Cut in rapid succession, these images end with a long-held shot of Hitler receiving tumultuous applause. The climactic association of images suggests that Hitler is manipulating governmental puppets for his own ambitions. In The Nazis Strike (1943), shots are cut to dramatize Germany's growing military power. German gliders soar, followed by a close-up shot of faces looking toward the sky, presumably at the gliders. But the next shot reveals the German Luftwaffe. The progression of shots from harmless gliders to instruments of destruction moves the viewer swiftly from a sense of security to the portentousness of Nazi air machinery.

The aural element is used with varying effect in Why We Fight. While it often functions merely to unify images, music is one of the series' stronger elements. The Battle of Russia, the most musical film in the series, relies heavily on musical scores from some of the greatest Russian composers, including Shostakovich, Tschaikovsky, and Prokofiev. Their music is used as leitmotivs to create moods, to build associations, and ultimately to evaluate the visual and aural

images. While the Soviets follow a scorched earth policy combatting the advance of the German army, for example, these leitmotivs play despondently. The triumphal avalanche of scales which opens the finale of Tschaikovsky's Fourth Symphony heightens the drama of Russian victory when the tide finally turns against the Nazis at Stalingrad. One sequence in War Comes to America (1945) employs counterpoint to develop its idea. As Hitler inspects deserted streets and buildings in German-occupied Paris, Judy Garland sings, "The Last Time I Saw Paris." This association of music with visual images comments ironically on the fate of the entire free world if fascism goes unchecked. Music in Prelude to War ridicules fascist leaders. As they march pompously in their elaborate uniforms, gay music plays, reducing the officials to comic figures. In an abrupt cut on the sound track, the narrator explains: "But they weren't comic. They weren't funny. They were deadly serious. They were out for world conquest." Unfortunately, more of the potential within compilation materials could have been released by using more authentic verbal elements. Hearing the enemy's own voice espousing world domination would have given the music something more to critique. One notable exception to unconvincing verbal material occurs in War Comes to America. As Franklin D. Roosevelt, Charles Lindbergh, and Wendell Willkie give speeches promoting recovery efforts of the 1930's, we see scrap metal being shipped to Japan. The discards that Americans once thought would help their country now appear to have had an unexpected effect. Moreover, we get to see and hear real evidence of events and attitudes.

The second weakest point in the series consists of narration imposed on self-explanatory images. With Why We Fight's compilation

method of illustrating verbal assertions, words naturally dominate the episodes. A typical example from Prelude to War shows how narration is used simply to give meaning to obvious sights:

Visuals	Commentary
Crowd of Japanese bowing and cheering war lords.	"Yes . . . in these lands the people surrendered their liberties and threw away their human dignity." (Crowd roars "Bansai.")
Germans frantically hailing Hitler.	"They gave up their rights as individual human beings." (Shouts: "Sieg Heil.")
Italians cheering before Mussolini's palace.	"And became part of a mass human herd." (Shouts: "Vive il Duce.")

Again, Why We Fight has exploited its materials at less than full potential. Perhaps the impact of the visual element would have been greater if the theme of freedom versus enslavement had been established first. Then the shouts that actually originated in the scene could have been heard, reinforcing the idea without the use of distracting verbiage. "Sound conservatism" is also evident in the series' use of animated maps. In Divide and Conquer, we see a map with a black, solid-looking arrow punching out from the black area under Nazi control. As the arrow crumples like an accordion when it "invades" Great Britain, the narrator explains the obvious: "World conquest was impossible without running smack up against the rock called Britain." Divide and Conquer does include reasurring aphorisms, however: "For free men are like rubber balls. The harder they fall, the higher they bounce."

Nothing damages Why We Fight's persuasive power more than its mixture of sources on the same evidentiary level. Because their

subjective level is relatively low, unedited newsreel outtakes and released newsreel footage are ideal sources for compilation films. Unfortunately, all of the episodes in the series contain production footage. In Prelude to War, shots of the assassination of socialist Giacomo Matteoliti during the rise of fascism in Italy were obviously staged or taken from a fiction film. In the same episode, a scene of a classroom of German children comes from a similarly questionable source. As the children look up at a picture of Hitler and sing, "Adolph Hitler is our saviour, our hero. He is the noblest being in the whole world," one cannot avoid wondering how this actuality was managed. In a film that purports to tell the truth such artificialities, although cleverly and smoothly photographed and effective as fiction, only detract from the credibility of the visual evidence.

