By far the greater majority of full-length films are fiction films. The fiction film is created from a screenplay, and all the resources and techniques of the cinema are directed toward the successful realization on the screen of the screenplay. Any treatment of motion picture production will naturally and logically begin, therefore, with a discussion of the screenplay.

1. THE SCREENPLAY.—The screenplay, which is sometimes known, also, as the scenario or film script, resembles the blueprint of the architect. It is the verbal design of the finished film. In studios where films are made in great numbers, and under industrial conditions, the writer prepares the screenplay under the supervision of a producer, who represents the budgetary and box office concerns of the front office, and who may be responsible for several scripts simultaneously. Under ideal conditions, the screenplay is prepared by the writer in collaboration with the director. This practice, long the custom in Europe, has become more common in the United States with the increase of independent production. Indeed, not infrequently, the writer may also be the director.

In its progress toward completion, the screenplay normally passes through certain stages; these stages have been established over the years and depend on the working habits of those engaged in writing it. The practice of these years has come to establish three main stages: (1) the outline; (2) the treatment; (3) the screenplay. The outline, as the term implies, gives the essence of the action or story and may present either an original idea or, more usually, one derived from a successful stage play or novel. The outline is then built up into the treatment. This is a prose narrative, written in the present tense, in greater or less detail, that reads like a description of what will finally appear on the screen. This treatment is broken down into screenplay form, which like its stage counterpart, sets out the dialogue, describes the movements and reactions of the actors, and at the same time gives the breakdown of the individual scenes, with some indication of the role, in each scene, of the camera and the sound. It likewise serves as a guide to the various technical departments: to the art department for the sets, to the casting department for the actors, to the costume department, to makeup, to the music department, and so on.

The writer, who should be as skilled in the dialogue of images as of words, must have the capacity to anticipate, visually and in detail, the finished film. The detailed screenplay, prepared ahead, not only saves time and money in production but also enables the director to hold securely to the unity of form and to the cinematic structure of the action, while leaving him free to work intimately and concentratedly with the actors.

Unlike the screenplays of today, the first scripts had no dramatic form, being merely lists of proposed scenes, and their content when filmed was strung together in the order listed. Anything that called for further explanation was covered in a title.

Step by step, as the form and scope of the film developed, the screenplay grew more and more detailed. The pioneer of these detailed screenplays was Thomas Ince, whose remarkable capacity for visualizing the finally edited film made a detailed script possible. In contrast were the talents of D. W. Griffith, who contributed more than almost any other single individual to the establishment of the technique of filmmaking, and who never used a script.

By the early 1920s, the writer was meticulously indicating every shot, whereas today, when the scenarist writes less in images and gives more attention to dialogue, leaving the choice of images to the director, the tendency is to confine the script to the master scenes, so called because they are key scenes, covering whole sections of the action, as distinct from individual camera shots. This practice also follows on the increasingly common use of the novelist to adapt his own books; he is likely to be unfamiliar with the
process of detailed dramatic and cinematic development. The dramatist, on the other hand, called on to adapt his play, is usually found to be more naturally disposed to do the work effectively. However, the scenarist is faced with a more difficult task than the dramatist. While the latter is, indeed, called upon to sustain the interest of an audience for three acts, these acts are broken up by intervals during which the audience can relax. The screenwriter is faced with the task of holding the attention of the audience for an uninterrupted two hours or longer. He must so grip their attention that they will stay on, held from scene to scene, till the climax is reached. Thus it is that, because screenwriting must build the action continuously, the stage dramatist, used to the building of successive climaxes, will tend to make a better film scenarist.

Sequences must never peter out but must carry the action forward, much as the car of a ratchet railway is carried forward, cog by cog. This is not to say that film is either theater or novel. Its nearest parallel is the short story, which is as a rule concerned to sustain one idea and ends when the action has reached the highest point of the dramatic curve. A novel may be read at intervals and with interruptions; a play has breaks between the acts; but the short story is rarely put down and in this it resembles the film, which makes a unique demand for uninterrupted attention upon its audience. This unique demand explains the need for a steady development of a plot and the creation of gripping situations arising out of the plot, all of which must be presented, above all, with visual skill. The alternative is ineliminable dialogue, which must inevitably send a cinema audience to sleep. The most powerful means of gripping attention is suspense. It can be either the suspense inherent in a situation or the suspense that has the audience asking, “What will happen next?” It is indeed vital that they should ask themselves this question. Suspense is created by the process of giving the audience information that the character in the scene does not have. In The Wages of Fear, for example, the audience knew that the truck being driven over dangerous ground contained dynamite. This moved the question from, “What will happen next?” to, “Will it happen next?” What happens next is a question concerned with the behavior of characters in given circumstances.

