



'Dear Owen': The CIA, Luigi Luraschi and Hollywood, 1953

DAVID N. ELDRIDGE, *University of Hull*

Early in 1953, an executive of Paramount Studios sent a series of reports to a contact at the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Historians have been familiar for some years with the roles of Walt Disney and Ronald Reagan as secret informers to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), but these reports are the first direct evidence of the CIA's influence over the content of American films [1]. In her account of the CIA's waging of the 'cultural Cold War' *Who Paid the Piper?*, Frances Stonor Saunders recently drew attention to these secret letters, rightly noting that they make 'extraordinary reading' [2]. For film historians this is particularly true, as the letters involve a whole new level of 'censorship' brought to bear in efforts to support US foreign policy by controlling the way in which America was portrayed abroad. However, in misattributing the reports to Carleton Alson, Saunders' evaluation of them is fundamentally flawed and her estimation of the CIA's influence over the films is misleading. This article, in establishing the real author of the correspondence and his place within the film community, demonstrates that Saunders overrated the longevity of the programme and the extent to which the CIA's ideas were actually implemented and shows how the CIA attached itself to the existing culture of self-censorship in Hollywood.

The international reception of films was evidently a issue of real concern to both the government and film industry at this stage of the Cold War. Dwight Eisenhower took office on 20 January 1953 at a time when anti-American opinion abroad was riding high. The international outcry at the impending execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg who had been convicted of passing US atomic secrets to the Russians had been intense and, when anti-American riots took place in Europe, America stepped up efforts to improve its image abroad. It is hardly surprising that film—being perhaps the most widely distributed and accessible vehicle for cultural information and which had been accused of carrying Communist propaganda in the 1940s—became the object of attention for government propagandists in 1953. The CIA reports note that representatives of the State Department and the United Nations were working openly in Hollywood in 1953 suggesting 'improvements' to the films. The CIA was, typically, more circumspect and appears to have been 'sounding out' a potential plan or programme for affecting the content of films more directly. Hollywood, as Saunders demonstrated, was one element (and a comparatively minor one) in a wide-ranging programme of cultural warfare which the agency undertook in the early 1950s. Established in the 1949 Central Intelligence Agency Act, the fledgling agency took full advantage of a multimillion dollar budget and the *carte blanche* it had effectively been given to build a 'consortium' of intellectuals and cultural opinion leaders to 'inoculate the world against the contagion of Communism, and to ease the passage of American foreign policy interests' [3].

The agency's wide network of covert sponsorship embraced everything from the

Congress for Cultural Freedom, *Encounter* magazine and *Partisan Review* to the Boston Symphony Orchestra and touring exhibitions of abstract art under the auspices of the Museum of Modern Art. These sponsored events, publications and projects were promoted as 'spontaneous' democratic outbursts in the face of communist cultural imperialism and were intended to demonstrate that American-style democracy could foster an expressive freedom which was vibrant, individual and unconstrained by ideology. In Europe, the CIA apparently sponsored British film adaptations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and *1984* to achieve their ends. However, in Hollywood they avoided financial commitments (at least as far as these reports indicate) and chose instead to use 'insiders' to adjust the content. Principally, the CIA's agenda was to remove 'bad behaviour' in terms of racism, alcoholism or criminal activity directed against citizens of other nations, substituting instead an image of a 'moral' USA whose citizens respected the customs and sensibilities of other nations. Most significantly, they intended to play down racial divisions within America and play up cooperation within the international community. To effect this, consideration was given to the recruitment of a number of well-placed members of the film community. The reports reflect the preliminary stages of such an agenda.

Fourteen of these reports, which are reprinted below, were found in the Charles Douglas Jackson collection at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library. They date from 24 January to 9 March 1953. Marked as 'Secret—Security Information', the clearance stamp indicates that the correspondence was declassified in a CIA review on 11 October 1992 and under State and USIA Guidelines on 2 August 1995. Appointed in January 1953, C. D. Jackson was Eisenhower's Special Advisor for Psychological Warfare, with responsibility for coordinating the administration's Cold War propaganda policy in 'the struggle for the minds and wills of men' [4]. These reports appear to have been mimeographed by the CIA and forwarded to Jackson to keep him abreast of the project. In this transition, the correspondent's name has been erased from the documents. The addressee is referred to simply as 'Owen'. The papers were cross-referenced in their file to 'Carlton Alsop' [*sic*], which explains Saunders' attribution.

Carleton W. Alsop certainly was a CIA agent. Saunders stated that he was a member of the CIA's Psychological Warfare Workshop and had been sent by the agency to secure the film rights to *Animal Farm* from Orwell's widow in 1950 [5]. Even the *Los Angeles Times* referred to him in a 1966 article as an 'ex-employee of the Central Intelligence Agency' and noted that he had been working for the agency at the time of his marriage in 1954 [6]. However, there is no direct evidence that he was working inside Hollywood and the correspondence was evidently written by someone well-placed at Paramount Studios in early 1953. The author claimed to have influence over production schedules, casting decisions and script revisions and that he was respected enough within the studio to be able to persuade luminaries such as Charlton Heston and Billy Wilder to make changes to their films and even to argue with the head of production, Y. Frank Freeman, over the casting choices of leading directors. He was also clearly working within Paramount's studio structure, rather than being an outsider trying to make suggestions; he mentions that he 'can only affect the production schedule' at his studio and that a 'general industry contact' would be better placed to affect film production as a whole. According to the Hollywood press, Alsop was a one-time film producer, radio announcer and theatrical agent for Judy Garland, but a cursory obituary in *Hollywood Reporter* on 31 July 1979 indicated that he was never a 'player' in Hollywood. No record of his involvement in the production of any particular films has been found and there is certainly nothing to suggest that he ever had a



FIG. 1. Luigi G. Luraschi—Paramount's Head of Foreign & Domestic Censorship and the CIA's man in Hollywood. Paramount Studio Collection; Margaret Merrick Library.

position at Paramount, nor any standing within the film community at all. Saunders' assumption that Alsop was 'working undercover at Paramount' is implausible. He could never have known—let alone influenced—the details of Paramount Studio's production in 1953, which the author clearly did. Alsop may have been a contact for the correspondent, he may even have passed the reports on to the CIA, but he certainly did not compose them.

The key to the correspondent's identity is in his mention of being 'active on several committees at the Academy [of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences]'. He claimed to have influenced the Board of Governors' decision in making this award for the best foreign language film. In 1953, the only people involved in the selection process were the governors and members of each studio's foreign department. The author further stated that he sat on the committee 'dealing with documentaries'. When awarding the Oscar for best documentary, members of the Academy were expected to vote from a short list proposed by a special committee, selected from all of the documentaries put forward. The programme for the screening of this selection lists only 14 members of the committee on Documentary Awards in 1953. Only one name sitting on both committees worked at Paramount: Luigi G. Luraschi (Fig. 1).

Luraschi was the Head of Foreign and Domestic Censorship at Paramount Studios in 1953, having worked for the studio's foreign department since 1929, first on the east coast, then transferring to Hollywood in 1933. In 1960, when Luraschi eventually left

Paramount to work with Italian producer Dino DeLaurentiis, *The Daily American* summed up his previous career.

Luraschi was a man with heart set on the hotel business when quite by accident he started with Paramount Pictures in their New York office. He moved up the hard way over the next 31 years, going to Hollywood and becoming assistant to the studio head as consultant on content of pictures—an international trouble shooter who snagged the trouble before it could start.

An international background got Luraschi into a position where, eventually, he determined whether a picture would or would not be made. His job was to size up the international distribution potential of a new picture before Paramount filmed it. As Luraschi described it, ‘to iron out any political, moral or religious problems and get rid of the taboos that might keep the picture out of, say France or India.’

‘The idea was to try to make the picture please the maximum number of people, internationally,’ he explained. ‘It’s easier to do at the script stage than as a patch-up job for the foreign film market after the story is already filmed.’

Luraschi’s role and influence at Paramount meshed perfectly with the interests of the CIA.

Luigi Luraschi was born in London in 1906 into an Italian Catholic family (the Italian and Catholic references in the letters are further counts against Alsop). The ‘international background’ which Paramount and the CIA came to value was the product of an education at the University of Zurich and experience in travelling through Europe and North Africa engaged in the family hotel business. According to Robert Vogel, his friend and counterpart at MGM studios, Luraschi was fluent in five languages, including Arabic.

When Luraschi arrived in 1933, Paramount’s international department seems to have been primarily concerned with the development of foreign publicity—a post-production exercise. However, Luraschi also held responsibility for corresponding with European censor boards, which would have drawn him into production issues when these censors demanded cuts. This was developed in 1936 when he also took over from John Hammell the role of ‘censor contact’ in the domestic market—which meant not only dealing with the state boards, but also with the Production Code Administration (PCA). Meeting the requirements of the Production Code meant making changes to scripts in development rather than simply imposing cuts on already filmed material. Luraschi worked closely with the staff of the PCA on an almost daily basis—forwarding scripts and story materials to the Breen Office for their feedback and, when necessary, representing the studio in conferences where the PCA was insisting on major modifications. The PCA was an industry-appointed watchdog, designed to guard against cuts which censors boards might make. As Luraschi noted, they were not simply censorious, for the PCA’s role was to assist in production. Staff would ‘inject’ ideas into the scripts on how to improve the script from a ‘moral’ perspective, suggesting ‘compensating values’ for immoral elements in the screenplay, such as sex outside of marriage, violence or crime. Vogel, who did not become MGM’s PCA liaison until 1949, recalls that ‘Luraschi had excellent, excellent judgment and the complete confidence of his superiors’ [7].

Only three studios operated this kind of autonomous international department: Paramount, MGM and RKO, each built around an individual—Vogel, Luraschi and

William Gordon, respectively. The other studios continued to run 'foreign' issues through their publicity departments. The Second World War was the most significant factor in raising the profile of the international departments, as studios became worried about sending pictures overseas containing a 'negative' portrait of America. Of particular concern was the way in which other nationalities were depicted—the government did not want Hollywood to risk offending their allies or give ammunition to opponents who could use the films to suggest that America was a racist nation whose democratic overtures to other nations were purely opportunistic. Article 10 of the Production Code had always recognised that 'the just rights, history, and feelings of any nation are entitled to most careful consideration and respectful treatment'—but, as disrespect would rarely upset domestic censors, it had rarely been strongly enforced. The war changed such attitudes. The Motion Picture Society for the Americas (MPSA), which was supposed to have been a spontaneous reaction by the industry in support of Nelson Rockefeller's role as Co-ordinator for Inter-American Affairs, was actually prompted by the government, in part to encourage films 'which created a better understanding between us and our Latin American neighbors'. Vogel was one of the MPSA's founding members and he brought in Luraschi to work on another aspect, tailoring scripts so as not to offend sensibilities south of the border—cutting out the clichéd portrayals of lazy Mexicans, for example.

Attitudes which may have at first been a patriotic impulse continued after the war, partly because of Cold War imperatives, but also for significant economic reasons. In 1948, the Supreme Court ruled on *United States v. Paramount Pictures*, enforcing the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts and ordering the major companies to divorce their production and distribution activities from the chains of theatre outlets they had built up. This ruling, breaking up the monopoly which the major studios had operated, came at the same time as Americans began to change their cinema-going habits, giving greater leisure time over to television and other entertainments. As Richard Maltby has argued, when Hollywood studios could no longer be sure of their domestic market, they began to focus on large 'prestige' productions. These were often filmed abroad, partly to take advantage of frozen funds and cheaper labour, partly because foreign locations and foreign stars gave an 'exotic' edge which would appeal to American audiences, but also because they ensured a ready 'pre-sold' market in the country of filming. Hollywood was responding to economic uncertainty by making film an even more exportable commodity and increasingly targeted an 'internationally undifferentiated mass market' [8]. As domestic earnings declined in relation to foreign takings, it was simply not good box office sense to continue to use broad racial and national stereotypes.