A more damaging tendency occurs in the use of footage from completed documentary films of different origins and points of view. Rather than actual newsreel footage, approximately half of Why We Fight's sources comes from German propaganda films such as Triumph of the Will, Baptism of Fire, and Victory in the West, and other documentaries such as The City and The River (American), and Target for Tonight and Listen to Britain (British). As this footage passes from unedited newsreel footage to the more complex documentary form, the level of subjectivity increases in proportion to the editing processes applied. Even the viewer who does not recognize the varied origins of the shots senses an undercurrent of bias. This not only hurts the credibility of a film which is supposed to be presenting evidence; lack of believability also lessens the impact of the whole montage. Yet even wartime production pressures had less of a detrimental effect

on Why We Fight's use of stock footage than deadlines would have on Capra's documentary successors on television.

The intent to involve and persuade huge audiences, to dramatize the great issues of the time, temporarily lost its force with the war's end. By the time real and imagined crises loomed on the horizon in the 1950's, television had arrived to meet the new demand for documentary films. Vaults all over the world housed incredible amounts of footage, so compilation naturally became one of the most convenient and popular documentary forms for television. Networks offered exciting and dramatic compilation series such as Victory at Sea and Project XX (NBC), Air Power and The Twentieth Century (CBS), and The Valiant Years (ABC). NBC was the first to broadcast its productions to nationwide audiences.

NBC's Project XX chief Henry Salomon promised that his group would

> give twentieth-century man the opportunity to stand apart from himself, for a long look at himself, and the world in which he lives. . . . If we do our work well, our drama will be so alive in its impact that its meaning and emotions will echo and re-echo in the viewer's mind long after the sight and sound of the programs have disappeared.[32]

To achieve these ambitious goals, Salomon constructed his films using the Why We Fight method. Victory at Sea had met with popular success by following Capra's compilation approach, so the Project XX production unit selected film, words, and music that would illustrate their predetermined point of view. If the footage indicated a different perspective, it was manipulated to support the story line or replaced by other sources.[33] No announcement of the footage's mixed origin is ever made. While such an admission would have tended to discredit Project XX's use of film as evidence, when the viewer notices the disparity he cannot avoid experiencing a sense of disbelief.

Project XX films use the aural element at far less than its full potential. Composer Robert Russell Bennett believed that music should "push the emotions of the viewer in the same direction as the picture [to] advance the story line."[34] While this may be theoretically sound, it mixes poorly in some of the Isaac Kleinerman footage soufflés. In The Great War (1956), men and machinery tumble across the battlefield to the tempo of a heroic musical score. This scene was obviously staged: newsreel cameramen could not have managed dolly shots at the front line. The music helps distract attention from this stopgap. Yet given the mixture of dissimilar footage, music could have been used more effectively. A bravado score played in conjunction with fiction footage could have been followed by a somber variation that accompanied newsreel images. This might have introduced new ideas for old footage: that while Americans see imaginary battles in darkened theaters, there are other dimensions to heroism. Nor is music used to explore the complexity in history. The narrator informs us that "America goes to war wide-eyed and eager," but the unchanged musical mood during the battle makes the film fictional, not documentary. As the drama intensifies, the music makes it all too easy to forget that these images are neither historical nor documentary, but part of an entertaining melodrama which has flattened the history, forgotten the human misery, and violated basic responsibilities of the compilation film.[35]

Project XX's narration may be less offensive to the sensibilities than its music, but words come in such great profusion that they exhaust the viewer before he can respond to visual associations. Writer Richard Hanser believed that "to see the pictures alone is often confusing and even irritating, until the narration clarifies them and

gives them meaning."[36] In The Twisted Cross (1956), however, narration only duplicates the film images.

Visuals	Commentary
Persecuting Jews through propaganda, intimidation, and vandalism.	"Hitler looses the flood of his demonic personality on the German people."
Reichstag burning.	"The Nazis burn the Reichstag as a pretext for abolishing civil liberties and arresting political opponents. In the ashes of the Reichstag democracy flickers out and the time of terrorism begins."
SS troops terrorizing German people.	". . . creatures of the gutters and the alleys."
Hitler speaking before enthusiastic crowds alternates with political rioting.	"The demand of Hitler is a cry for violence. Violence against the republic and destruction of the Versailles Peace Treaty which shackles German militarism. Violence against the Jews, and destruction of all who question the radical superiority of the Germans."