In the theater, the performance of the actor carries the audience along. Thus dialogue and ideas suffice. This is not so in the motion picture. The broad structural elements of the story on the screen must be cloaked in atmosphere and character and, finally, in dialogue. If it is strong enough, the basic structure, with its inherent developments, will suffice to take care of the emotions of the audience, provided the element represented by the question “What happens next?” is present. Often a successful play fails to make a successful film because this element is missing.

It is a temptation in adapting stage plays for the screen writer to use the wider resources of the cinema, that is to say, to go outside, to follow the actor offstage. On Broadway, the action of the play may take place in one room. The scenarist, however, feels free to open up the set, to go outside more often than not. This is wrong. It is better to stay with the play. The action was structurally related by the playwright to three walls and the proscenium arch. It may well be, for example, that much of his drama depends on the question, “Who is at the door?” This effect is ruined if the camera goes outside the room. It dissipates the dramatic tension. The departure from the more or less straightforward photography of plays came with the growth of techniques proper to film, and the most significant of these occurred when Griffith took the camera and moved it in from its position at the proscenium arch, where George Méliès had placed it, to a close-up of the actor. The next step came when, improving on the earlier attempts of Edwin S. Porter and others, Griffith began to set the strips of film together in a sequence and rhythm that came to be known as montage; it took the action outside the confines of time and space, even as they apply to the theater.

The stage play provides the screenwriter with a certain basic dramatic structure that may call, in adaptation, for little more than the dividing up of its scenes into a number of shorter scenes. The novel, on the other hand, is not structurally dramatic in the sense in which the word is applied to stage or screen. Therefore, in adapting a novel that is entirely compounded of words, the screenwriter must completely forget them and ask himself what the novel is about. All else—including characters and locale—is momentarily put aside. When this basic question has been answered, the writer starts to build up the story again.

The screenwriter does not have the same leisure as the novelist to build up his characters. He must do this side by side with the unfolding of the first part of the narrative. However, by way of compensation, he has other resources not available to the novelist...
or the dramatist, in particular the use of things. This is one of the ingredients of true cinema. To put things together visually; to tell the story visually; to embody the action in the juxtaposition of images that have their own specific language and emotional impact—that is cinema. Thus, it is possible to be cinematic in the confined space of a telephone booth. The writer places a couple in the booth. Their hands, he reveals, are touching; their lips meet; the pressure of one against the other unhooks the receiver. Now the operator can hear what passes between them. A step forward in the unfolding of the drama has been taken. When the audience sees such things on the screen, it will derive from these images the equivalent of the words in the novel, or of the expositional dialogue of the stage. Thus the screenwriter is no more limited by the booth than is the novelist. Hence it is wrong to suppose, as is all too commonly the case, that the strength of the motion picture lies in the fact that the camera can roam abroad, can go out of the room, for example, to show a taxi arriving. This is not necessarily an advantage and it can so easily be merely dull.

Things, then, are as important as actors to the writer. They can richly illustrate character. For example, a man may hold a knife in a very strange way. If the audience is looking for a murderer, it may conclude from this that this is the man they are after, misjudging an idiosyncrasy of his character. The skilled writer will know how to make effective use of such things. He will not fall into the uncinematic habit of relying too much on dialogue. This is what happened on the appearance of sound. Filmmakers went to the other extreme. They filmed stage plays straight. Some indeed there are who believe that the day the talking picture arrived the art of the motion picture, as applied to the fiction film, died and passed to other kinds of film.