The new president of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA), Eric Johnston, was particularly sensitive to the industry's need for good international relations. Early in 1947 he moved to augment the PCA with an international information centre to 'furnish advisory services to producers with respect to the sensibilities of foreign film audiences' [9]. Addison Durland and Harold L. Smith were added to the PCA staff to assist in this work. Numerous press releases came from Johnston's office during the next decade, stressing how 'Hollywood is World Conscious' [10]. In practical demonstration of this, the Academy moved to make an honorary award to the best foreign film (beginning in 1947) and, as the acknowledged 'experts' in the industry, Vogel, Gordon and Luraschi were responsible for the selections. They were also prominent in another of Johnston's innovations—as a 'third check' on the content of films, after the PCA and the studio's own international departments, he established

the International Committee of the MPAA. Essentially, this gave formal recognition to the work of the 'foreign experts' of each studio and provided a forum in which they could meet regularly 'to exchange information on current problems in their field ... for the purpose of supplementing and improving their work'. The members included Gordon and Vogel, Adele Palmer from RKO (who had replaced Gordon when he moved to Universal to set up a department there), Frank McCarthy from Fox, Carl Schaefer at Warners and Eddie Schellhorn (who now handled much of the publicity side of things at Paramount). Luraschi was chairman of the committee more times than any other member, holding the post in 1950, 1951, 1953–1955 and 1958. Much of the information about other studios he included in the CIA reports came from this committee.

The reports therefore reflect the heightened sensitivity about the way America was being represented abroad. Some influential sections of opinion in Western Europe were particularly fearful that America was becoming paranoid, worried by the State Department's inability to stand up against McCarthy and the first peacetime death sentences for espionage given in the Rosenberg case. In Asia, the Korean War had demonstrated that America considered itself justified in intervening militarily in the domestic politics of the area to pursue its objective of containing Communist expansion. And in Indochina, Truman had extended military aid to the French against the Viet Minh, propping up colonial rule and undermining the credibility of America's 'free world' rhetoric. Eisenhower was well aware of the damage being done. While he immediately sought a face-saving armistice in Korea, he removed the Seventh Fleet from Formosa in February 1953 to 'unleash' Chiang Kai-Shek. Chiang began bombing raids against the China coast which convinced the Chinese Government to resume armistice talks in Korea. In Indochina, he put pressure on France to put the conflict on 'an international footing', suggesting that they offered independence to the colony, to make it clear to the rest of the world that it was not a revolt against colonial rule that Ho Chi Minh was creating, but rather a struggle between Communism and freedom. Eisenhower was also seeking to establish the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (created in 1954) and needed to convince the rest of Asia of the legitimacy and 'purity' of American motives [11].

Responding to this international context, Luraschi and the CIA were conscious that films should try to avoid arousing or justifying existing anti-American sentiment, particularly in Europe or Asia. In an exercise in 'damage limitation', he sought to edit out instances when Americans were shown as brash, drunk, sexually immoral, violent or 'trigger-happy'. When films depicted American characters abroad—as an increasing number of films in the 1950s did—Luraschi wanted to ensure that they were not shown as being insensitive to other cultures. The 'imperial' tones in *Elephant Walk*, which was set on a British plantation in Ceylon or on a American plantation in Brazil in *The Naked Jungle* were muted and balanced by showing Americans who paid proper respect to local custom and religion and by introducing 'dignified' native characters. With France engaged in a colonial war against the Viet Minh and Britain trying to crush the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya, the CIA clearly did not want Hollywood to associate Americans with imperialist pretensions. They also wanted to ensure that the films themselves did not display such insensitivity in their portrayal of other nationals. Luraschi was particularly unhappy about Jerry Lewis burlesquing an Arabian shah character in *Money From Home* and worried about how such characterisations could damage American interests. This came at a time when Iran was in the middle of a crisis in which the shah and premier Mohammed Mosaddeq were competing for effective sovereignty and the American Government suspected Soviet inspiration behind Mosaddeq's nationalisation

of British oil interests. Luraschi, if he had sufficient authority, would have ensured that no opportunity be given to communist propagandists to use Hollywood films in ridiculing American attitudes towards other races or creeds and, in the course of the letters, he pondered the reception of different films by Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists, Asia, Latin America and Europe.

Luraschi argued his case from a strongly anti-Communist position. He seems to have taken to heart the charges of communist subversion in Hollywood that the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) and McCarthy had levelled and endorsed the 'red baiting' that Los Angeles columnists Hedda Hopper and Louella Parsons were leading. Letter 2 provides a detailed assessment of how 'pink' he considers each studio's key personnel to have been and evaluates their commitment to propagating a pro-American, anti-Communist message. He warned the CIA not to trust Dore Schary's 'conversion' from left-wing sympathies and found Billy Wilder to be a 'very, very liberally minded individual' who must be 'handled' carefully. On the other hand, when he came to discuss his colleague Robert Vogel, he considered that Vogel's membership of the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals—the reactionary right-wing group most active in enforcing the blacklist—made him 'alright politically'. The letters further demonstrate the extent to which the red scare and subsequent blacklisting made it difficult for politically or socially sensitive films to get made in this period. Luraschi was ready to use his authority to impede the development of projects such as *Giant* or one considered by Wilder which would have concerned the Japanese baby of a GI. Using his position on the Academy, Luraschi also went to work to ensure that left-wing or 'suspect' films that had already been produced did not receive wider recognition or win industry endorsement. He claimed to have been instrumental in ensuring that *High Noon* was at least passed over in the category of best film in the 1953 Academy Awards and circumvented serious consideration of Julien Duvivier's *The Little World of Don Camillo* for the best foreign picture Oscar. However, he was careful to note that explicitly anti-communist message films should also be treated cautiously, responding to the CIA's decision that American culture should be used to export positive 'American values', contrasting democratic capitalism as the ideological alternative to Soviet communism.

Luraschi also evidently followed McCarthy in finding the State Department to be too left-wing or at least insufficiently anti-communist, remaining intensely dubious of the State representative in Hollywood, Orville Anderson. Moreover, with his own axe to grind against the Voice of America, he was particularly gleeful when the Senator began his mud-slinging investigation of the VOA in February. This attitude may owe much to the Catholic background he shared with McCarthy. Gallup polls in 1954 suggested that Catholics stood 'more solidly behind McCarthy than ... the rest of the populace' [12]. Patrick Allitt noted that 'Catholic new conservatives'—a description which seems to fit Luraschi as well as William Buckley and Edward Teller—took a militant anti-Soviet and anti-Communist position ... [which] understood communism as a Christian heresy':

Communism was for them what the French Revolution had been to Burke. They believed the Cold War must be seen as an eschatological struggle in which Christian Western Civilization, the preserver of truth and faith, confronted its demonic nemesis [13].

In Luraschi's case this appears to have been exacerbated by his Italian roots. He was particularly critical of films he felt were 'debunking religion' as vehicles for Communists

sowing 'the seed of doubt' about Western civilisation. In Letter 14, he draws attention to Roberto Rossellini's *Flowers of St. Francis*, Duvivier's adaptation of Giovanni Guareschi's *Little World of Don Camillo* and a potential production of Gabriele D'Annunzio's *Daughters of Jorio*—all of which are Italian, all of which, he claimed, were anti-clerical in tone or content. In one of the earliest 'scares' in the Cold War, the Communist Party had narrowly been defeated in the 1948 Italian elections. While Luraschi may not have been aware that their defeat had been contrived with the covert assistance of the CIA, he was evidently alert to the cultural left-wing of his 'homeland'.

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of the letters is the attention given to racial attitudes. Evidently asked to be on the look out for insensitive portrayals of African-Americans and opportunities to 'plant' Blacks in scenes which would imply a 'normal' and equal relationship between the races, Luraschi frequently reported on what he called 'the Negro situation'. Saunders rightly noted that Cold War strategists were particularly concerned with the mileage that Soviet propagandists got out of America's poor civil rights record. The legal sanction given to segregation (the doctrine of 'separate but equal' facilities had only just been challenged by Truman's Justice Department in December 1952) made it impossible for the American Government to speak out against the establishment of apartheid in South Africa, the framework for which was being put in place as Luraschi was writing. Efforts to pass an anti-lynching law through Congress continued to be blocked and critics of the US could point to numerous examples of economic and social inequality. Even Washington DC remained segregated until the middle of 1953; in his campaign Eisenhower had pledged to at least end this, stressing that the 'humiliation' of foreign dignitaries was 'the kind of loss we can ill afford in today's world' [14]. The fact that the voting rights of Blacks in the South were denied or circumvented undermined America's claims to be the standard-bearer of international democracy.

Rather than face up to this and use film, even in limited way, to mobilise sentiment towards civil rights reform—as some film makers had tried to do in the immediate post-war years—Luraschi and the CIA brushed the issues aside. Putting Blacks 'as spectators on golf links' in the Martin and Lewis comedy *The Caddy* was tokenism at best, while suggesting that they be 'shown using a nice-up-to-date car' represents a deliberate (albeit slightly absurd) effort to distort reality. This approach won few converts in Hollywood. Luraschi's efforts were resisted by the director Norman Taurog who refused to compromise his control over the production and, also, on another level, by the studio head Y. Frank Freeman. Freeman was 'very cold to the idea', expressly fearful of upsetting southern White audiences and blocked even such limited changes. While Luraschi was reasonably successful in discouraging the stereotyping of other nationalities, where there could only be box office gain, not loss, his efforts to change the depiction of African-Americans lacked either an effective business or social imperative that would have eased the CIA's agenda. In effect, the notion that Blacks could gradually be 'sneaked' into the backgrounds of films until they appeared to be a normal, accepted part of society mirrored the contemporary gradualist approach that the Eisenhower Administration and most northern liberals displayed towards civil rights before 1954.

We do not know for certain whether these 14 reports are the sum total of Luraschi's correspondence with the CIA, but it may well be that 'Owen' decided that this line of involvement was no longer necessary. The nature of the international market in the 1950s meant that Hollywood was more 'world conscious'. Just as Luraschi started his reports, Eric Johnston, head of the MPAA, announced 'A five-point reorganization

program for its foreign division' which included strengthening the MPAA contact with the State Department and foreign embassies and ministries [15]. This included measures to ensure that scripts handled foreign characters and situations with greater understanding. While principally concerned with marketing and distributing films, the plan also affected the PCA, bringing Addison Durland directly into the Production Code offices under its director Joseph Breen. Under the previous arrangement, when the Breen Office readers considered that scripts might breach Article 10, they asked producers to consult with Durland. A lot of the time Durland seems to have been neglected and he spent much of his time organising studio tours for foreign dignitaries. The new set-up meant that Durland was now pro-active and in a position to give his opinions on all scripts—not merely those referred to him as 'problematic'—and persuade film makers to change their characterisations of other nationals [16]. Just as Luraschi was suggesting to the CIA that a 'general industry contact' should be developed to do for the industry as a whole what he was doing at Paramount, Johnston had moved Durland into precisely that role.

Moreover, Paramount was a poor place and 1953 a poor time to make real inroads influencing production. The studio was haemorrhaging—the first to be hit by the federal court order to separate production and distribution from theatre exhibition. As box office returns plummeted and contract producers and writers were leaving, the prestige of the studio rested almost entirely on Cecil B. DeMille and production was almost at a standstill, waiting to see if three-dimension would be the saviour they were looking for. Most of the movies Luraschi referred to in his first letter—a report on the situation at the studio—had already been filmed and, as the reports progressed, he had less and less to say about actual production, referring rather to his involvement with the Oscar nominations—which was perhaps not what 'Owen' had been expecting.

Luraschi may also have been considered 'out of step' in his approach. Luraschi was evidently anxious about the ways in which Communists could use the social problems addressed in some films as anti-American propaganda. He was inclined to take the side of the International Catholic Cinema Office, which late in 1953 warned film makers that

'They must understand that if they present a degenerate picture of the West, they'll open the doors to communist propaganda. Many people will begin to believe that if moral regeneration is not possible, they must turn East' [17].

This notion was being discredited within the industry. Johnston, when reporting to the MPAA's board of directors on a survey of 'The Impact of U.S. Motion Pictures Abroad', affirmed that one of the strongest reasons given by international audiences in favouring American films was that

'They don't try to hide the faults in your society. If anything, they explore these faults and try to solve them. They show us that you know how to criticize yourselves. That's why we respect your films' [18].