Since Hitler had been released from prison in the preceding scene, The Twisted Cross might have been more convincing if the commentary had not explained what is visually obvious. With evidence of the Reichstag destruction framed by shots of Nazi oppression, the commentary is only redundant in its statement about Nazi motivation. The biting reference to the SS may seem like a refreshing narrative technique; visual depiction, however, makes the statement adequately. The commentary only detracts from the graphic shots used as evidence.

Project XX's indiscriminate mixture of footage usually hurts the montage. In The Great War (1956), the filmmakers attempted to interpret America's participation in World War I. Several different

sequences contrast a peaceful atmosphere of indifference in the United States before the war with the battles simultaneously raging in Europe. The sources' textures differ markedly because of shooting conditions. Images of foreign turmoil appear to be of newsreel origin, but the shots of the United States were staged for a 1940 documentary, The Ramparts We Watch. While the graphic element might appear to contrast adequately to convey this informational theme, the obvious (and unannounced) mixture of footage tends to discredit the source's value as evidence. The effectiveness for communicating ideas decreases proportionately. Three, Two, One, Zero (1954) attempted to persuade viewers that the Soviet development of atomic power has had a deleterious effect on global stability. In one obviously staged shot, sinister-looking Russian scientists work in a laboratory. As one of the characters in this relatively placid shot empties his test tube, a vertical wipe reveals atomic bomb detonations in the shots that follow. This arrangement of images ineffectively dramatizes a cause-effect relationship: Soviet nuclear science has resulted in destruction. What appears peaceful will, in the wrong hands, quickly degenerate into a negative force. Although the violence of the second shot conflicts with the tranquility of the first, the montage is not very persuasive. Because the first shot is so obviously staged, the gap between informational and graphic content is too wide for the footage to be accepted as evidence.

Project XX editors did not resist the temptation to include visually exciting footage from fiction sources. In Nightmare in Red (1955), the filmmakers wanted to portray the violence of the actual battles of the Bolshevik revolution. In addition, they wanted entertaining and

dramatic excitement which no actuality material could supply. But fiction footage was on hand. There were scenes from Eisenstein's The Battleship Potemkin (1925) and another Eisenstein film about revolution, October (1928). Anyone who has seen Nightmare in Red knows how exciting these re-edited sequences are, but even the most naive viewer watching the film must eventually begin to ask himself: How did a cameraman get close enough to the battle to record such crisp, steady close-ups of faces, hands, weapons? How could a cameraman have taken such excellent and dramatic advantage of natural light sources? Viewers who have previously seen the two Russian classics have even stronger doubts to overcome.[37]

The indiscriminate use of completed documentary footage in Project XX films has a more damaging effect. In tracing the effect of the pivotal Reichstag elections of July 31, 1932, The Twisted Cross editors interrupted some very convincing actuality footage with shots taken from a Nazi propaganda film, Triumph of the Will (1936). The shot order and origin is as follows:

1. Hindenburg arriving at Reichstag following the Nazi party's win of a majority in German Parliament (newsreel).
2. Hitler receiving enthusiastic popular support from thousands of Germans (Triumph of the Will).
3. Reichstag burning (newsreel).
4. Concentration camps (U.S. invasion force actuality, 1945).

The Twisted Cross could have used the footage more credibly to make a point about Nazi propaganda. As the sequence stands, we are told that

the Nazi political victory of 1932 resulted in immediate popularity for Hitler before destruction of the Reichstag. But the footage that shows the masses supporting Hitler neither dates from 1932 nor represents the actual support Hitler enjoyed. Triumph of the Will, among the most powerful propaganda films ever made, was shot under highly controlled conditions. Thus, the images presented as historical evidence represent an actuality different from the footage's use of them as evidence. The filmmakers made no attempt to explore the ideas in this inviting subject. Had they wanted to examine the power of Nazi propaganda, Triumph of the Will would unquestionably have been appropriate footage. But to edit in any film that carries the story discredits the film as documentary evidence. Little attempt has been made in The Twisted Cross to go beyond simple chronological interpretations. In both principle and practice, Project XX films mark a low point in American compilation filmmaking.

More recently, American filmmakers have shown an increasing interest in responsible compilation film work. Since the genre typically uses evidence of an historical nature, professional historians and students of culture are beginning to publish film scholarship in the film medium itself. Writing along these lines, compilation filmmaker Hans Richter believed that the task of such film essays "is to portray a concept. Even what is invisible must be made visible. Acted scenes as well as directly recorded actualities must all be thought of as bits of evidence in an argument, an argument that aims to make problems, thoughts, even ideas, generally understood."[38]

Working in this spirit, historians collaborated in the making of Goodbye Billy to provide media-saturated students with a more genuinely

stimulating film than what is commercially offered for television and the classroom.[39] They used the potential of film language not merely to report what happened, but to make the viewer participate in a turbulent emotional experience. To convey these experiences, the film-makers avoided a strictly linear account. Instead, they concentrated their efforts on theme by rapidly and violently juxtaposing aural and visual imagery.