The truth is that with the triumph of dialogue, the motion picture has been stabilized as theater. The mobility of the camera does nothing to alter this fact. Even though the camera may move along the sidewalk, it is still theater. The characters sit in taxis and talk. They sit in automobiles and make love, and talk continuously. One result of this is a loss of cinematic style. Another is the loss of fantasy. Dialogue was introduced because it is realistic. The consequence was a loss of the art of reproducing life entirely in pictures. Yet the compromise arrived at, although made in the cause of realism, is not really true to life. Therefore the skilled writer will separate the two elements. If it is to be a dialogue scene, then he will make it one. If it is not, then he will make it visual, and he will always rely more on the visual than on dialogue. Sometimes he will have to decide between the two; namely, if the scene is to end with a visual statement, or with a line of dialogue. Whatever the choice made at the actual staging of the action, it must be one to hold the audience.

2. DIRECTION.—Film direction was born when for the first time a man held a motion picture camera and turning it on his friend said, "Do something." This was the first step in creating movement for the camera. To create things that move for the camera is the aim at all times of the storytelling director.

Documentary direction is different. Its directors are primarily editors or, rather, discoverers. Their material is provided beforehand by God and man, noncinema man, man who is not doing things primarily for the camera. On the other hand, pure cinema has nothing in itself to do with actual movement. Show a man looking at something, say a baby. Then show him smiling. By placing these shots in sequence—man looking, object seen, reaction to object—the director characterizes the man as a kindly person. Retain shot one (the look) and shot three (the smile) and substitute for the baby a girl in a bathing costume, and the director has changed the characterization of the man.

It was with the introduction of these techniques that film direction departed from the theater and began to come into its own. Still more is it the case when the juxtaposition of images involves a noticeable change, a striking variation in the size of the image, the effect of which is best illustrated by a parallel from music, namely in the sudden transition from a simple melody played on the piano to a sudden burst of music by the brass section of the orchestra.

The essence of good direction then is to be aware of all these possibilities and to use them to show what people are doing and thinking and, secondarily, what they are saying. Half the work of direction should be accomplished in the script, which then becomes not merely a statement of what is to be put before the camera but in addition a record of what the writer and director have already seen as completed on the screen in terms of fast-moving rhythm. This, because it is a motion picture that is visualized and not a play or novel—an adventure carried along by a central figure.
In a play, the action is moved forward in words. The film director moves his action forward with a camera—whether that action is set on a prairie or confined to a telephone booth. He always must be searching for some new way of making his statement, and above all he must make it with the greatest economy and in particular the greatest economy of cutting; that is to say, in the minimum of shots. Each shot must be as comprehensive a statement as possible, reserving cutting for dramatic purposes. The impact of the image is of the first importance in a medium that directs the concentration of the eye so that it cannot stray. In the theater, the eye wanders, while the word commands. In the cinema, the audience is led wherever the director wishes. In this, the language of the camera resembles the language of the novel. Cinema audiences and readers of novels, while they remain in the theater or continue to read, have no alternative but to accept what is set before them.

Then comes the question of how they are to see what they are shown. In a mood of relaxation? Not relaxed? It is how the director handles his images that creates the state of mind, of emotion, in the audience. That is to say, the impact of the image is directly on emotions. Sometimes the director goes quietly along in a mood of simple, normal photography, and the eye is pleased as it follows the story. Then suddenly the director wishes to hit hard. Now the pictorial presentation changes. There is a bursting impact of images, like a change in orchestration. Indeed, orchestration is perhaps the best simile for a film, even to the parallel of recurrent themes and rhythms. And the director is, as it were, the conductor.

Given the skill that permits a man to direct, skills shared in varying degrees, perhaps the most significant and individually important thing about a director is his style. This style is evidenced by both his choice of subject and his manner of directing it. Important directors are known for their style. The record speaks of Ernst Lubitsch as having a style characterized by cinematic wit, or the pictorial quip. Charlie Chaplin is spoken of as having a style, and it is interesting to notice that it was his incursion into dramatic direction in *A Woman of Paris* that seemed to crystallize this style.

On the whole, style was slower to manifest itself in U.S. pictures, always excepting the extravaganzas of C. B. DeMille and the works of Griffith and Ince. In the early 1920s the Germans gave great evidence of style. Whether or not it was something imposed by the studios, or individual to the directors, it is clearly in evidence in the work of Fritz Lang, F. W. Murnau, and many others. Some directors are more concerned with style and the treatment of the content than with securing new themes. This is to say that, for the director, as often as not, what is important is the manner of telling his tale. The more original will revolt against the traditional and the cliché. They will want to show contrast, to present melodrama in a revolutionary way, to take melodrama out of the dark into the bright day, to show murder by a babbling brook, adding a touch of blood to its limpid waters. Thus the director can impose his ideas on nature and, taking what savors of the ordinary, can, in the way he handles it, render it extraordinary. So there emerges a kind of counterpoint and sudden upheaval in the ordinary things of life.

