

BLACKFRIARS

spectacle, in their most highly developed, and therefore most authentic and intelligible, form of one or another of the virtues that should be the aim of all of us: others exhibit the perfect practical exercise of general spiritual principles in varying circumstances. The life of St. Teresa of Lisieux is one of those which from time to time, as the world needs it, present a fundamental scheme of readjustment or reinterpretation of our attitude towards God, particularly in regard of the pursuit of holiness, opening for us a fresh vista of the Way of Perfection.

It is the same journey to the same City, but with a new map to travel by.

K. H. J. STEUART, S.J.

THE FILM IN EDUCATION

Shorn of wearisome details the recent dispute between Sir James Marchant and the British Film Institute— which acts as liason between the teachers and the Cinema Trade— reveals the disquieting fact that a complete mechanical education is to be part of our conditioned life of tomorrow. The teacher already challenged by robot Radio is to be superseded by the Talkie Educator; and even a Peoples' Cinema University.

The Cinema Trade offers itself as an instrument in the cause of education; it would say:

' You teachers know little of film technique, and for our part we know little about teaching; let us collaborate: we will turn out the films you need.'

Could anything be fairer than that? Make friends of the Mammon of Iniquity, of a giant organization involving some five hundred million pounds of capital, and chiefly controlled by an international ring of Jews!

A remarkable article appeared in *La Revue Catholique des Idées et des Faits*, Feb. 1929, under the title *Les Juifs et le Cinéma* in which we are told that the production

THE FILM IN EDUCATION

and distribution of the film in England, America and **most other** countries is directed by Jews with the intention of **undermining** the Christian Religion. This may or may not be true; but when we recall the Jewish origins of Louis Meyer, Samuel Goldwin, Szarwassy, C. F. Bernhard, Louis Bernstein, Eisenstein, Edward Stoll, J. W. Rosenthal, Ludwig Plattner, Lupu Pick, Harry Day Levy, Denman, Hyams, Woolfe. to name but a few, there seems little doubt **that** the power behind the film trade is largely Jewish. These men are interested in education. We may well ask why?

Is the interest financial? The provision of necessary apparatus for the schools of this country will run into millions of pounds. Or are we really to believe that in the film-world lurks the insidious propaganda of Anti-Christ? Whatever be the answer to these questions there can be little doubt that trade interests will ultimately control the situation in the name of progress. Complete mechanical education is in the making.

In the meantime there is little sense in formulating a Catholic policy so tardily that once again (**as** in the case of the **B.B.C.**) we shall be compelled to make the best of a bad job. This encroachment of the film into the realm of education must be either accepted or rejected; whichever we ultimately decide, our first duty is to understand the nature of the film.

What is the film? We must first distinguish under the generic term 'Film' between the moving-picture and the art of cinematography, which is a definite and inevitable application of the art of the moving-picture and constitutes **what is** generally known as the **film-medium**.

The moving-picture is based on the discovery of a light-sensitive emulsion which enables us to take a 'snapshot,' **in** which **the** fast shutter-speed of the camera allows practically no movement in the object. Consequently when a series of **such** photographs is taken in quick succession the complete series is the full story of the movement. After processing (*i.e.*, developing) this can be thrown on the screen in the usual way, and provided the shutter in the

BLACKFRIARS

projector cover the change of picture the illusion of movement, corresponding to that originally photographed, will be created.

That quite simply is the principle behind the moving-picture. Can this invention be used as an accessory in education? The answer, it seems to me, must be affirmative. The moving-picture is not trick-photography, but the complete picture of life giving us both movement and purpose which at most the 'still' picture can only suggest.

Many examples could be given to illustrate this point. For instance *The Peregrine Falcon* made by Visual Education, Ltd.—a film of a bird living in remote and rugged parts of the coast. The photographer, we are told, was let down the face of the cliff to the bare ledge on which the eggs had been laid. In the film we see the eggs breaking and the gradual development of the young birds.

Another example is the 'stop-action' photography (perfected in England by Mr. J. H. D. Ridley), by which it is possible to film a growing plant: and such questions as: 'How do plants climb? How is water absorbed by the roots? How do foliage buds open?—are answered pictorially—the growth of several weeks being presented on the screen in a few minutes.

But perhaps the most interesting application of the motion-picture in recent years has been the photographing of the 'death-ray' in the endowed laboratories of Pennsylvania University, U.S.A. This film has been shown several times in this country. As a direct view of this ray is fraught with grave danger to the investigator, the use of motion-photography is apparent, both as a permanent record and in the lecture-room.

Little doubt can be entertained regarding the usefulness of the moving-picture as a means of illustration. I stress the word 'illustration.' If the moving-picture is to help and not merely be used at the dictation of commercial interests, it should be ancillary to the spoken word and not a substitute for it. On the old silent screen words were used to explain the picture, in the new instructional film technique the screen or picture must illustrate the spoken word

THE FILM IN EDUCATION

and remain subservient to the teacher. In view of the menace of 'talkie' education this principle is of supreme importance.

Among teachers the consensus of opinion in favour of **this** view would seem to be overwhelming. Mr. H. Ramsbotham, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, addressing the North Essex Educational Fellowship, March 3rd, this year, said:

' I am inclined to think the silent film is better for **the** purpose of teaching than the "talkie" . . . it seems to me that the teacher should be the "talkie" . . . whatever we conclude the place of the cinema and broadcasting to be in the educational system **we** can say with confidence that they can never take the place of the teacher. No mechanical device or artifice can supplant the personal contact.'

Similarly, Mr. Frederick Evans, Chief Education Officer of Erith, Kent: ' In my view, for school purposes the silent film will prove the most suitable . . . It is the teacher's place to use the illustration and talk about it ' (*Sight and Sound*, Vol. 3, No. 9).