Subtitled An Emotional History of the Times, Goodbye Billy sweeps the viewer up in the "innocent" enthusiasm for the Great War in part one. The experience of the second third becomes more complex: aural and visual images begin to conflict, recreating the same kind of emotional and mental strain which Americans felt when the war touched them personally. As the war affected the entire nation, the final third takes the viewer through the dissonant world of the "lost generation." Goodbye Billy depicts a nation violently drawn into an emotional commitment to the war. In the film, the American people gradually confront the grim reality of their commitment. Finally, they emerge into a disoriented and uncertain future.

Recognizing that even the most skilled montage in a historical compilation film would ultimately be ineffective without credible evidence, the makers of Goodbye Billy avoided incorporating footage with a high level of subjectivity. Realizing the pitfalls in using footage and mixing provenances of this period, the filmmakers examined holdings available in the National Archives Signal Corps Collection. While some of this film stock includes reenacted and staged scenes, it represents footage closest to actuality from this time in American film history.[25] No instances of the slick photography associated with

fiction films or the previous bias associated with completed documentary films appear in Goodbye Billy. Thus, the impact of the film's montage is reinforced by the authentic texture of unvarnished actuality footage.

From the very first shot the viewer is placed in a first person point of view with respect to the aural and visual images. The opening shot seats the viewer in a pre-war theater by showing President Woodrow Wilson's request made to war-anxious motion picture audiences of the day:

> President Wilson has asked Americans to maintain absolute neutrality in the war abroad. Please refrain from partisan expressions during this picture, thereby respecting the President's request.

This immediately thrusts him into a participant role. As long as the aural and visual images selected for the film are contemporaneous with the World War I era, point of view remains in first person. Since we see only images and hear only sounds that an individual living in the midst of these historical events would have experienced, for the film's duration we vicariously become that person.

Goodbye Billy explores the compositional qualities inherent in its archival materials. In part one, crowds of civilians and soldiers display their enthusiasm for the business and war and move rapidly in a general right to left direction. Military inductees eagerly don their new uniforms. Aboard ships headed for France that move from right to left, the soldiers participate in carefree games to kill time. Back at home, familiar public figures such as Theodore Roosevelt, Charlie Chaplin, Marie Dressler, and Douglas Fairbanks urge crowds on to new heights of nationalism. Patriotic parades of cheering,

flag-waving people march briskly across the screen. These scenes involve the viewer in the popular attitudes of the day. Rapid cutting reinforces the energetic movement. The filmmakers have selected footage that moves in the same general direction within the frame. Movement in a variety of directions would have confused the meaning of part one: war fever has intoxicated Americans so that they were unable to stand back and consider the war's reality.

In part two, this rapid movement within and among frames begins to conflict as it alternates with shots of battlefield and trenches. The patriots comfortably at home continue to move rapidly, in the same right to left direction, but the rapidly cut movement of soldiers on the battlefield tends to be in a variety of directions, often circular. These compositional conflicts emphasize the increasing gulf between the war at home and the war "over there." In another scene, a slick advertising poster for a Packard truck alternates with shots of a battle-scarred Packard truck being extricated from the mud in which it is engulfed somewhere at the front. The juxtaposition of different textures and movements of this archival footage suggests that American pride in technology may not rescue the country from the chaotic times that lie ahead.

Part three pulls the viewer into a retrospective position. Pace of both the edited and compositional movement slows. Preparation of the living and dead for return to the United States comes in gruesome shots of long duration. A burial team wraps decomposed corpses in army blankets, sprinkles them with formaldehyde, and places them in pine coffins. Disfigured soldiers try on masks that will conceal their newly acquired deformities. The movement of soldiers is less hurried

as they return home. They are beginning to ponder their horrible experience. So are Americans at home thinking about the recent past. As President Warren G. Harding dedicates the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery, the pace slows even further. A long-held overhead shot of the ceremony pans over the listening crowd. Along with Harding's audience, the viewer is encouraged to reflect on his recent experience.