Motion pictures would be a source of much richer enjoyment, as is the case in other arts, if the audience were aware of what is and what is not well done. The mass audience has had no education in technique of cinema, as they frequently have in art and music, from their school days. They think only of story. The film goes by them too fast. The director, then, must be aware of this and must seek to remedy it. Without the audience being aware of what he is doing, he will use his technique to create an emotion in them. Suppose he is presenting a fight—the traditional fight in the barroom or elsewhere. If he puts the camera far enough back to take in the whole episode at once, the audience will follow at a distance, and objectively, but they will not so really feel it. If the director moves his camera in and shows the details of the fight—flaying hands, rocking heads, dancing feet, put together in a montage of quick cuts—the effect will be totally different and the spectator will be writhing in his seat, as he would be at a real boxing match.

Styles in direction can be individual; they can show trends or fashions. In recent times, the Italian directors have worked in the manner or style known as neorealism. They were concerned with the hardships of World War II as currently manifested in the life of the man in the street. There was a style, too, in German films in the silent days. More recent films from Germany show little new development. The French directors are well served by their cameramen and their art directors, who have great originality and a fine understanding of the cinematic. In the United States, there has been a movement in the direction of realism, but in the key areas of photography and settings the director is still forced to work in
an atmosphere of artificiality. The plushy architecture of Hollywood militates against a pure atmosphere and destroys realism. Only gradually is the situation changing, and it is not so long ago that the artist was shown to be starving in an attic as large and as luxurious as the living room of a wealthy house.

Sets, lighting, music, and the rest are of immense importance to the director, but everything, as Ingmar Bergman has said, begins with the actor's face. It is to the features of this face that the eye of the spectator will be guided, and it is the organization of these oval shapes within the rectangle of the screen, for a purpose, that exercises the director. What figure is to be shown—and how? Near to—or at a distance? Often it is wiser for a director to save long shots for a dramatic purpose. He may need them, for example, to express loneliness, or to make some other verbal statement. Whatever his choice, the content of the pictorial frame must have an impact. This is the real meaning of the word dramatic. It signifies that which has emotional impact. So it may be said that the rectangle of the screen must be charged with emotion.

At all times the director must be aware of his intention. What is his purpose, and how can he effect it in the most economical way? Not only must he provide images that add up to a language; he must also know what it is that makes it a language.

The most apparent and, to the outsider, the main function of the director is the actual staging of the action of the film. From a director's point of view, this staging is best described as the mechanical process of setting up the action so that the actors can move in and bring their emotions to bear, not spontaneously, however, but under his strict supervision.

In the theater, albeit after long and intensive rehearsal, the actor is finally free and on his own, so that he is able to respond to the live audience. In the studio, he responds to the director, who is staging the action not only piecemeal but, as often as not, out of sequence. The director controls every movement of the screen actor, working for the most part intimately and closely upon him.

The amount of action contained within a frame should convey neither more nor less than what the director wishes to convey. There must be nothing extraneous. The actor, therefore, cannot operate at will, spontaneously improvising. The restrictions that this imposes on the actions of the body are readily seen.

Certain special considerations apply to the face. In this regard, the chief requisite for a good screen actor is the capacity to do nothing—well. Furthermore, the director must bear in mind that the audience is not absolutely sure of the precise significance of the expression until it has seen what causes it. At the same time, this reaction must be made with the greatest measure of understatement.

In a world of images, in which both actors and things are alike capable of such significant statements, what is the role of dialogue? The answer is that the introduction of dialogue was an added touch of realism—the final touch. With dialogue, that last unreality of the silent film, the mouth that opens and says nothing audible disappeared. Thus, in pure cinema, dialogue is a complementary thing. In the films that for the most part occupy the screens of the world, this is not the case. As often as not, the story is told in dialogue, and the camera serves to illustrate it.

And so it is that the last infirmity of both writer and director, when invention fails, is to take refuge and perhaps relief in the thought that they can "cover it in dialogue," just as their silent predecessors "covered it with a title."