M. C. Lebrun, Director of the *Musée pédagogique* in Paris, writes in *Le Cinéma Privé*: ' Peu à peu, le cinéma éducateur prend la place que lui revient justement. On limite raisonnablement son emploi dans l'enseignement, en ne l'admettant dans les classes qu'en qualité d'auxiliaire du maître et en ne l'employant de plus en plus que pour des fins compatibles avec une pédagogie raisonnable.'

Sixty French teachers of experience contributing to a symposium conducted in January by *Le Cinéma Privé* enthusiastically approved the use of silent substandard film: and their findings may be summarized in the words of M. René Vincent in the same issue:

(1) The teacher alone is qualified to adapt the film and his commentary to the needs of his own students, who **should** never exceed forty in number.

(2) The film should complete and never displace the lesson of the teacher.

BLACKFRIARS

(3) The film should never be used when a static illustration is sufficient.

(4) The films should be short (30ft.-60 ft.) and simple.

(5) No use should be made of the art of cinematography.

There are, of course, occasions when auditorium films, silent or talkie, could be shown before the whole school; just as an outside lecturer might occasionally be engaged. But the classroom film must remain intimate and simple.

So much for the film as simple illustration; and we pass on to the application of the moving-picture, the art of cinematography. This must first be distinguished from the art of the theatre. The confusion between the two has arisen in the popular mind from two causes: first, the tendency of film directors in the beginning, and even to-day, to photograph the theatre; and secondly the absurd and undue prominence given, chiefly for purposes of advertisement, to the Film Star, so creating the impression that the actors are the all-important element in the art of film. This is far from the truth. Film actors are, or should be, instruments in the hands of the Director; they do what they are told, of course to the best of their histrionic powers; but, nevertheless, they remain instruments, **and** never creators.

'The foundation of film-art,' remarks Pudovkin in his celebrated work, *Film-technique*, 'is editing.'

By editing is meant not merely the arrangement of strips of film or 'shots' in time-succession, but the actual creation on the screen, by manipulating these strips of celluloid, of a theme which is in the Director's mind. In creating this objective picture he has at his disposal the whole perceptive range of the camera which can record pictures in filmic-time and filmic-space beyond the power and scope of the human eye.

An example of filmic-time is the 'stop-action' photography, already referred to, which enables us to record the accelerated growth of a plant. Another common example is the slow-motion picture. It is also possible to put in im-

THE FILM IN EDUCATION

mediate filmic sequence two events which are really **separated** by a lapse of **time**.

By **filmic-space** is meant the projection of a scene which has **no real** existence outside the film. For instance, we are told that Elmer, when making *Fragment of an Empire*, **photographed** scenes in various Russian cities, but for the **purpose** of the film synthesized them into a single mighty city.

In **addition** to the creation of time and space values, there are other points of film technique, such as *emphasis*, made possible when the camera, at the will of the Director, searches out details in the near-view and the close-up; and *rhythm* which enables the Director to build up his film to a dramatic climax, or, as in the case of Pudovkin's picture of a man working with a scythe, by varying the position and speed of the camera, the sequence and length of the 'shots,' to give a singularly pleasing and satisfying impression of mown grass.

Can this art of cinematography thus briefly and inadequately sketched be used in the cause of Catholic education? Some would answer emphatically No, as the medium is essentially perverted. Others would frame the same objection in other words, and say that the employment of film-fake except for amusement, such as a Silly Symphony, is preposterous.

Fake! That is the key-word; and its very use shows a complete misapprehension possessing the public mind, We can fake, certainly in photography, but never in cinematography. The object of the art of film is not to photograph reality as seen in the theatre or elsewhere, but to create on the screen—objectively—the mind of the Director. If the prose writer is allowed through the printed word and the technique of the literary art to admit us into a world of his own creation—*i.e.*, to describe places which do not exist and events which have never happened, why cannot the film director do the same by using the art and technique of cine-photography, It is just as ridiculous to condemn the fantasia *King Kong* or *The Invisible Man* as

BLACKFRIARS

fakes as it would be to accuse Lewis Carroll of literary dishonesty for sending Alice through the Looking-glass.

Without doubt the screen is often exploited; but we **must** not condemn the film-art for this exploitation any more than we should blame the dramatic art for what many would call the present deplorable *st̄at̄e* of the theatre.

Most people to-day need the pictorial or rather *ciné-pictorial* presentation of truth; they are said to be 'film-minded.' This mood has to be used by the apostle and the teacher. Following the advice of the Holy Father—and what could be safer?—we must adapt the film-medium as an accessory of Catholic Action. It is not enough to organize a boycott against indecency and to overlook in our zeal the greater prostitution of the mind. The chief danger of the film is emphatically not sex; and if anyone doubt this let him go to see *The Soil is Thirsty* by Raismann and *October* by Eisenstein.

The film medium must be used—like the printing press. The way to rid the world of wrong literature is not only to demand a clean literature, but to create a right literature; and so the only effective way to rid the screen of its chief danger, which is wrong thinking, is to use it in the cause of truth.

We must be thankful that the Catholic Truth Society has decided to blaze this trail in England. **As** was announced publicly by Bishop Myers at the General Meeting of the Catholic Truth Society in Low Week, this year, at which the Cardinal Archbishop presided, a Catholic Film Library of substandard stock is already in the making. The library is destined primarily for use in Catholic Schools, Parish Halls, and for the new style of film-lecture. The movement will grow. To feed this Library it is proposed to found a Catholic *Ciné Society*, **as** will be announced later in the Catholic Press.

FERDINAND VALENTINE, O.P.