The final shot in Goodbye Billy, held for over one minute, increases aesthetic distance even more. In this reenactment scene, the only movement is of a woman caring for the grave of a loved one in a military cemetery. The camera zooms out slowly from her figure. A static shot of the cemetery ends the film. Stillness encourages the viewer to ponder further the events witnessed and allows time to absorb the film's interpretation of the war experience.

The aural elements are used effectively in Goodbye Billy. Except for the final scenes, nearly all of the sounds (and sights) in the film originated with the era depicted. Part one uses patriotic music such as "The Stars and Stripes Forever" with visual images of patriotism. Parts two and three, however, use this musical theme ironically. Shots of a wrecked zeppelin followed by crosses in a cemetery appear while "The Stars and Stripes Forever" plays dissonantly. The patriotism rampant as the film showed America entering the war has now gone sour.

Goodbye Billy employs no narration until the final minutes of part three. Its function there is to pull the viewer back from the war experience into a retrospective position. As President Harding dedicates the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the narrator reads from the "Body of an American" chapter of John Dos Passos' 1919. The Harding

speech gradually shifts into the background. In this montage, the competition of sounds suggests that official rhetoric is no longer important to Americans who have endured the war experience. In the final graveside scene, the narrator speaks slowly: "Here, dead we lie, because we did not wish to shame the land from which we sprung. Life to be sure, is not much to lose. But young men think it is, and we were young." Omission of voice-over narration until the final minutes makes the experience of Goodbye Billy more genuine.

As with any good historical compilation, Goodbye Billy strives for credibility. Only the filmmakers know if fiction and documentary footage was selected as stopgaps. Yet repeated screenings of the film indicate that none of these shortcuts were taken. Further strengthening Goodbye Billy's credibility is the filmmakers' reliance on aural elements of a similar origin. At the least, their choice of raw materials for Goodbye Billy does not subvert the credibility of the production. More significantly, the authenticity of materials used as evidence reinforces the authority and impact of the ideas presented. With this advantage, the filmmakers have created an effective montage of visual and aural imagery.

The filmmakers have used the powers of montage to explore irony in the events of Goodbye Billy. In a scene that juxtaposes aural and visual imagery, President Emeritus of Harvard Charles W. Eliot indicts German militarism as the "fundamental trouble with civilization" while we see images of American militarism that contradict his statement: the Knights Templar parade in plumes and full military regalia. Later, a reporter announces, "Several stories have come to me, well authenticated, concerning the depths of Hindenburg's brutality." But the next

shot reveals American brutality: a segregated Negro battalion marches off to perform its menial duties. Each montage dramatizes the irony of national rhetoric that obscures national reality. The irony is developed further when men fight in the real war while Enrico Caruso sings a stateside song, "Johnny, Get Your Gun." Next, an explosion followed by the body it has shattered is juxtaposed ironically with a spoken motif heard earlier in the film: "If me mother could see me now."

Montage also develops a major symbol in Goodbye Billy. In part one, a lengthy sequence of industrial activities alternates with shots of patriotic demonstrations, associating American industry with war victory. Industrial machinery appears to rumble powerfully and symbolically on, unstoppable:

Visual	Aural
Troops digging trenches at front lines.	Music: "Pack up your troubles in your old kit bag and smile, smile . . ."
Workers and machinery in steel plant (two shots).	Industrial music (introduces the leitmotiv heard next).
Workers with cutting torch.	
Workers at lathe (two shots).	
Workers riveting ship.	
Shipbuilding activities (three shots).	
Soldiers training.	Industrial music (leitmotiv).
Manufacturing activities.	Voice of Samuel Gompers superimposed on industrial leitmotiv: "This war is a people's war. Labor's war. The final outcome will be determined in the factories, the mills, the shops, the
Patriotic parades (two shots).	
Cheering crowd.	

Visual	Aural
(continued)	
Shiplaunching (two shots).	mines, the farms, the industries, and transportation agencies of
Girl working in factory.	the various countries. That group of contries which has most
Woman in patriotic hat.	successfully organized its agencies of production and
Lathe workers (two shots).	transportation . . . will . . . win. . . . Our republic, the
Munitions ready for shipping.	freedom of the world, progress and civilization hang in the balance. We dare not fail; we
Several shots of men and equipment moving toward the front.	will win."

This impact montage of visual and aural imagery establishes industry as a force that will embody new symbolic value later in the film. As soldiers trod through the cities that have been reduced to rubble and while the camera inspects the devastation of the French countryside, the industrial leitmotiv plays once again. But now the association of images points to industry as an instrument of destruction, not civilization. The sights and sounds have been allowed to make the point by themselves, without distracting voice-over narration or music that is inconsistent with the visual evidence.