Hollywood was not trying to pretend that America was Utopia. Self-awareness and the freedom of speech in America which allowed criticisms of racial problems, delinquency or crime to be put on the screen was heralded as proof of America being truly democratic—suppression and denial of the 'truth' was the province of the Communist regime. Johnston described the motion pictures as 'a pictorial Gallup poll on democracy' and this argument received widespread support. Obviously, the pat on the back

from Johnston for doing a good job was more appealing to film makers than being shouldered with responsibility in an ideological war—but the logic was also appealing and may have persuaded the CIA that they only needed to monitor the reception of films abroad and not interfere with their production.

There would have been little to encourage the prospects for investing more time or money into a programme and growing reasons to expect that Hollywood was ‘putting its house in order’. Orville Anderson’s report, which Luraschi tended to sneer at, was endorsed by the State Department as demonstrating that ‘particularly in recent months, the motion picture industry has shown a thorough realization of the importance of telling the proper story about America overseas’ [19]. The report, which is also reprinted below to offer a different perspective on this episode, suggests that Hollywood itself could even be used effectively as a model of democratic capitalism with which everyone abroad would be familiar.

Two other events occurred while Luraschi was writing which may have given the CIA pause to reconsider its agenda. First, on 9 February Allen W. Dulles was appointed as the new Director of Central Intelligence. Given his commitment to ‘psychological warfare,’ he may have reviewed the agency’s policy towards Hollywood. Secondly, the announcement of Joseph Stalin’s death came on 6 March and, according to the *New York Times*, America’s propagandists were caught ‘virtually unprepared to exploit [the] situation’ [20]. This certainly prompted a rethinking of the CIA’s propaganda activities. However, perhaps the most likely explanation of the CIA apparently backing away from its Hollywood connections is that the Eisenhower administration was openly taking over this role.

The psychological warfare agenda which Luraschi had been implementing now fell within C. D. Jackson’s remit. Jackson took up his position on Eisenhower’s Committee of International Information Activities just as Luraschi began his reports. By 17 February he had joined the White House staff directly in coordinating ‘the presentation of a favorable image of America abroad while at the same time convincing the world that communism contained the seeds of its own destruction’ [21].

Much of Jackson’s work was directed at the establishment of ‘a new agency having policy-making as well as operating functions to direct psychological warfare operations’—which in August was to take form as the United States Information Agency. Moreover, in early April 1953—less than a month after Luraschi’s last known report—the appointment of Cecil B. DeMille as a special consultant to the government on cinema was announced. DeMille was at least as conservative and anti-Communist as Luraschi, and also, of course, worked out of Paramount Studios. According to documents quoted by Saunders, he and Jackson saw eye to eye, agreeing ‘that the most effective use of American films is not to design an entire picture to cope with a certain problem, but rather to see to it that in a “normal picture” the right line, aside, inflection, eyebrow movement, is introduced’. Echoing Luraschi’s self-confidence, DeMille told Jackson that ‘any time I could give him a simple problem for a country or an area, he would find a way of dealing with it in a picture’ [22]. Jackson certainly had connections with the CIA before 1953 and, given the coincidence of timing and the fact that the reports were copied to him, it is quite conceivable that Luraschi’s reports were ‘commissioned’ by the CIA for Jackson. Having obtained a detailed picture of the problems and opportunities in adapting Hollywood films to Cold War psychological strategy, the CIA could then have passed implementation directly over to him. And, as Saunders discovered, the idea was still in currency in 1956 when the government brought the Joint Chiefs of Staff together with John Ford, John Wayne and Merian

Cooper to discuss how Hollywood could promulgate the concept of 'militant liberty'. They agreed on the imperative to produce films which would 'explain the true conditions existing under Communism ... and to explain the principles upon which the Free World way of life is based' [23].

Research into the projects which Luraschi refers to demonstrates exactly how much—and how little—he was able to change. The documents which follow are annotated to demonstrate this and, where relevant, the scripts in question have been analysed. The CIA plan may never have been fully formulated and its impact limited, but the reports reveal much about the ways in which Hollywood and different film makers responded to the Cold War. They represent an excellent illustration of how anti-Communism in the film industry was not confined to blacklisting and overt attacks on suspected Communists, but affected everyday production. Discerning a critical moment for America in world affairs, Luraschi's letters are permeated not only with a sense of paranoia, but also with the grandiose sentiment that film could change the course of history.

Letter 1: 24 January 1953

Dear Owen,

This is just to clear the decks and give you a picture by picture report at [Paramount] so that you will be completely up to date as of now.

NEGROES in pictures. This subject has been discussed with Casting [24]. Henceforth, wherever the background of the picture permits, well dressed negroes will be planted as a part of the American scene, without appearing too conspicuous or deliberate.

SANGAREE which is shooting doesn't permit this kind of planting, unfortunately because the picture is period and layed [*sic*] in the South. It will consequently show Plantation negroes. However, this is being off-set to a certain degree by planting a dignified negro butler in one of the principals' homes, and by giving him dialogue indicating he is a freed man and can work where he likes [25].

CADDY as you know, is the Martin-Lewis golf comedy, actually closed down at the moment because of Lewis's sickness. When it reopens, as there are still some shots on the golf links to be made, with spectators watching the match, some negroes will be planted in the crowd, and, if possible, shown using a nice up-to-date car [26].

ARROWHEAD (formerly Adobe Walls, the Nat Holt Western). This presented a serious problem which the Commies could use to their advantage in Asia. The complete indictment of Apaches and our treatment of them. The indictment consisted of our white characters claiming Apaches are just bad, and that is that. You're born an Indian so you're no good. The other point was the shipment of a whole tribe by the army against their wishes to Florida, and the tagging of them like animals. The conflict now has been reduced to one of personalities. The Apaches are misbehaving because they are following the misguided advice of their leader Toreano (Jack Palance) who has a long feud with Bannon (Heston) an apache reared white man. All the bad acts on both sides stem out of this personal feud, and at the end of the picture, after Toreano is killed, it is clear that there is now going to be peace, as the leadership of the tribe is being taken up by a different man. From a very intellectual standpoint, the inference is analogous to the fact that the Germans and Russians would be all right if they hadn't

respectively listened to Hitler and Stalin. From the broad audience standpoint, particularly the Asian one, we have removed the broad indictment of a people because of its color. The Commies will probably still make use of it, but less effectively, particularly since it is a period western.

The removal of the tribe by the Army to Florida is handled in this manner. One of the older chiefs has himself requested that they be moved to a more fertile and productive place where his people can make a better living. This consequently no longer has the flavor of forced immigration creating D[isplaced] P[erson]s. The tagging of the Indians is explained by an army man as a means of identification, in the same manner that the soldiers themselves are tagged.

To achieve all of this, which at best is a removal of negative values, rather than the introduction of positive ones, it has been necessary to redub several lines of dialogue since the picture has already closed. Our contact at Paramount had no difficulty, thanks to the very cooperative attitude of Nat Holt, to whom it was put on a commercial and patriotic basis [27].

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. This is a project picture to be made by Nat Holt. Adventure intrigue. Presently still in the discussion stages. Nothing written as yet. Was originally to have been layed [sic] in the Azores, but because of dull background has been switched to Tangier. Could be a good vehicle to introduce some constructive thoughts, but must wait for a script in order to make an accurate evaluation. In the meantime, however, since the heavy was to have been an American, Holt has been informed that we positively don't want an American heavy in Tangier, or any part of *that* world, at the present time, for the very obvious political reasons. This will be changed; the heavy will probably have a slavic sounding name. You will be kept informed of further developments [28].

MONEY FROM HOME. This is the forthcoming Martin and Lewis comedy to be made by Hal Wallis. This type of vehicle is not a very fertile field for our purposes. Shall watch it closely however. Perhaps we can inject the negro angle. There was one funny gag involving a couple of wives of a visiting Pasha, a horse-race lover. We have had the gag removed, since it involved the manhandling of Moslem women by Lewis, and in my opinion would have had disastrous results in the Moslem world. Hal Wallis was very understanding [29].

PERSIAN GULF. I don't know what is going to happen to this project. It certainly is not going to be made by [Joseph] Sistrom and Warren Duff; the story they wrote was so involved that the key points were never quite clear; it was difficult to put your finger on the picture problem and determine who was the heavy and why, and what should the hero do to be one. It certainly contains very dangerous political elements layed [sic] against the background of a part of the world which we all know is in a critical situation [30]. There's nothing much I can do either way however, unless the project becomes active. There is some discussion of giving it to [William H.] Pine [and William C.] Thomas, and discussions have already been had with these gentlemen pointing out the dangers, which they seem to understand [31]. I would like it to become a vehicle to carry some of our points if possible, but this can only be achieved once we know who is going to make it, and what the story line is. There is also the possibility that the property will be sold to the outside. If this takes place, we will have to keep track and see who gets it. It could be a very disastrous picture if the wrong people got a hold of

it. Either deliberately or through ignorance or indifference. This is one of the reasons we should get a general industry contact as soon as possible.

INCA STORY. Also very much in abeyance at the moment due to casting difficulties. The proper character of the American lead can best be written, when once we know who is to play it. As long as the story stays at Paramount, we can keep track of this whenever it is made. In the meantime we have planted the background for the female lead, so wherever the story goes, at least this will have a chance of remaining as an integral part. The girl is now no longer an American girl of dubious virtue, but a nice foreign girl D.P. Whatever she did in her past was because she was on the run after the Commies took over the country, which until then had been a very nice place to live in. Not quite as blunt and corny as this, but in essence this will be the idea [32].

BABYLON REVISITED. Paramount does not seem interested in making this story at the moment and it is up for sale. Actually it could be made as a dramatic subject without being injurious to the U.S. The producer who was originally interested in it at Paramount, Bernie Smith, was in my opinion, very dubious from a political standpoint. He is no longer at the studio but still shows interest in the subject on the outside. [William] Wyler was also interested in it for [Gregory] Peck, and then the project fizzled. You will note, however, from the names of the people who like this story that we have reason to be worried about it and should keep track of where it ends up [33].

RHAPSODY. Has been sold to Metro. Dory Schary liked it very much. It was prepared by Bernie Smith and Charlie Vidor (of *Thunder in the East* fame) at Paramount. Could be an excellent dramatic love triangle, but it contained a serious social problem due to the characters as written [34]. Was in process of having this changed, based on casting, when sale took place, so ... Now Schary may see the problem, may correct it, may ignore it, perhaps (let's be kind) because he's oblivious to it. But as this should be an important and entertaining picture, it should be seen by a large public, hence all the more reason why it should contain no injurious thinking, but constructive scenes.

NEW KIND OF LOVE. This is up in the air in spite of an early start date. Billy Wilder just can't find the right story line. He has switched as you know, from the early 'male *Ninotchka*' idea, as he said Communism was no longer funny, and he couldn't make the story work today, switching the Commissar from a woman to a man and making it 1952. There's a lot of truth to this. Nevertheless, he's a very very liberally minded individual working with Jules Epstein, a writer, of very much the same ilk [35]. Consequently they will have to be guided very carefully over the paths they are going to travel, to see that whatever sympathy is given to the Russians, is given to the character of the man himself, for what he is, and does not slop over to 'there being some good in the system' he represents. This can best be achieved by a sincere love affair between him and our American woman which can never reach its proper fruition, because the system he serves will not permit an individual any personal thinking or happiness, in contradiction to the God-given rights under our Constitution. If we can get this thought across in terms of 'boy loves girl, girl loves boy—but they can't have each other,' there will be no need for soap-box oratory to explain to an audience that the USSR system stinks. Emotionally every man and woman would be hissing at it. I think we have Wilder on this track, and now he is looking for the right frame-work for it. More later [36].

This about covers it for the moment. As other project comes up, or are developed and as the ones covered in this report unfold, I shall send you further information.

Letter 2: 24 January 1953

Dear Owen,

A few random thoughts on the general situation. I have sent you a separate report on the situation at Paramount, but after all there are only a limited number of pictures to be produced, and even if we can get some constructive thoughts into all of them, there will still be a lot of pictures being made in Hollywood which we should consider.

I would have discussed this with the gentleman to whom you introduced me [37], but unfortunately he had to leave town before we could get together again, so I am passing these thoughts on to you in the meantime. If they are repetitious, forget them; if not they may help crystallize your thinking.