3. PRODUCTION METHODS.—Sets and Art Direction.—The staging of the action by the director draws on all the resources of the medium. Of first importance among these are the skill and knowledge of the art director who plans the sets, and the dresser who furnishes them.

Originally, film sets were neither so complete nor so elaborate as they are today. Usually, they were bits and pieces constructed for single scenes and always planned as part of the scene. The sets built today are usually large and complete. The result is that the prosценium arch of the theater is virtually restored. The mere building of a room does not build it for the camera, and this should be the aim of all construction. The set is a kind of shorthand. It gives an impression of locale and as often as not, by means of a stock shot: Washington is a view of the Capitol; New York, a skyscraper. To use an unfamiliar view would confuse the audience.

An art director must have a wide knowledge and understanding of architecture. On the other hand, he must be able to distinguish between what characterizes a type of dwelling and what individualizes the inhabitant of that dwelling. The profession of a man may be characterized by what is on his walls. His untidiness, however, will be personal to him. Indeed, it is only the more imaginative aspects of art direction that require the art director to depart from...
the letter of his research. His basic information is not the answer to the actual requirements of a character or a scene. Increasing awareness of the capacity of the camera to show reality, to set the action in real streets under real trees, created the demand for reality even in interior sets. Therefore the woodwork and the lath and plaster of sets, no matter how manifestly artificial from behind, must face the camera with all the appearance of visible reality.

With the increasing cost of materials and labor, sets become a very serious budgetary consideration. Their construction calls upon the resources of machine shops, carpenter shops, plasterer shops, the paint shop, in short, upon all the resources needed for house building, so that the audience may be given the reality it demands. One of the results of this has been the discovery, over the years, of an amazing variety of ways to circumvent this problem by the use of models of all kinds, of trick work and of various special effects, or trick shots, all of which are realistic substitutes for a reality beyond the resources, both financially and otherwise, of any studio.

The most intelligent place to be economical is at the script-writing stage, and the preparation of the script should be well advanced before any artwork is begun. The main factor to be borne in mind in art direction, as in other areas of filmmaking, is the complete control that can be exercised not only over what the audience sees or does not see on the screen but even over the actual movements of the eye.

Lighting.—The lighting of the sets is the concern of the photographer and not, as is commonly supposed, the concern of the designer. Originally he was referred to as the cameraman. Today he is more commonly referred to as the lighting expert, the actual working of the camera being carried out by an operator under his supervision. In addition to supervising the work of the electricians and the camera operators, he functions by adding creatively to the mood and cinematic value of the scenes. The common impression that the sets are designed for lighting is incorrect. In theory, it should be possible to plan lighting ahead, at the set construction stage, but the actual lighting of a scene is a specific and particular operation demanding a fine, on-the-spot sense of light and shade and of composition.

Camera.—All uses of the camera, whether it be used straight on or at an angle, whether it be stationary or moving, must be directed to one and only one thing, namely to the dramatic impact of pictorial images that are to be cut together to reveal the progress of an action or story. The movements of the camera come under two main headings:

1. Movement in relation to the movement of the characters. Here the camera follows a character, dollying ahead or following in profile, because the character is walking. The ideal to be aimed at here is that the audience should never be aware of the camera moving. Thus there always must be complete coordination between the movement of the camera and the movement of the character. If the two movements are out of synchronization at any time, so that the camera is moving while the character is still, the effect is not obtained.

2. Dramatic movement, movement of the camera—that is, with the character in repose, and always for a dramatic purpose. For example, the camera may dolly up to the face of the character for emphasis, or dolly away at the end of a scene to reveal a lonely figure standing by himself in the center of a room. So used, the camera may be said to make a statement. The film, like the novel, is the sum total of these statements.

Sound.—The principal adjustment that had to be made between the technique of talking pictures and that of the silent screen was in the respective roles of image and word. The written word, when brought to the moment of filming, may turn out to be redundant, the expression of the actor conveying the meaning with equal force. Sound has many other uses, however. It can serve very effectively to denote the progress of an action. Or it may be used for a stream of consciousness over an unspeaking mouth. It is likewise of great help in expressing the mental processes of the characters. The screen shows the face of a girl. Over it comes the sound of a school bell, thus revealing that she is reminiscing. It is in its own way, then, an image maker and has been used as such from the first in a variety of ways.