Even with the vast archival materials available to them, Capra, and Salomon especially, did not explore the full potential in their footage. Why We Fight and Project XX films may demonstrate an awareness of these cinematic qualities, but their techniques often seem contrived. Content shaped in ignorance ultimately impedes genuine attempts at rich expressions of ideas. Adherence to basic compilation principles might have increased the time involved, but more discipline would certainly have led to more effective, more credible, and thus more persuasive films. Keeping to heavy examination schedules

requiring the scrutiny of miles of raw footage, with no guarantee that the materials will yield a legitimate theme, might appear to be a limitation. But in archival film work, shortcuts are seldom conducive to the aim of the compilation film. By sticking to their beliefs in the integrity of film documents and in the need for compilation themes to come from within the raw materials, the makers of Goodbye Billy have given themselves an advantage over Capra and Salomon. Learning from a negative tradition and following the Russian example may have been laborious and time-consuming, but such efforts had their rewards--a correct and thus a persuasive compilation. As the slag-heaps of old film grow and the cost of shooting new footage rises, the compilation form will become even more popular. Responsible artists who shape the materials and discriminating viewers why "buy" the finished product will continue to define the principles for compilation film and to seek the potentials of this documentary genre.

NOTES

[1]For an analysis of the contributions to film art of George Melies, Porter, and D. W. Griffith, see Lewis Jacobs, The Emergence of Film Art (New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1969), pp. 10-57.

[2]Obviously compilation films were not abandoned until World War II, but the Why We Fight series, like early Russian compilations, was designed as official propaganda to be distributed on a mass scale.

[3]The federal government first showed an interest in documentary films when it sponsored Pare Lorentz's The Plow That Broke The Plains (1936) and The River (1937). Although Lorentz was able to make persuasive films of notable aesthetic quality, he lacked administrative abilities. For an examination of Lorentz's work, see Peter Rollins and Harris J. Elder, "Environmental History in Two New Deal Documentaries: The Plow That Broke The Plains and The River," Film and History, 3 (1973), 1-7 and Robert L. Snyder's torpid Pare Lorentz and the Documentary Film (Norman, Okla.: Univ. of Okla. Press, 1968). A critical history of government-sponsored films can be found in Richard Dyer MacCann, The People's Films: A Political History of U. S. Government Motion Pictures (New York: Hastings House, 1973).

[4]Films in the series are: Prelude to War, The Nazis Strike, Divide and Conquer, and The Battle of Britain (1943); The Battle of China and The Battle of Russia (1944); War Comes to America (1945).

Those who assisted Capra included Anatole Litvak, Leonard Spigelgass, John Huston, Walter Huston, Eric Knight, Anthony Veiller, and Richard Griffith.

[5]For an in-depth examination of the series, see Peter Rollins, "Victory at Sea: Cold War Epic," Journal of Popular Culture, 6 (1972), 463-482.

[6]Penelope Houston, "The Nature of the Evidence," Sight and Sound, 36, No. 2 (1967), 90, writes that "In so far as films are a primary source material, they ought to be protected by the same disciplines as written documents." C. Hagle, "Use and Abuse of Stock Footage," Film Comment, 4, No. 2 (1967), 50, believes that "producers and editors of compilation films should consider the integrity of the primary material before re-using it within a new context."

[7]Hagle, p. 51, states that "If a documentary purports to document reality, then the film maker must be prepared to sacrifice effect now and then. Frankly, there must be more urgent imperatives than shots that 'work,' especially where the subjects of the films involve war and national effort and major social issues."

[8]Professor John Greenville of the British Universities Consortium believes that "The historian investigates the evidence of film in a different way from the film maker who is not an historian. He can relate and compare film evidence with written evidence thereby widening his analysis of the visual and written materials. But, he also interprets the film evidence in its own right. Evidence whether written or film does not interpret itself. It has to be interpreted by historians

if the result is to be 'History.' . . . The historian's approach to documentary film making can not be first /to/ write a script about some historical event and then to search through film archives. This would be using film evidence not in its own right adding further to our understanding but merely as illustration which adds to our interpretation. A good many documentaries have been constructed in this way nevertheless. They may be excellent as entertainment but they are certainly not historical studies using film." As quoted in Patrick Griffin, "Film, Document, and the Historian," Film and History, 2 (1972), 2.

[9]Siegfried Kracauer, From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1947), pp. 275-331.