Since the election, and additionally since the new anti-semitic policies of the USSR, our leftists are very subdued and quiet [38]. Maybe the actual party members are going underground; the fellow travellers are scared or disillusioned, and the overly broad-minded liberals are coming to their senses; be that as it may, there is going to be a decrease in the amount of pro-commie propaganda they will attempt to inject for awhile; it doesn't mean we must be less vigilant, not does it mean necessarily that they will automatically swing in the opposite direction and become anti-commie. However, this lull, as I see it, is the best moment for us to start injecting some of the various important points we have to make.

I know about the negro situation, and my other report will show where I have already taken steps in the right direction. I shall have to rely upon you, or some other person you will designate, to keep me promptly informed of any critical situation as it may arise, and towards which you will need our constructive help. Time is of the essence, as it takes so long to inject a thought into a picture and get it before the public [39].

Since I can only affect the production schedule at Paramount, it is important, as soon as you feel it opportune, to make the next step, that people in key positions be solicited for help, so that a larger number of pictures can come under our influence. We have already talked about the *Production Code Administration*; this is a wonderful spot to keep check on the Independents, both from the standpoint of eliminating troublesome material as of injecting stuff. Of the two candidates mentioned I should add that [Geoffrey] Shurlock is a gentle type of person, perhaps a little too inclined to compromise on divergence of opinion; [Jack] Vizzard, whilst less experienced in the general field, is very militant to the point of being quasi intransigent on his fight against the Commies [40].

Looking around at the other Studios for a general analysis where best we should place our people, I feel as follows:

RKO: Hopeless for the moment; too disorganized and not sufficient production [41].

Columbia: Some of our leftists have been very successful in the past in getting their thoughts into the productions of this company, as the record will show. This has been principally by individual producers or writers, rather than by a front-office person in a key spot [42]. I don't know of any candidate you could place in a key spot, and in any

case, I don't think they have sufficient production to warrant enlisting someone at this Studio, when you have already indicated to me you don't want too broad an operation anyhow. If anything dangerous should crop up here, it would be caught, I hope by the Production Code Administration, and in that case, as a last resort a personal plea to Harry Cohn should do the trick.

Warners: They blow with the wind. Vide the anti-nazi pictures; later the pro-russian pictures, now the anti-commie pictures and the pro-catholic ones [43]. The wind is right for us, so we can leave them alone. In case of emergency which PCA might alert us to, again a direct appeal to Warners should be effective.

Republic, Monogram, etc.: I am not too informed on this. But what I have said for Columbia and Warners may partially apply here, with a chance of direct appeal to Studio head, in case of emergency.

Universal: I would say this is not unlike Columbia, except that the leftist wing got more conscious help from the front-office; at least from certain individuals in it. I am thinking particularly of Bill Gordon, who at the moment is very quiet. I don't know whether he feels betrayed or disillusioned, depending on what his actual status with the party may have been, but in any case the enthusiasm appears to be gone. [44] Let matters stand 'as is' for the moment.

That brings us to **Fox** and **Metro**, both of which are important because of the quantity and appeal of the pictures they turn out [45].

At **Fox** you have Zanuck; I am sure he will not consciously do anything to help the left; how militant he will be against I don't know either. Personally, very much so, I should imagine, but perhaps not in his product [46]. He has Blaustein as a producer, regarding whom I am not quite certain [47]. He also has Frank McCarthy; the latter has been active principally on pictures set in foreign countries, and in this respect he has shown the proper sensitivity; however, even though he is a strong supporter of Ike, I'd like to know more about him politically. If he is OK, he could be a wonderful asset [48].

Metro: Now here's the Company we must do something about. At least that's how I feel. The name, the quantity of pictures, the distribution they get, etc. [49]. Dore Schary, who now heads their production, you must know has been the subject of rumours for a long time. It is felt that he leaned very much to the left. He has others on his lot who enjoy (?) [*sic*] the same reputation. Of late he has been outwardly very anti-commie. His production of *The Hoaxters* is the best material example of this, so much so that it is opined in some circles that this picture is the 'white paper' of a fellow traveller, or the denouement of a misguided person [50]. I think we definitely should do something about this organization.

In the International dept. heading censorship etc. is *Robert M. Vogel*; has been there a great number of years, knows his work well; talks a good game with his colleagues, but I don't know how much strength he actually carries inside the Studio; am pretty certain he is alright politically; he has been openly identified with the Motion Picture Alliance which is very anti-commie, and which has been accused even by fair-minded liberals as being 'fascistic'. If he were acceptable he might, *alone*, not be as effective as we would want, since I'm not sure of how much weight he actually carries. With the help of an important key executive in the production end to back him up, he should be able to operate satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, if such an executive exists, this person could

execute the work using Vogel in the normal sense, without Vogel being taken into the organization; this I mention only in case you are concerned in keeping the number of people officially engaged to a minimum for obvious reasons [51].

Looking for that executive one's mind turns to the Story Dept, and its head Kenneth MacKenna. Frankly I know nothing about one way or the other, and in view of the importance of this post, I think it would be in our interest to find out how he rates, so that we can be watchful, or outright enlist his help. The local *Who's Who* has this to say about him:

Kenneth MacKenna: Story editor, actor (right name Leo Mielziner, Jr.) born Canterbury, NH, Aug. 19th, 1899; educated Paris, London, Ethical Culture School, NY, Columbia U., NY. Brought to Hollywood in 1939 as Studio Story editor, later taking over scenario dept; since 1950, head of story dept. and editorial executive with Dore Schary [52].

There is no published biography on Robert M.G. Vogel; he is about fifty, married, three children, U.S. born, partially educated in Switzerland, smattering (not too fluent) of German, Spanish. Has travelled in South America. European experience based on his schooling in French Switzerland.

That's about it. Hope this isn't too long, but wanted to get these matters off my chest, so that you can dismiss them, if you see fit, or take any other steps you may deem necessary. Please let me know whether I am wasting my time or yours with this kind of report, or whether it has any value.

Before closing, I should add one word more about some of the representatives of Government who are stationed in Hollywood and are interested in Movie content.

First of all *Mogens Skot-Hansen*. Official representative of the U.N. Ostensibly out here to try and popularize the U.N. concept through movies [53]. A Dane. Likeable fellow. As a U.N. employee is apolitical, and consequently not openly anti-commie; as a matter of fact, feels the whole attitude against the commies is hysterical. Has made contact at all Studios and has achieved a certain minor degree of success. Is, or was until recently, mostly wooed by the leftist fringe. Perhaps they find it convenient to try and use the U.N. aegis for some of their questionable ideas, and he doesn't realise, or maybe he willingly acquiesces. I don't know. They are in any case lying low at the moment. I would feel securer if the post were abolished; I don't see what earthly political value it has from our point of view, and from the enemy's standpoint it can be too easily used as a cloak of respectability for questionable material. Once we had a serious argument with him about the Doctor in *Peking Express*, who was a U.N. doctor and consequently as such didn't care about the politics of the sick he was interested in curing, but as a private individual in the picture, an American, did express an anti-commie attitude on politics, as was becoming a loyal U.S. citizen in these days. Skot was very disturbed. Wanted the picture stopped; wanted the character changed, etc., etc. We paid no attention and went ahead [54]. He had a fellow come out from U.N. in the East to talk to us, who tried to get quite tough, threatening, if need be, to go to Barney Balaban [55]. This fellow's name is Joseph Handler, Head of Public Information Dept., World Health Organization, U.N. We ignored the guy's demands, and nothing ever happened. There was, however, far too much excitement and agitation for so relatively unimportant a matter, and I've always been a little leary of Skot since then. If my feelings should be well founded, then perhaps we should look into:

Orville Anderson. Employee of the State Dept. Was in Italy several years, knows Pilade [56] quite well, is in Hollywood for, frankly I can't define exactly what reason, but it has to do with picture content and international relations; has never said anything out of place to me, and is only because he is being introduced by Skot to that questionable circle of friends that I wonder ... Incidentally, Bill Gordon recently took Anderson to see Schary on a long conference, and since he comes from State I wonder—although I suppose we must have some good people in State [57].

A picture made during the War by the Armed Forces called *Why We Fight*. You may remember this series. It dealt with our Allies and various other problems with which our troops had to be indoctrinated. One of the series dealt with our ally Russia, naturally in a favorable light [58]. Evans, the Malayan censor from Singapore, told us recently that in 1951 he was disturbed by the number of Chinese who seemed to be attending screening of a 16mm print borrowed from the U.S. Film Office (I don't know whether this is the proper name) in Singapore. It turned out to be one extolling Russia. He made a swift complaint; the screenings stopped, and the print was taken off the list of available subjects. I just wonder whether all of this was accidental, and whether we have taken the proper precautions to see that the print was removed from circulation all over the world.

Letter 3: 26 January 1953

Dear Owen,

A couple of extra words to add to the foregoing:

At Paramount, following new problems:

GRINGO. A comedy vehicle for Bob Hope, involving Mexico, bandits, etc. Very funny, but very offensive South of the Border. Idea has been killed, but I am afraid the writer, Eddie Beloin, will try to peddle it elsewhere in town, and it may end up on another lot [59]. This would only be practical if a Mexican comedian like Cantinflas were to play the lead. Done by a U.S. company with a U.S. comedian, it would be most injurious to our Latin-American interests.

LISBON. May be made with Joan Crawford. A melodrama with love angles, and political undertones concerning U.S. business man held for ransom by some Iron Curtain country. Could be messy if mishandled, but so far we have them thinking along the right track and this could be very useful to us. Shall watch very carefully [60].

LEININGER AND THE ANTS. Layed [sic] in the Upper Amazon. Useful to show friendly relations between Brazilian and an American who have been living down there for some fifteen years [61].

ELEPHANT WALK. Pure love, adventure and melodrama. Perhaps can get a couple of points across with the American character, Dana Andrews, but unfortunately the role isn't exactly suited for what we would like to have said [62].

Letter 4: 27 January 1953

Dear Owen,

I don't know whether there is any branch of our organization, or of an affiliate one,

which concerns itself with promoting distribution or dissemination abroad of those subjects which could be considered good propaganda for the U.S., and yet do not fall in the commercial field of motion pictures, so that they would normally get distribution through the commercial motion picture organizations. What I am referring to are some of the documentaries.

You probably know I am active on several committees at the Academy, one dealing with documentaries. One reviewing the various entries submitted for this year's Awards, we ran last night an excellent subject entitled *American Harvest*. Running time 30 mins. In Technicolor. Produced by the Jam Handy Organization, Inc., for the Chevrolet division of General Motors. It is a very well made film calculated to sell Chevrolets. Actually only the last two or three minutes are devoted to pointed shots of how a Chevrolet is made. Prior to this the film is devoted to showing the riches and the natural resources of our country; the type of people who develop them under our system of free enterprise, and how, little by little, each aspect makes a small contribution which ends up in making the manufacture of a Chevrolet, or any car, for that matter, possible. How the car then benefits the country and so-on down the line to the very individual, who made his small contribution in the first place. Mr Wilson could well use this film to substantiate his statement that what is good for G.M. is good for the USA and vice-versa! [63]. It was the unanimous opinion of everyone present (and we are a heterogeneous group!) that this was the finest piece of American propaganda that we have seen in a long time; not soap-box stuff, just plain interesting truthful facts of our country with which the rest of the world should be acquainted. The scenes are all shot silent, and a well-written narration runs throughout the film underscored with appropriate music; it would be a simple matter to prepare foreign language versions by just replacing the narration, and such narration could be a little more slanted and emphasized politically for the particular country for which it is being prepared [64]. I know it's a pretty difficult proposition to get world-wide distribution for a subject of this type. It should be seen abroad however. I remember in 1946 when I went to Germany, what a wonderful impression was being created on the post-war Germans by a subject the Army was distributing called *The Jeep* [65]. I would say this falls into the same category, but covers a much broader field. Perhaps G.M. itself would make up the foreign versions and then place prints at the disposal of our film officers abroad, so that they could be placed at the disposal of various groups they contact; certainly it would do much more good than the Army film about our 'Russian Allies' regarding which I have already written! We only see the selected documentaries, but if what I am mentioning is at all feasible, there must be a lot of other documentaries which could fit into this groove and of which I am not aware. Hope someone can look into this, as it seems to be a chance we should not let slip by.