Music.—Though it is entirely possible to see a silent film and become so engrossed in it as to be oblivious of the absence of sound or accompanying music, there have never been public showings of films without music. From the beginning there was at least the single piano, improvising; and later the orchestra, sometimes with specially composed scores. Sound has tended to increase the importance
of music, and regularly over the years composers of the highest standing have written scores that, while serving to add a dimension of mood and atmosphere to the film, have also stood by themselves as compositions.

The presence of music, then, is perfectly in accordance with the aim of the motion picture, namely to unfold an action or to tell a story, and thereby stir the emotions.

Color—Color, like sound, is to be used dramatically, when needed. Its values are never realistic and often are merely for embellishment or for decorative purposes. Thus, like the wide screen, its use belongs to the realm of showmanship. It can also serve an aesthetic purpose when the subject, whether the face of a woman or of a landscape, is enhanced by its use. It can likewise be used for spectacular or emotional purposes, as in battle scenes or in displays of pageantry or splendor, such as occur in historical or epic tales. Its range of uses is from the mood of décor to the clothes of a star. However, until such time as the realism of truly natural color is achieved, the use of it is primarily as an embellishment.

Wide Screen.—The development or at least the use of the wide screen in public theaters really belongs, like color, to the realm of showmanship. In its most common form, namely CinemaScope, it requires a rectangular screen. This shape, with a very low ratio of height to width, is now generally regarded as unsatisfactory, and some studios, by lopping off the ends of the screen, narrow down its excessive width.

Editing.—Editing, or, as it is sometimes called, montage, has been described as the foundation of the art of making films. Basically, it is the placing of the strips of film in the order and sequence deemed best to unfold the action or story. Initially, the strips of film were joined in a simple sequence. Even pioneers of the photodrama, such as George Méliès, made no attempt to do more than follow the story quite simply, as seen from the point of view of a camera, the position of which was fixed and central. Other pioneers, in particular the Englishman G. A. Smith and his associates in the Brighton school of filmmaking, and Edwin S. Porter, working in the U.S. for Edison, began to experiment with what were the rudiments of editing and montage. The Russian filmmakers, Eisenstein, Pudovkin, and their contemporaries, in the late 1920s developed creative editing, or montage, as they called it, by way of the juxtaposition not just of sequences but also of individual shots or frames, to illustrate character, to convey ideas or even to create motion by the juxtaposition of static objects.

Methods of editing vary according to the preference of the director. In most cases, the material is assembled as the film is in progress, by an editor working from the screenplay. The director who plans the editing at the screenplay stage makes his decision as to the coverage of the scenes and characters at that stage and then shoots as planned.

Whatever method is used, it is used with the realization that everything in cinema is a visual statement and the images are its language. Film, therefore, like any language, has its own syntax, which, as the word implies, is a lining up or ordering of images to create the maximum effect.

The Machinery of Filmmaking.—Serving the filmmakers is the machinery of production, and in treating methods of film production it is necessary to distinguish between what is needed to bring one film and what is needed to bring a hundred films to the screen. In other words, it is necessary to distinguish between individual and mass production. A single production, planned by an independent filmmaker, carries with it no overhead costs and needs space only during the time of production. It can be made anywhere that there is space to be rented, and it employs only the personnel required for the project. Equipment is also hired, as are the services of the laboratories and printing establishments that are available in any production center.

The independent producer, then, whose increasing emergence in the decade following World War II was a significant feature of the changes that have continued to overtake film production, notably in Hollywood, is, in theory, much freer to concern himself with the quality of his film. The 20 years between World Wars I and II saw Hollywood studios at the height of their productivity, under executives like Marcus Loew, Carl Laemmle, Adolph Zukor, Jesse Lasky, Louis B. Mayer, Joseph Schenck, Samuel Goldwyn, the Warner brothers (Harry M., Samuel L., Albert and Jack L.), and others who brought their organizing ability, developed in other fields, to bear on the making of motion pictures. They took over the entertainment of the people and put melodrama, comedy, and musical plays on an industrial footing. They put large sums into
the improvement of techniques and encouraged the development
of new devices for camera, sound, editing, the recording of mu-
sic, and three-dimensional and wide screen; all were calculated to
give glamour to the film on the screen, to attract back a wavering
audience by the novelties and the devices of showmanship.