[10]Schub later wrote of how she discovered this potential in old newsreels: "In the montage I tried to avoid looking at the newsreel material for its own sake, and to maintain the principle of its documentary quality. All was subordinated to the theme. This gave me the possibility, in spite of the known limitations of the photographed events and facts, to link the meanings of the material so that it evoked the pre-revolutionary period and the February days." Published in Krupnym planom (In Close Up) (Moscow, 1959), as quoted in Jay Leyda, Films Beget Films: A Study of the Compilation Film (New York: Hill and Wang, 1964), p. 25.

[11]From Caligari to Hitler, p. 297.

[12]As quoted in Leyda, p. 79.

[13]Marcel Martin in "Les Films de Montage," Cinema 63, April 1963, p. 24, believes that "One should keep in mind that montage is not a simple succession of shots, nor even a sum of their contents, but produces something new, something original."

[14]Films Beget Films, p. 140.

[15]Leyda, p. 45.

[16]Sergei Eisenstein discusses "Methods of Montage" in Film Form: Essays in Film Theory, ed., trans. Jay Leyda (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1949), pp. 72-83.

[17]As quoted in Leyda, p. 26.

[18]Charles M. Berg, "The Human Voice and the Silent Cinema," Journal of Popular Film, 4 (1975), 174, concludes that "Because of the failure of inventors to deliver 'the myth of total cinema' in one neat package, motion picture showmen were forced to experiment with alternatives to synchronized recorded sound due to audiences' felt need for aural stimulation."

[19]As quoted in Leyda, p. 84.

[20]Films Beget Films, p. 107.

[21]Siegfried Kracauer, Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960), pp. 118-119, called this practice "spoken editorials, with the visuals thrown into the bargain." I. V. Pudovkin advised Leyda in 1946 to "treasure that direct linkage between seen facts which can be visually shown, and present it not only

through the words of the commentator. . . . If you succeed in convincing the spectator not only by the logic of consistently presented thought but also strike him with the unexpected spectacle of direct interlinkage of what would seem unrelated facts divided in time and space, the impact of such a picture multiplies in force" (as quoted in Leyda, p. 66).

[22]Films Beget Films, p. 130.

[23]The Name Above the Title (New York: Macmillan, 1971), p. 327.

[24]Congressional Record, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 8 Feb. 1943, p. 674.

[25]Capra, p. 327.

[26]Griffith's contribution to Paul Rotha, Documentary Film (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), p. 310.

[27]MacCann, p. 156. For a brief analysis of the series, see William Thomas Murphy, "The Method of Why We Fight," Journal of Popular Film, 1 (1972), 185-196. An historical analysis of the series is examined in Thomas Bohn, "An Historical and Descriptive Analysis of the Why We Fight Series," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1968.

[28]Leyda, Films Beget Films, p. 119, stresses that the procedure "of writing the script first, and then struggling to find and fit the images to it . . . is not workable with the compilation film."

[29]Photographic scenarios containing written narrations and descriptions are filed among the central files of the records of the

Office of the Chief Signal Officer. Project folders Nos. 6000-6005 and 11000, Accession 52-248 (RG 111), Washington National Records Center. The origin of each shot was carefully recorded in shot lists compiled by Capra's unit. The lists reveal title of source, if any, and name of company or government agency. Signal Corps motion picture case files, OF 1-7, NA.

[30]Leyda, Films Beget Films, p. 23, states that "In the cutting of past newsreels to present historical concepts or to 'agitate' an audience into thinking, it has become obvious today that to neglect the formal content of each piece weakens its informational content, and leaves the audience groping for the purpose of the sequence and the idea of the whole."

[31]"The Global Film," Hollywood Quarterly, 2 (1947), 327.

[32]As quoted in Lewis Jacobs, ed., The Documentary Tradition From Nanook to Woodstock (New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1971), p. 298.

[33]A. William Bluem, Documentary in American Television (New York: Hastings House, 1965), p. 147.

[34]Bennett's contribution to a 1957 Seminar on Documentary at the University of Denver, as quoted in Bluem, pp. 152, 153.

[35]John Grierson, "Propaganda and Education," in Grierson on Documentary, ed. Forsyth Hardy, rev. ed. (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1966), p. 294, registered a similar complaint about documentary film: "These easy concepts and easy words, when they are once broken down, bring us in full view of the social and political reality of our

time, with all its problems and all its perspectives and all its hopes. We do not achieve an understanding of any one of them by splashing romantically, Hollywood fashion, through the braveries of battle or by dwelling in great self-righteousness on abstract issues of might and right, evil and good. . . . If we are to persuade, we have to reveal; and we have to reveal in terms of reality."