Regards,

Letter 5: 31 January 1953

Dear Owen,

In one of my other notes I mentioned the name of *Orville Anderson* of the State Dept. and the survey he was doing out here. He has completed his report and I am attaching two copies of the same [66]. It is a very ambitious one and, as far as I can see, he has covered every possible facet of the Motion Picture Industry and how it can be used

abroad in the interests of the U.S. The purpose of this note is not to evaluate his suggestions; I haven't had time to study them too carefully, neither do I know how practical they are, who would do the work, who would pay the costs, etc., etc. Rather I should like to point out that even if every one of his suggestions is good, their implementation will be only as effective as the attitude and the sincerity of the person or the dept. handling them.

Let me clarify. Some time ago we had the French section of the Voice of America out here doing a programme of a very constructive character for French dissemination [67] The things that were to be said of Hollywood and France were excellent and could not help but contribute to a better feeling between the two countries; in other words on paper the script was fine. Now comes the rub. The Voice unit made contact principally with the suspected Commies and known leftists, so it was this particular group of Hollywoodites who would be the sponsors of this better understanding between the two countries. An impartial French audience that might have listened to the programme would have been pleased by it and would have gained an improved opinion of the players speaking, so that if at some later date they were found to be Communists, they would have been sympathetic to those 'nice people' who were being the victims of a 'witch hunt'. Even if such an investigation were not to take place, the Communists in France would still have been able to use the programme to show that the only proper consideration from America for French things and feelings exists in the Communist group. Additionally, to give the group a greater feeling of importance, they tricked a couple of non-Commie individuals, such as Alan Ladd, into participating. Fortunately I found out what was taking place and through the channels of the companies involved, stopped the whole matter. You may have heard about this through other sources.

Now my point is obvious; all of Anderson's suggestions don't mean a thing if they are going to be handled in the above manner, as a matter of fact they would be most undesirable. I know nothing of Anderson and he may be very good, but unless we maintain strict [control] over this whole operation, it could still be loused up by people under him, deliberately or otherwise. Now I know I'm not exactly dealing here with the principal points of what my function is to be, and it can well be that smarter people than I have already gone into this very thoroughly, so I am wasting my time in bringing it up. However, until I get positive direction from you and have a little more experience in this work, I would just as soon pass on everything that gives me concern, and leave it to you to dismiss it or pursue it further.

Cordially,

Letter 6: 6 February 1953

Dear Owen,

Some achievements and some setbacks this week.

DRUNKS. Have succeeded in removing American drunks, generally in prominent, if not principal roles from following pictures:

Houdini

Drunken American reporter. Cut entirely. Mr Freeman most helpful. This may need a retake to correct [68].

- Legend of the Incas* Removed all heavy drinking on part of American lead from script.
- Money from Home* (Hal Wallis–Martin & Lewis picture) They have a secondary more British character, a jockey, always dead-drunk for comedy and plot purposes. Am trying to have this changed, and will be successful if proper casting of role is resorted to, for instance Richard Hayden [69].
- Elephant Walk* Keeping drunkenness to strict plot purposes only, and instead of its being spread over a whole group of British planters, am trying to reduce it and condense it to one or two characters [70].
- Leininger and the Ants* All heavy drinking by American lead is being cut out of script.

So much for American drunks. With the exception of Wallis, who is an independent individual, I had no trouble with the other productions, as Mr Freeman feels very strongly about the whole matter, and is wholly responsible for the Houdini elimination, which took some doing [71].

NEGROES. Here comes the setback. I had indicated in a previous report that when *Caddy* would resume at Paramount, some negroes would be spotted as spectators on golf links. Casting put the call in; the director turned them down. That matter was discussed with Freeman, who upheld the director. Then took the opportunity of opening up the whole matter with him. He [Freeman] is very cold to the idea, no matter how much he realizes the importance of such scenes in Asia, because he feels it will create a problem for him domestically. Have tried to explain we can avoid this, but I don't know how successful I've been. Upshot is this, whenever we want negroes injected, must check with him personally and he will decide. My contact in Casting is very sympathetic and anxious to help, and will bring every possibility to my attention; the more stuff I am able to refer to Freeman, the better, as the law of averages will help us out, even if we do get some turn-downs [72].

ORIENTALS. In *Elephant Walk* we have had scene before Bhuddist [*sic*] shrines re written, to remove jocular feeling, and possible disrespect from dialogue of principals. Understand, Bhuddist organization in Ceylon made same request of producer, so we are on the beam. New dialogue has been approved by Bhuddists [73].

In Wallis picture *Money From Home* am still very disturbed by oriental comedy character and wives. Have removed some of this comedy, but would be happier if whole character could be taken out. This appears to be impossible as Wallis is set on it. Have changed the title to something outlandish, so it cannot be identified with Moslems or Hindus. Am also checking wardrobe and turbans to avoid religious significance, but this still doesn't do the trick. Am afraid we will have some kicks on this [74].

Elephant Walk. More on this. Have made sure character of Dr Pereira (good character) will be cast with actor impersonating full-blooded Ceylonese. Very dignified doctor, who takes care of our sick male lead, and is spearhead against cholera epidemic. Have also asked, during epidemic, he send for a couple of Ceylonese interns and nurses to

help; this to balance Ceylonese against coolie labor. Educated Ceylonese will handle themselves on equal level when dealing with the Europeans [75].

Arrowhead. The dialogue corrections regarding the Indian conflict, indicated in an earlier report, have been made [76]. It took a lot of doing after all, the resistance coming from Charlton Heston, for reasons pertaining purely to characterization [77]. Producer finally had him see me, so I could do the selling. I was lucky; he did so without further protest.

New Kind of Love. You have probably heard that this project of Billy Wilder's, which was to have been a male *Ninotchka* has been shelved. Many reasons: No script ready; Should it be made in third dimension or Widescreen; projected leading lady wasn't too enthusiastic; couldn't guarantee finishing date with Yul Brynner, etc. etc. Actual truth is, Wilder couldn't lick the story. It's just as well, from our point of view, that he dropped the subject, as, if improperly made, it would have had an adverse effect politically of the one desired [78].

Letter 7: 7 February 1953

Dear Owen,

Here's one we will have to think about. From other reports you know that Billy Wilder's project at Paramount has been shelved. In any case he had been toying around with a couple of ideas for independent production anyhow, but now that he is without an assignment at the Studio, he is speeding up his work on the other ideas.

The one most prominently in his mind now, and which he has discussed with me *ex-officio*, for guidance, concerns the return to Italy of an ex-G.I. on his honeymoon trip, with his U.S. bride, and the rediscovery in Italy of his illegitimate off-spring, borne by a 'decent' Italian girl with whom he had an affair, and who was killed during an air-raid after the child was born. The G.I. father has not known of the existence of the child up to this moment. The story then would develop the personal problem with his new wife, the responsibility that he owes his son, etc., and would end on the constructive note of the child being taken into the family and returned to the States.

Kirk Douglas will play the G.I. However, on considering his story-line, he thinks the Italian angle with an Italian kid is old hat, and would like to transpose the whole idea to a Japanese setting. He recently read an article by Mitchener [*sic*], I think, talking about the problem of the G.I. illegitimate kids in Japan; their not being accepted in the Japanese communities where they are given an insulting Japanese name, and the failure of American fathers to do anything about facing up to their responsibilities.

You have to handle Billy easy, so I took a deep breath and told him that the background would undoubtedly be novel and fresher than the Italian one, but that he would be buying a problem for himself by introducing a racial element into his story, which would not be the case in a European setting. I then took him over the hurdles and showed him what a wonderful piece of propaganda this would be for the Commies. I'll spare you all the details; you know them. Billy wasn't deterred; he said he would use the obstacles I was bringing up in the interest of the story, and disprove any Commie propaganda by showing, in the picture, that this was one of the many regrettable things that occur during a war, and we were sufficiently conscious about it to do something. I pointed out that the happy ending in the story showed that our characters in the

picture did something about it, but the Commies could still point out that in a practical sense we haven't done a thing. Furthermore, it would be very embarrassing to Japanese sensitivity to even remind them of the situation by making a picture on the subject. A magazine article was one thing; a graphic picture something entirely different.

He still felt he could overcome all of those obstacles, and in giving me his solutions, I pointed out to him that he now seemed to be writing something which was calculated to encourage mixed marriages, with the resultant problem in this country. He's still not discouraged. Since this is a picture which would be made outside the aegis of one of the major companies, it is difficult to keep track of it, and impossible to bring 'front office' pressure to bear on points in which we are interested. I suggested it would be very unfair to himself and to his subject matter to write a story of this type without being familiar at first hand with the country, the people and the problem. That he must make a trip to Japan in the near future, since he also wants to explore for locations.

Now, a good Billy Wilder picture is something the public will go and see, so if it contains points we want made, it would be of inestimable value. Whilst I am very sceptical of the whole matter, it could well be that I am unduly disturbed, and the reaction of yourself and colleagues may be more optimistic. I will consequently welcome your reaction as soon as you've been able to give this kind of idea some thought.

Bear in mind, that if he is to be encouraged, I am in a position of helping him do it along the right lines, and he will be very receptive to suggestions from me as to what angles should be emphasized. On the other hand, if it is to be killed, I can try to deter him as much as possible, but the spirit of contradiction in him, particularly since this is a personal project, may make him continue anyhow. In this latter instance, since he must make a trip to Japan, as outlined above, and will need passports, permits, etc., we can keep track of him, so that the proper people higher up can make our point of view valid; at that level, I am sure he would be amenable [79].

This may not develop too quickly, but if it has to be killed, it is much easier to do this before a lot of money and time has been spent in developing the project, so I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Cordially,

Letter 8: 9 February 1953

Dear Owen,

Here's another we have to watch. A novel called the *Giant* [*sic*] by Edna Ferber. In case you missed the reviews it's a long involved novel on life in Texas, and touches upon the following three problems:

1. Unflattering portrayal of rich, uncouth, ruthless Americans. (Texans)
2. Racial denigration of Mexicans in Texas.
3. Implication wealth of Anglo-Texans built by exploiting Mexican labor.

Doran asked me to read it as a possibility for *Gregory Peck* or *Kirk Douglas* [84]. I read it. Story could be told and above problems avoided by very careful handling and sincere effort of Producer and Director. A lot depends on the latter point. I asked D.A. how it came on the lot. Had he dug it up personally. He answered *Charlie Vidor* was

interested in doing it either for MGM or Paramount, and it was Vidor who had brought it to his attention [81].

I killed it then and there and told D.A. bluntly we couldn't possibly take a chance with Vidor, after *Thunder in the East*. He said forget it. I'll see to it that it is killed each time someone tries to reactivate it at Paramount; but what happens if Vidor doesn't lose interest and tries to take it elsewhere? That's why the sooner we can get general industry help, the happier I will feel [82].

Regards,

Letter 9: 14 February 1953

Dear Owen,

I would be interested in hearing from you regarding the value, constructive or otherwise, of a picture MGM is just releasing entitled *Above and Beyond*. In case you haven't seen it it deals with the organization of a squadron to be trained to drop the atom bomb on Japan. Based on actual truth, it boils down to a biography of Lt. Col. Tibbetts, who was the commanding officer involved. Picture very well made; plenty of thought given to the problems of conscience in dropping such a terrible death-dealing weapon [83].

The reason I ask is that Paramount had just made a deal with the author of the above piece, Beirne Lay, Jr., to do a story with Jimmy Stewart in the lead about the Air Force problem of keeping ex-air force men active in the reserve activities, in order to form a squadron of B47's (the new six engine bomber) which would be capable of instant mobilization to deliver an atom bomb on any target in the world.

I've spoken to the author and have told him we don't want this project to develop into a picture which the enemy can use to show that we are a lot of trigger-happy warmongering people, just itching to drop atom bombs at the slightest provocation, particularly on Orientals. The story doesn't have to be like this at all. The author agrees with me, that this impression must be avoided. First of all he wants to make a good personal story, so as to safeguard the entertainment values; secondly, we will get all the cooperation we want from the Air Force, so will get some excellent action footage of jets, etc., in action; and thirdly, the story should deal with the difficulties of creating the 'first military force, conceived, trained and equipped' (these are the author's words) 'to prevent, not fight, a war.' It's a thin line of differentiation, but properly developed it could be effective [84].

I need guidance. First a reaction as to what was right or wrong with the MGM story, then what to emphasize or stay away from in this one. Perhaps it's too hot a subject to handle at best, I don't know. Be glad to hear from you when you will have had time to give it some thought.