A basic method of production has survived from those days and
begins with sending the script to the production department. There
it is broken down into its physical requirements. These are esti-
minated and a budget drawn up.

After the script is approved and the budget passed, copies are
sent to all departments for each to prepare its contribution to the
production against the day set for shooting, according to the sched-
ule drawn up by the unit manager.

The organization of filmmaking in the United States still centers
for the most part around a producer. This arrangement originated
in the need to coordinate the mass production of films; at one time
the whole responsibility was so much in the hands of the producer,
and so little in the hands of the director, that the latter would
be handed a script that was complete, with a cast already chosen.
At one time, indeed, the production method was for the producer
himself to put the film together after the director had completed
the shooting. This system has now virtually died out, and the inde-
pendent producer is as often as not his own director, or perhaps his
own star, since the actor-producer has become a commonplace,
along with the producer-director and the writer-producer-director.

4. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS.—While the changes in methods
and circumstances of production have resulted, in part, from a de-
sire among writers and directors for greater artistic freedom, they
have received their two greatest impulses from the economic situa-
tion: (1) increases in income tax, which cripples the salaried film-
maker; and (2) the economic decline of motion pictures, begin-
ning a few years after World War II and caused by rivalry from
imization; combined with a general falling off in the entertainment
quality of the films. Indeed, in 1957 Hollywood was described in
a report prepared for the American Federation of Labor Film coun-
cil as being at the crossroads. In the ten years between 1946 and
1956, the attendance at theaters in the U.S. fell off 50% at a time
when the national economy was strong and growing stronger. The
number of U.S. features released in the American market declined
by 28%, while the number of imported features increased by 233%.

Then, in 1948, by a decree of the Supreme Court of the U.S., the
major studios, whose security had been based on their producer-
to-consumer organization, were ordered to dispose of their the-
eters as a result of complaints by independent theater owners.
The situation deteriorated more or less steadily up to 1958.
Then in 1959, the tide seemed to turn as a result of a general re-
organization and a new policy mapped by executives from New
York. Fewer pictures were made, but those made were produced
on larger budgets and were given longer runs. There were sales of
old motion pictures to television, and the renting of studio space
to both television companies and to independent film producers.
The returns of the major companies all showed a profit, and the
theaters showed a healthy rise in attendance.

5. THEATER MANAGEMENT AND PROMOTION.—The changing con-
ditions of the cinema have called for changes in the running of the
theaters and the promotion of films. Prior to the coming of sound,
to both television companies and to independent film producers.
The returns of the major companies all showed a profit, and the
theaters showed a healthy rise in attendance.

Then, suddenly, everything arrived in cans—picture, music, and
sound. All that was needed now was to set up the projection sys-
tem. With that, something living went out of theater management
and presentation. The effect of this was not apparent during the
1930s and 1940s. Only gradually, in the late 1950s, was it realized
that with fewer films being made the exhibitor must give special at-
tention to each film. With the so-called rehousing of the big, expen-
sive productions, on a twice-a-day showing booked in advance,
the tide began to turn. Films began again to be presented impor-
tantly, with big advertising campaigns and a new element—the per-
sonal appearance of stars and directors—to give a flesh-and-blood
contact back to audiences.

With the continued development of these methods, a phrase
that epitomizes the old approach to cinema-going will fittingly dis-
appear from the language, namely, "This is where we came in."

Television helped in changing the approach to filmmaking and
film presentation by taking away the audience for what is called the
"grind policy": i.e., the continuous performance with a double fea-
ture program, changed twice weekly.

There is evidence of other changes, too. There is a tendency
to decentralize production, and Hollywood is said to be located
round the world. There are several reasons for this, in spite of the
fact that, technically speaking, production is still easier and better
in Hollywood. The need for special location, for example, is clear
enough. Again, if the script calls for a number of supporting actors
for a foreign story, then it is an advantage to go to the country in
which the story is set.

A further, and comparatively recent, development has been the
drive-in theater. This exists as a matter of social convenience. Young
couples can see a film and yet enjoy a sense of being alone. Fam-
ilies unable to get a baby-sitter, or to afford a sitter as well as a film,
can take their children with them and put them to sleep in the car.
The drive-in also gives a feeling of being a place; less than the the-
ater, but more than television at home. It thus satisfies the urge
to go out—a deep-seated urge, which will prevent television from
being a final threat to the picture theater.