[36]University of Denver Seminar on Documentary, as quoted in Bluem, p. 151.

[37]Patrick D. Hazard, "Nightmare in Red," Senior Scholastic, 6 Oct. 1955, p. 52, noted that "Because the viewer is an emotional captive of the screen, the problem of editorializing in a documentary must be stressed. This you can do by showing how the documentary techniques can be abused to persuade people to believe falsehoods."

[38]As quoted in Leyda, p. 31.

[39]The filmmakers discuss their attitudes toward compilation film work in separate articles. See Griffin, "Film, Document, and the Historian," 1-5; R. C. Raack, "Clio's Dark Mirror: The Documentary Film in History," The History Teacher, 6 (1972), 109-118. Musicologist William F. Malloch collaborated with Raack in a long-playing record "The Stars and Stripes and You" (Pox Productions, 1971), an aural compilation of the World War I period. For a specific discussion of Goodbye Billy, see Patrick Griffin, "The Making of Goodbye Billy," Film and History, 2 (1972), 6-10.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berg, Charles M. "The Human Voice and the Silent Cinema." Journal of Popular Film, 4 (1975), 165-177.

Bluem, A. William. Documentary in American Television. New York: Hastings House, 1965.

Bohn, Thomas. "An Historical and Descriptive Analysis of the Why We Fight Series." Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Capra, Frank. The Name Above the Title: An Autobiography. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Congressional Record. 78th Congress, 1st Session, 8 Feb. 1943.

Eisenstein, Sergei. Film Form: Essays in Film Theory. Ed., trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1949.

Grierson, John. Grierson on Documentary. Ed. Forsyth Hardy. Rev. ed., Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1966.

Griffin, Patrick. "Film, Document, and the Historian." Film and History, 2 (1972), 1-5.

Griffin, Patrick. "The Making of Goodbye Billy." Film and History, 2 (1972), 6-10.

Hagle, C. "Use and Abuse of Stock Footage." Film Comment, 4, No. 2 (1967), 47-53.

Hazard, Patrick D. "Nightmare in Red." Senior Scholastic, 6 Oct. 1955, pp. 34, 52.

Houston, Penelope. "The Nature of the Evidence." Sight and Sound, 36, No. 2 (1967), 90-92.

Jacobs, Lewis, ed. The Documentary Tradition From Nanook to Woodstock. New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1971.

Jacobs, Lewis. The Emergence of Film Art. New York: Hopkinson and Blake, 1969.

Kracauer, Siegfried. From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1947.

Kracauer, Siegfried. Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960.

Leyda, Jay. Films Beget Films: A Study of the Compilation Film. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.

MacCann, Richard Dyer. The People's Films: A Political History of U. S. Government Motion Pictures. New York: Hastings House, 1973.

Martin, Marcel. "Les Films de Montage." Cinema 63, April 1963, pp. 22-27.

Murphy, William Thomas. "The Method of Why We Fight." Journal of Popular Film, 1 (1972), 185-196.

Office of the Chief Signal Officer. Project Folders Nos. 6000-6005 and 11000, Accession 52-248 (RG 111), Washington National Records Center.

Office of the Chief Signal Officer. Signal Corps motion picture case files, OF 1-7, NA.

Pudovkin, Vsevolod I. "The Global Film." Hollywood Quarterly, 2 (1947), 327-332.

Raack, R. C. "Clio's Dark Mirror: The Documentary Film in History." The History Teacher, 6 (1972), 109-118.

Rollins, Peter and Harris J. Elder. "Environmental History in Two New Deal Documentaries: The Plow That Broke the Plains and The River." Film and History, 3 (1973), 1-7.

Rollins, Peter. "Victory at Sea: Cold War Epic." Journal of Popular Culture, 6 (1972), 463-482.

Rotha, Paul. Documentary Film. London: Faber and Faber, 1952.

Snyder, Robert L. Pare Lorentz and the Documentary Film. Norman: Univ. of Okla. Press, 1968.

VITA

Harris James Elder

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE COMPILATION FILM: PRINCIPLES AND POTENTIALS OF A DOCUMENTARY GENRE

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, March 31, 1945.

Education: Graduated from Bartlesville College High School, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, in May, 1963; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Oklahoma State University in May, 1968; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1976.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, 1973-1976; research work on a compilation film, _Will Rogers' 1920s: A Cowboy's Guide to the Times_ (1976).