Regards,

Letter 10: 23 February 1953

Dear Owen,

Little activity to report during the past week due to slow-down production wise; everything seems to be marking time pending a variety of decisions to be made on third

dimension, etc. Not much happening at Paramount anyhow, as you know, and as far as I can make out, same goes for other Studios [85].

Billy Wilder seems to be fairly set on doing Japanese kid story I wrote you about earlier, so as soon as you can get me word on this, I would appreciate it.

I think we have succeeded in shunting *The Little World of Don Camillo* over to one side so that it won't get the Oscar for the 'Best Foreign Picture.' Actually, I don't personally feel that this picture is too dangerous politically, but the Leftists were so intent on getting it to qualify, and have been doing some private electioneering for it, that they must see a great advantage in its getting an Oscar, so that's why I have gone right out against it. I presume it is because the end of the picture would indicate that it is possible for Communists and others to live 'happily' together [86].

Incidentally was interested in reading in yesterday's paper about the investigation of the French Section of Voice of America; sort of bears out what we had sensed here, (as already discussed), and was also interested in seeing reference to the use of Edna Ferber's *Giant* as anti-American propaganda [87]. Couldn't be a coincidence that Vidor wanted to do it with Peck. All the more reason why we must expand industrywise soonest to keep track of these general activities.

Regards,

Letter 11: 24 February 1953

Dear Owen,

More on Orville Anderson. He came in to have lunch with me today and we had a long talk about his work in general. He told me that Bill Gordon had introduced him to Dory Schary with whom he had a long chat regarding his report to the State Dept [88]. That Schary had been sufficiently impressed with it to discuss it with Eric Johnston when he was out here recently; that the latter had also been impressed and said he would take it up with Ken Clark when he went back East [89].

I find Anderson comes under Compton (who has just resigned), and also works with Begg. Anderson says he will be leaving Hollywood shortly to assume a new post which may be in Teheran, but more probably in Mexico City under newly appointed Ambassador White [90].

To replace Anderson in this work will come a young man by the name of Dave Penn, who was recently with George Allen in Yugoslavia [91].

I repeat that Anderson is most enthusiastic about the possibilities of his project; what it could do for both the Industry and the Country in furthering better understanding of us abroad. It is important therefore to find out how he stands, so as to place the plan in its proper political perspective.

Regards,

Letter 12: 25 February 1953

Dear Owen,

I don't know whether this is any concern of ours or not, but once again here it is, for

what it's worth. Apparently *Birth of a Nation* is being re-released again in England. I have read a review in a very serious magazine which I get regularly as they generally make a sound analysis of all problem pictures in relation to present day politics [92]. This review states amongst other things:

'The story is concerned with the aftermath of the Civil War in America and the origins of the K.K.K. as a force intended to destroy the power of the Negroes who threatened to overrun the State and break down the Constitution. Perhaps the anti-Negro coloring of the film is a bit too strong for present palates and one wonders whether the film's release at the moment, when so much feeling is being aroused in Kenya, South Africa and other places, is altogether a fortunate accident.'

It's the last point that worries me, apart from whether the impact of the picture will be a very serious one or not.

Did its re-release in England do us any harm? Can't we stop any plans that might be afoot for a general world-wide re-release?

Regards,

Letter 13: 9 March 1953

Dear Owen,

We have just received word from Duke Wales at the Motion Picture Producers Association that we are to expect shortly the visit of a *Voice of America* correspondent by the name of Ramses Nassif, who will be in Hollywood from March 19th to 25th. He wants to tour the Studios, Paramount in particular, to gather material for a series of scripts for broadcast to the Middle East; this will consist of interviews with stars, directors and technicians [93].

The arrangements for the visit are being made by Arthur Kaufman, Chief Special events international radio program division, U.S. Dept. of State, International Information Administration.

In view of the questionable nature of some of the Voice of America operations, I wonder if we can get any kind of information on this Nassif fellow. Who is he? Is it OK to work with him?

So far Duke Wales has been unable to obtain any dope, and even Orville Anderson, the State Dept. fellow out here, has never heard of him [94].

Regards,

Letter 14: 9 March 1953

Dear Owen,

So just a few words on a couple of random matters. Have been doing a lot of personal work with various members of the Board of Governors of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, re. the award for the best foreign picture [95]. A previous report from me will have indicated that our Leftist friends are anxious to get *The Small World of Don Camillo* the award. They want to focus attention on a picture which in

essence says Communism and the rest of the world *can* get on together. I think we have them stymied. So far we have lined up enough people to indicate by a straw vote that the Award will go to *Forbidden Games*, the French picture and not to *Camillo* [96].

Whilst we are on this award business it is interesting to note a lot of activity from the same left flank in favour of anything dealing with *High Noon*, the Gary Cooper Western directed by Fred Zinnemann and produced by Stanley Kramer [97]. As you know, domestically at least a very successful picture at the box-office. The original script was written by Charles Forman [*sic*], very much identified with leftist causes [98]. A writer I know who read the first screenplay refused to have anything to do with the picture, so full of messages did he find the script. I don't know whether things got hot or not, but Forman was taken off, the propaganda presumably taken out, and the picture made as it is being released today [99]. For the average fan it will seem O.K. For the Communist and for his propaganda purposes abroad, where he may see fit to press the issue, it is still full of subtleties which are a part of the construction and which can't be taken out.

The plea will be made that this is just a Western and anybody finding fault with it must be a fanatic. Actually, the period is Western and one of the situations is, but the types and the basic plot line are not Western but dressed in Western clothes to appear so. The *good* people in the town are a bunch of weak-spined individuals, who haven't the guts to support the Sheriff (Cooper) in keeping a criminal from returning to town. They feel this is a quarrel between the criminal and the sheriff and they can't afford to get mixed up in it. They'll get along which ever way it works out. The key scene takes place in church with some damaging casting on the Minister by a very weak-faced individual. These are the good people mind you. Now we have the opposite, the bad people, and they are what they are, happy to see the Sheriff in such a spot. The Sheriff is in a hell of a spot, as he can't deputize anybody and has to face the criminal and his three cohorts alone. Furthermore this is his last day in office, he's just got married to a nice *Quaker* girl who tells him and us about her philosophy and convinces the sheriff to run out on the town. Being Gary Cooper, he changes his mind, turns back, and with the unexpected help of his wife (who much to her disgust kills one of the men in protecting her husband) he knocks off the other three. The good people of the town come out to congratulate him; he takes his badge off and throws it disdainfully into the dust. And we can't help but agree with him, since our American Western town is made up of a pretty worthless lot of people.

Incidentally the race angle hasn't been overlooked either. Katy Jurado, the Mexican actress, plays a high class sort of kept woman or prostitute. She is leaving town too when the killer is coming back; her reason could be she is afraid of him as she used to be his mistress, but this isn't entirely so; we know nice women in town don't like her. What she should say on leaving is that with this kind of a sanctimonious crowd a prostitute can't make a living in this town. What she does say, out of a clear blue sky is 'What chance has a *Mexican* got in a place like this,' (approximately). I could write the French, Italian, Belgian commie reviews for this picture right now, and I'm sure you could too. I've been trying to work against this picture on the Awards angle too, but it is harder to do so, because it is successful at the B.O. and after all the Academy membership in voting will not be too aware of what I have lined herein. Have mentioned this to Freeman who has also mentioned it to Eric Johnson, but I

really don't know what can be done about it. Can't understand how Cooper got sucked in; he's a savvy guy, but I guess the Western cloak fooled him [100].

Amongst the other foreign offerings this years was an Italian picture made by Rossellini on the Life of St. Francis of Assisi. This is really something; you couldn't hope for a better picture debunking religion than this. It presumably sets out to give a graphic account of the forming of the Order of St. Francis and his companions. Actually they are characterized in such an extreme over-simplified manner, that you get the feeling they are a bunch of nincompoops, not all there mentally and some of them perhaps homosexuals. The astonishing thing is that the main title carries the technical advisory credit to Father Lissandrini and Father Morlion, both pretty well-known prelates in the Catholic Church [101]. Unless they are suspect then they must be so unaware of what Rossellini has done and what the impact of the picture could be, that this ignorance is positively criminal. This is the opinion of not only myself but of several people who saw the picture with me. I got so hot under the collar I have stirred up Breen about it, and have given him a written report which he is going to take up in Vatican circles shortly when he goes to Italy. Fortunately the picture is not good, so there won't be too many people who will want to go to it, but I shudder at what could be done with this in countries like Poland and Hungary etc. with a good doctored commentary. Incidentally the title of the picture (I notice I haven't mentioned it before) is *Flowers of St. Francis* [102].

Since I am on the subject of pictures striking at Religion because of the primitive superstitious manner in which it is presented, we might as well talk of D'Annunzio's *Daughter of Iorio* [sic] which we are contemplating for production. Here the D'Annunzio name may be the cloak, but with Moravia working on it it will be 100% anti-clerical you can bet, and even if the subject matter is of no interest to U.S. or Anglo-Saxon audiences, it certainly will have some appeal to the Latin Americans, which is precisely a field, from what you tell me, that has to be watched very carefully. How can we stop this one too? I suppose the Vatican could do something about it [103].

Don't think I'm taking too much of a pro-Roman Catholic attitude which may be coloring my outlook. In this battle for the minds the first step the Commies must take is to debunk religion, or at least start the seed of doubt, and I couldn't think of any better way than by using the type of material discussed in this note.

Regards,

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the invaluable contributions made to this article by Ed Sikov, Roainn Baird of the James Michener Library at University of North Colorado, David Haight, archivist at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Professor Tony Badger at Cambridge and Dr Stephen Spackman at St Andrews. Particular thanks are due to Professor Nicholas Cull, who forwarded the 'Dear Owen' letters and has followed this article from its inception and Barbara Hall, head of Special Collections at the Margaret Herrick Library of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in Los Angeles, whose skills as a detective would make Dana Scully proud.

Correspondence: David Eldridge, Jesus College, Cambridge CB5 8AL, UK. E-mail: d.n.eldridge@amstuds.hull.ac.uk

NOTES

- [1] Marc Eliot, in *Walt Disney: Hollywood's dark prince*, revealed that, because of the information he provided the bureau, Disney was made a 'full Special Agent in Charge Contact' [sic] in 1954. For discussion of this and Reagan's similar role as confidential source designated 'T-10', see *The New York Times*, 6 May 1993.
- [2] Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the cultural Cold War* (London, 1999), p. 290.
- [3] Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 2.
- [4] Statement by Eisenhower, quoted in Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 148.
- [5] Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 293.
- [6] The news report concerned a peculiar burglary at Alsop's Pasadena home, in which a 'masked gunman' broke into the house, tied up the maid and forced the butler 'to go to the Alsops' bedroom and get Alsop to open the door by telling him he needed \$25'. Alsop refused to answer the door, but passed through the \$25, which the gunman took and fled! It seems that, while being interviewed by the *LA Times* about this incident, Alsop himself boasted of his former CIA connections, adding an air of intrigue to the affair. *Los Angeles Times*, 19 August 1966.
- [7] See *Robert M.W. Vogel Oral History*, interviewed by Barbara Hall, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (Los Angeles, 1991), p. 231.
- [8] Richard Maltby, *Harmless Entertainment: Hollywood and the ideology of consensus* (London, 1983), p. 82.
- [9] MPAA press release, 27 March 1947, Production Code Administration File 1, Association of Motion Picture and Television Producers' (AMPTP) Collection, at the Margaret Herrick Library (AMPAS), Los Angeles.
- [10] *Hollywood is World Conscious* by Rupert Allen, American Films Abroad file, AMPTP Collection, AMPAS.
- [11] See Stephen Ambrose, *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938* (London, 1988), Chapter 8.
- [12] Quoted in Donald F. Crosby, *God, Church and Flag: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the Catholic Church, 1950-1957* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1978), p. 229. Crosby casts serious doubt on the validity of the Gallup results, but evidently Luraschi was one Catholic who did stand behind McCarthy.
- [13] Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America, 1950-1985* (London, 1993), pp. 60 and 81.
- [14] Robert Frederick Burk, *The Eisenhower Administration and Black Civil Rights* (Knoxville, TN 1984), p. 29.
- [15] *Daily Variety*, 30 January 1953, p. 6.
- [16] In his memoir of the PCA, Jack Vizzard records that Durland, a Cuban-American was hired 'at the urging of officials in high estate in Washington' to help bring Hollywood into step with the cultivation of international goodwill during the war. He recounts an occasion in 1953, when Durland brought producer Sam Katzman to book on the script *Flame of Calcutta*, a film concerned with the fight of Indian guerrillas to oust the East India Company in 1760:

'You're running around with the recklessness of a bull in a china shop,' Durland told Katzman. 'Line after line in your script tramples on the sensitivities of the Indian people. You have gross distortions of history, you are untactful, you maul traditional customs, and, in a word, you leave much to be desired. Don't you realize your picture will be banned everywhere throughout the Far East?'

'So what if it is?' asked Sam ... 'You don't think I've had pictures banned before.'

'I imagine you have,' conceded Durland, 'but India is a tinderbox at the present moment. The Russians are trying to woo it, and the American government is trying to get it over to our side. So why do you aggravate it?'

Katzman prevaricated and pleaded he was too poor to hire a technical advisor, so Durland himself personally undertook the research to correct the misrepresentations. (See Jack Vizzard, *See No Evil: Life Inside a Hollywood Censor* (New York, 1970), p. 123.)

- [17] Press release of Bureau of Information of National Catholic Welfare, 25 November 1953, Production Code Administration file 2, AMPTP Collection, AMPAS.
- [18] *What They Say About Us. The Impact of U.S. Motion Pictures Abroad*, report by Eric Johnston to Board of Directors, Motion Picture Association of America, May 1958, Eric Johnston files, AMPTP Collection, AMPAS.
- [19] State Dept. lauds H'W'D pix exports, *Daily Variety*, 29 January 1953.
- [20] *New York Times*, 6 March 1953, p. 13.
- [21] David Haight, The Papers of C.D. Jackson: a glimpse at President Eisenhower's psychological warfare expert, *Manuscripts* (Winter 1976), p. 29.
- [22] Letter from C.D. Jackson to Henry Luce, 19 May 1953, quoted in Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 288. The last comment bears uncanny similarity to a quote frequently attributed to the famously egotistical DeMille: 'Give me any couple of pages of the Bible and I'll give you a picture'.
- [23] Quoted in Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 284.
- [24] This could refer to William Meiklejohn, the supervisor of talent at Paramount Studios from 1940.
- [25] Luraschi is stretching a point here. The butler was already a character in the novel by Frank G. Slaughter, on which the screenplay was based. *Sangaree* concerned a Civil War surgeon who inherits a plantation in Georgia, with directions to run it as a social 'experiment'—growing tobacco and encouraging profit-sharing with the workers and the education and manumission of slaves. Priam, the butler at the home of Mrs Darby (the love interest), is presumably such a manumitted slave. When the surgeon first meets Priam, he mistakenly thinks he 'belongs to Mrs Darby'. Priam corrects him, stating 'I'm a freedman, Sir. I work where I'm paid.' This dialogue had been introduced in a draft dated 8 September 1952, but was not intended as a commentary on slavery. Rather it simply set the scene for a later development, in which Priam is paid by slave traders to assassinate the surgeon. The notion of a manumitted slave working for slave traders had obviously caused concern to Ralph Bettinson, the first scenarist to work on the script, who had made the assassin a 'one-eyed beggar', but the later drafts and filmed screenplay rejected this in favour of returning to the novel's original plot. This was hardly a good demonstration of Luraschi's influence or of Hollywood's racial sensitivity. (*Sangaree*, Paramount Script Collection, Margaret Herrick Library, AMPAS, Los Angeles.)
- [26] By 1953, the cycle of films which had dealt openly with issues of racism in America had ended. Following the war, film makers had made efforts at treating the race problem with some seriousness. In 1949, 20th Century-Fox had made *Pinky*, MGM adapted William Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust* and independent film makers, such as Stanley Kramer with *Home of the Brave*, had produced a run of films which dealt with issues of racism and Black identity in post-war America. Fox's *No Way Out* of 1950 perhaps went furthest, at least in 'shock value', by embodying extreme racism in a psychotic killer and filming cinema's first 'race riot'. However, by 1953, the crusading momentum had been lost and Blacks were increasingly being shown in 'normative' positions in society. Paramount had avoided any real contribution to the cycle of 'message' films and Luraschi's idea of showing African-Americans at country clubs and golf clubs in the 1950s was in effect a continuation of the studio's policy. As Frances Stonor Saunders noted, this was at a time 'when many "negroes" had as much chance of getting into a golf club as they had of getting the vote', but the studio preferred to place Blacks in circumspect roles. Perhaps by showing them with cars, Luraschi hoped White American audiences might assume they were valets or chauffeurs. *Caddy* was finally released in September 1953. See Thomas Cripps, *Making Movies Black: the Hollywood message movie from World War II to the civil rights era* (Oxford, 1993).
- [27] The early 1950s also saw a cycle of movies depicting the Indian—Cavalry Wars. Many of these films had continued the traditional Western thesis, that the only 'good Indian is a dead Indian'—e.g. *I Killed Geronimo* (1950), *New Mexico* (1951) and *Bugles in the Afternoon* (1952). *Arrowhead* evidently was conceived in a similar vein and Luraschi's suggestion must have seemed progressive after such a series. However, as with depictions of African-Americans, Luraschi's attitude was rather overtaken by a growing number of films which demonstrated greater sensitivity to the one-sidedness of Hollywood's previous treatments. *Oh Susanna* (Republic, 1951) depicted an Indian-hating commandant allowing greedy gold miners to break the treaty with the Apaches and plunder the Black Hills. Friendly Indians had already been accepted by the television audiences for *Daniel Boone* and *The Lone Ranger* and more positive images of

Native Americans were developed in films such as *Apache* (United Artists, 1954), *Pillars of the Sky* and *They Rode West* (Columbia, 1954). It has been suggested that these films may have been seen by film makers as a way of addressing civil rights issues, with the Native American standing in for the African-American. However, the 'one bad Indian' plot which Luraschi saw as a temporary solution, persisted as a common device in westerns—a formula of 'Cochise good, Geronimo bad' developed by Fox in *Broken Arrow* in 1950 and *White Feather* (1955) and particularly apparent in *The Conquest of Cochise* (Columbia, 1953) in which 'good' Apaches united with the US Cavalry to wipe out 'renegade' Comanches. (See Peter Biskind, *Seeing Is Believing: how Hollywood taught us to stop worrying and love the fifties* (London, 1984), pp. 230–239.)

- [28] Tangier had been designated a 'free' city—administered by eight occupying allied forces. The 'international airport' story planned to use this circumstance to make international tension the background to an espionage plot. Released as *Flight to Tangier* in November 1953, scripted and directed by Charles Marquis Warren, the complex plot involved the defection of a Prague millionaire and his pursuit by a number of disparate villains after his money. The prime villain is Danzer, a renegade American, of German descent, intent on stealing the millions to use in purchasing planes to sell behind the Iron Curtain. One of the pursuers is actually an undercover CIA agent, desperate to stop Danzer

Brady: If Danzer ever completed the deal, the propaganda value to Russia would be disastrous. An American, selling to the enemy just to make money would be all they needed.

As Luraschi advised, a minor but significant alteration was made to Danzer's background by the time Robert Douglas played him on the screen. Demonstrating that the USSR had always planned for the Cold War, Danzer was made a Soviet agent, sent as a 'sleeper' in 1945 to gain citizenship and bide his time to discredit the United States:

Danzer: With papers to prove that I'm an American citizen, I buy these materials and sell them behind what is referred to as the Iron Curtain. And then I'll have proved our point—that Americans are the war mongers we say they are.

(*Flight to Tangier*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).

- [29] See notes 69 and 74 for a discussion of *Money From Home*.
- [30] The Persian Gulf had been the scene of one of the earliest crises in the Cold War. During the Second World War, the Soviets, British and Americans had jointly occupied Iran, but in 1946 the Soviets hesitated to leave until they received oil concessions similar to those won by the British. Diplomatic pressure had been sufficient to end this confrontation, but in 1951 the premier of Iran, Dr Mohammed Mosaddeq, provoked new tensions by nationalising Iran's oil wells, including those owned by Britain. In retaliation, the Western-owned companies boycotted Iranian oil, creating an economic crisis in the Persian state. As Luraschi was writing, Eisenhower had refused Mosaddeq's appeal for assistance. This encouraged the premier, who was already associated with the Soviet-inspired Tudeh party, to turn towards the Soviet Union. In August 1953, the CIA was to intervene in backing a *coup d'état* in which the imperial government of Shah Pahlavi took the place of Mosaddeq's administration. As historians have noted, this served a number of US goals, 'protecting the flow of oil to the American economy ...; destroyed the potential menace of an oil-enhanced power bloc extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean; diminished the Moslem threat to the fledgling state of Israel; and ended the danger of Soviet encroachment on the oil-rich gulf'. (See Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, *The CIA and American Democracy* (New Haven, CT, 1989), p. 89.)
- [31] William Pine and William Thomas were an independent co-producing team working out of Paramount (Pine had been a production executive and Thomas a writer). In the 1940s they had been responsible for such B-movie fodder as *They Made Me a Killer*, but by the mid-1950s they were in charge of some of the studio's biggest productions, particularly historical dramas such as the 1955 Lewis and Clarke story *Far Horizons* and *Sangaree* (see letter 1). The 'Persian Gulf' project was never produced.
- [32] Released in June 1954 as *Secret of the Incas*, this was made a vehicle for Charlton Heston. In the earliest draft of the screenplay, by Sydney Boehm, the heroine was Penny Ante, 'a cute and wise blonde from the States who is in trouble with the Cuzco police'. This was the character Luraschi wanted changing. By October 1952, Heston's character was now to befriend one Julia Bartosh, 'a refugee from a European slave labor camp, an ex-model of Paris, and at the moment a fugitive from the police because she unwisely irked a man of wealth and influence and is facing

deportation charges'. Evidently, the background was right, but Bartosh's virtue was still open to question. Luraschi had his way and Randal McDougall rechristened the girl Elena Antonescu—a 'lovely refugee from a country behind the Iron Curtain ... pursued by a Communist agent who wants to take her back—and her only hope of escape is to reach the United States'. Elena, eventually played by Nicole Maurey, is a Romanian refugee, pursued by the consul. She joins Heston in his quest for Inca treasure, simply because he is the only man with a plane to fly her out of Peru (*Secret of the Incas*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).

- [33] Paramount's treatment of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Babylon Revisited* was sold to MGM, retitled *The Last Time I Saw Paris* and produced by Jack Cummings in 1954. The novel's 1920s setting was updated to make it a story of a GI with literary ambitions in post-Second World War Paris and Elizabeth Taylor was cast as the feminine lead. Bernard Smith had been a story editor and subsequently the head of writers at Paramount from 1948. He became a producer in 1952 but left Paramount the same year, later joining the notably liberal Hecht-Hill-Lancaster production company. Smith returned to prominence in the 1960s, seemingly appearing from 'nowhere' with *Elmer Gantry* (1960) and *How the West Was Won* (1962). It is possible that his low profile during the 1950s was related to the blacklist. William Wyler had recently been directing Gregory Peck in *Roman Holiday* for Paramount (filmed in the summer of 1952). They were keen to work together again and, after considering a number of projects, they eventually co-produced *Big Country* in 1958. They shared similar liberal democrat politics and, along with others such as Humphrey Bogart and Danny Kaye, Peck and Wyler had been founding members of the Committee for the First Amendment, the organization which hoped to combat the anti-communist witch-hunt in Hollywood and the blacklist. Peck was particularly outspoken when his Jewish friend John Garfield was blacklisted—Garfield had been Peck's inspiration for his role in *Gentleman's Agreement*, the 1947 cinematic assault on anti-Semitism. Peck himself was 'investigated' by California's State Committee for Un-American Activities, who brought up his membership of supposed communist front organisations (including the Actor's Laboratory, the China Conferences Arrangements Committee, Committee for a Democratic Eastern Policy and the Progressive Citizens of America), but he was cleared by State Senator Hugh Burns and was never called to answer before McCarthy. Coincidentally, while Peck never appeared in *Babylon Revisited*, he did play F. Scott Fitzgerald in 1959 in Fox's *Beloved Infidel*. (See Michael Freedland, *Gregory Peck* (London, 1980) pp. 86–89.)
- [34] The property screenplay by Ruth and Augustus Goetz was sold early in the year to MGM for \$210,000, with Vidor accompanying it to direct. Described as a 'romantic soap opera set to classic music', *Rhapsody* starred Elizabeth Taylor as a brattish rich girl, passionately in love with a young violinist who puts his music above her. Her possessiveness drives him away from her and she retaliates by marrying another young musician—an ex-GI and pianist—whom she does not really love. She almost ruins his career, turning him to drink. In the novel *Maurice Guest* by Henry Handel Richardson, the alcoholic GI commits suicide. Set in Paris, Zurich, St Moritz and Rome, Luraschi probably considered that this story of 'rich-bitch', alcoholic and generally dysfunctional expatriate Americans marauding through Europe was definitely the wrong image to promote, much the same reason for which he condemned Fitzgerald's *Babylon Revisited*.
- [35] Julius Epstein collaborated with his twin brother Philip on the scripts of *Casablanca*, *The Man Who Came to Dinner* and *Forever Female*. Philip had died in 1952.
- [36] Although the film was never produced, Yul Brynner came on board with Wilder and Epstein, to play the role of a Soviet Commissar in Washington. A discussion of the potential project was held with the PCA which Luraschi attended. According to a memo in the PCA files dated 10 December 1952, Wilder envisaged 'a modern story very much along the lines of *Anna Karenina*. The lead, Jule [sic] Brynner will be a member of the Soviet embassy in Washington. He will fall in love with the wife of some other foreign diplomat. The situation will develop to the point where they will have to flee the country to Mexico. The Soviets will be after him throughout the story. After a very unhappy and tragic time in Mexico, our lead will realize the impossibility of the situation and will let the Soviets catch up with him and kill him, somewhat as in the case of Trotsky. The wife will then be free to endeavor to rehabilitate herself.' Wilder's most recent biographer suggests 'casting complications' as the reason for shelving the project. (See Ed Sikov, *On Sunset Boulevard* (New York, 1998), p. 345.)
- [37] This man has not been identified. It is possible that he was Carleton Alsop.
- [38] In January 1953, the *New York Times* reported a 'Communist policy of attack against Zionism'. The Communist Party in Prague had been purged of Jews, Jewish doctors at the Kremlin were

arrested on charges of plotting the murder of Stalin and the Soviet journal *New Times* asserted that ‘the entire Jewish Zionist movement ... was helping United States imperialists to create a ‘fifth column’ in the Soviet Union’. This was a revitalisation of policy first promulgated in 1949, when the Soviet Union had demonstrated its support of the Arab states against Israel by condemning Zionism as a ‘nationalist and bourgeois movement’ and suppressing both the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and the Jewish press. Examples of Soviet anti-Semitism filled American papers throughout the month, with the *New Times* accusation that Zionists had ‘‘sold out’’ to American intelligence’ being publicised just 2 days before Luraschi wrote this letter. The allegations of Soviet atrocities reached sufficient levels for Eisenhower to address the American Jewish Committee on 30 January adding his own denunciation of ‘the vicious anti-Semitism raging behind the Iron Curtain’. (*New York Times*, 22 January 1953, p. 6, 30 January 1953, p. 6 and 9 February 1953, p. 6.)

- [39] Luraschi appears to be responding to the fears of America’s Cold War strategists ‘that continuing racial discrimination was the ‘‘Achilles heel’’ of American foreign policy’. Eisenhower’s incoming administration was immediately confronted by the need to implement Truman’s executive order calling for an end to discrimination in the military (which was apparent to those countries with American bases) and Ike’s own pledge to end segregation in Washington DC (which was apparent to visiting non-White diplomats). As well as the Cold War dimension, Luraschi was also undoubtedly aware that one of the last acts of Truman’s Justice Department in December 1952 was to file the brief challenging the constitutionality of a group of Supreme Court cases, entitled *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*. This was the case which led to the Supreme Court ruling in May 1954 that racially segregated public schools were a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment and that ‘separate educational facilities are inherently unequal’. Such a ruling was in America’s international interests and the CIA may have wanted Hollywood to promote positive images of civil rights to help win over domestic audiences as well. (see Robert Frederick Burk, *The Eisenhower Administration and Black Civil Rights* (Knoxville, TN, 1984), pp. 29, 46–50 and 134.)
- [40] Interaction with the staff of the PCA represented Luraschi’s principal work at Paramount. He was the ‘buffer’ between writers and producers at the studio and the industry’s own ‘moral watchdog’ which had been set up to anticipate the cuts that censor boards might make. As Luraschi implies, individual members of Joseph Breen’s staff had their individual temperaments and some would allow film makers more licence than others. Geoffrey Shurlock and Jack Vizzard were the key ‘deputies’ to Joseph Breen, the director of the PCA. Shurlock took over at Breen’s retirement in October 1954. Vizzard was evidently Luraschi’s favoured contact—perhaps because of their shared Catholic background—but Luraschi is cautious about recommending anyone too positively, possibly covering himself in case the CIA had information on these people which he was not aware of. It is noteworthy that Luraschi does not suggest Addison Durland, who officially had the responsibility of seeing that Article 10 was enforced. (Article 10 stated that ‘the just rights, history, and feelings of any nation are entitled to most careful consideration and respectful treatment’ and gave the PCA the authority to insist on changes to the way in which other nations were represented.) This absence may reflect the fact that Durland was not yet integrated into the PCA, remaining in an essentially advisory capacity at the International Department of the MPAA until later in 1953.
- [41] That RKO could be dismissed so readily reflects Howard Hughes’s mismanagement of the studio since he took it over in 1948. Staff had been cut by 75% and, with the resignation of Dore Schary, film making dropped to a minimum. Most of RKO’s output consisted of distribution deals for independent producers. In 1952 Hughes had sold his stock to a dubious Chicago-based syndicate and at the time Luraschi was writing, the studio was tied up in a stream of law suits—most of them directed against Hughes and his incompetence.
- [42] Left-wing directors such as John Huston had provoked accusations of ‘communist propaganda’ being turned out by Columbia. Huston’s 1949 film *We Were Strangers* concerned the 1933 Cuban revolution and the overthrow of the Machado Government and *Hollywood Reporter* had branded the film ‘a shameful handbook of Marxian dialectics’ (22 April 1949). The studio was an easy target for the anti-communist investigations and, in 1952, the HUAC accused Columbia of having had 38 communists on the writers’ payroll. Five of the Hollywood Ten—Herbert Biberman, Edward Dymtryk, John Howard Lawson, Samuel Ornitz and Dalton Trumbo—had worked at the studio before the war. Sidney Buchman, writer of *Mr Smith Goes to Washington*,

Here Comes Mr Jordan and *The Talk of the Town* was the most notable HUAC casualty at Columbia. (See Bernard F. Dick, *Columbia Pictures: portrait of a studio* (Lexington, KY, 1992), p. 16.)

- [43] *Confessions of a Nazi Spy* (1939) had been personally instigated by Jack Warner—against high level opposition from the German Government—with writer Milton Krims working alongside an FBI investigator who had found Nazi spies operating in the east in 1938. The studio continued its anti-Nazi films during the war, notably with *Casablanca* (1942), *Edge of Darkness* (1943) and *Passage to Marseille* (1944). In this patriotic frame of mind, the studio also produced *Mission to Moscow*, at the urging of the Office of War Information, in 1943—a film which distorted Russian history, particularly in relation to the Trotskyite trials, blatantly defending Stalin’s actions. In a meeting between Ambassador Davies and Stalin, the premier was depicted as a noble prophet, ‘a great builder for the benefit of mankind’. One of Hollywood’s few purely propaganda films, this became a serious and infamous embarrassment to the studio during HUAC’s investigations. (See Clayton R. Koppes and Gregory Black, *Hollywood Goes to War* (London, 1987), Chapter 7.) Despite the pressure, Warners reacted less certainly than some studios. It was not until 1951 that *I Was a Communist for the FBI* was made to appease HUAC, relating the story of a real-life investigator who posed as a Pittsburgh steelworker to infiltrate communist organisations (with the unfortunate implication that Blacks and school teachers were most susceptible to the red menace). ‘Pro-Catholic’ and anti-communist sentiments combined in *The Miracle of Fatima* (1952). This box office success reverentially re-created an alleged miracle which occurred in Portugal in 1917—when the Virgin was seen in the sky by three children, bringing them prophesies which the villagers treated with scepticism until they too witnessed an apocalyptic vision. Chief among these prophesies was a warning about the ‘evil scheme’ designed to destroy the earth which would first appear in 1917 (See Ted Sennett, *Warner Brothers Presents* (New York, 1971).
- [44] William Gordon was Luraschi’s counterpart at Universal-International, head of the departments of public relations, foreign affairs and censorship. Gordon also served with Luraschi on the Academy’s Committee on Documentary Awards in 1953. Little is known of his political associations. As for the studio, their principal casualty to HUAC was Lester Cole, one of the Hollywood Ten, who had a long association with Universal before the war.
- [45] Over the previous 5 years, Fox had released 184 features and MGM 171. In comparison, Warner Bros. released 129 and Paramount 122. Columbia and Universal had released more (261 and 175, respectively), but the majority of these were ‘B-movie’ products. As a indication of the ‘quality’ of these films, Fox had dominated the seven Academy Awards since the war, with eight best picture nominations and two awards and MGM had seven nominations with one win. In contrast, Paramount had only four best picture nominations, and had won with *The Greatest Show on Earth* in 1952, principally because of the Academy’s need to honour Cecil B. DeMille.
- [46] George Custen, Zanuck’s recent biographer, notes that, unlike Louis Mayer or Jack Warner, Zanuck did not go to Washington to testify before the HUAC and, standing apart from almost every other powerbroker in Hollywood, he did not consent to the 1947 Waldorf Agreement which initiated the blacklist. Zanuck was a conservative, but he had many left-wing and liberal writers working for him and knew that they did not represent a threat to the national welfare. However, he did yield to pressure in dismissing Ring Lardner Jr and Abraham Polonsky, two of the Hollywood Ten. And he did become more cautious in his productions: the man who had made films in the 1940s attacking racism and anti-Semitism now backed away from some of Philip Dunne’s ideas for making similar films which criticised the HUAC and McCarthyism. (See George Custen, *Twentieth Century’s Fox: Darryl F. Zanuck and the culture of Hollywood* (New York, 1997) pp. 312–317.)
- [47] Julian Blaustein, appointed executive producer at 20th-Century Fox in 1951, had been responsible for *Broken Arrow* and *The Day the Earth Stood Still*—both of which were pacifistic message films, the former highly critical of the historic treatment of Native Americans, the latter condemning the militaristic attitudes of all nations in the Cold War and man’s capacity for self-destruction.
- [48] Before joining 20th-Century Fox as the director of public relations in 1949, Frank McCarthy’s credentials included wartime service in the military intelligence division of the war department, as secretary to the war department general staff and as assistant secretary to the Secretary of State in 1945. His role in handling foreign pictures had been as the European manager for the MPAA in 1947–1948.
- [49] With regard to distribution, MGM was the last studio to hold out against the Supreme Court’s

1948 divestiture order, separating production from ownership of theatres; not until 1959 did it divide itself into two unconnected companies (Loew's Theatres and MGM), and thus lose direct control of the distribution of its product. This delay gave the company greater stability during the 1950s than Paramount, which was the first studio compelled to comply. (See Michael Conant, *Antitrust in the Motion Picture Industry* (Berkeley, CA, 1960), Chapter VI.)

[50] Dore Schary was almost unique among studio heads—such as Zanuck, Samuel Goldwyn and, most especially his predecessor, Louis Mayer—in that he did not vote Republican. He was a self-confessed liberal and an active campaigner and speech writer for Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956. However, he too bowed under during the blacklist and witch-hunt. When the industry leaders determined to make a public statement in 1948, deploring the behaviour of the Hollywood Ten and announcing that known communists would no longer be employed, Schary was selected by the others to present this 'Waldorf Statement'. As 'the most conspicuous of the liberal producers' he was being forced to 'atone.' (See Richard Maltby, *Harmless Entertainment* (London, 1983), p. 125.) Faced with Hedda Hopper's further accusations that he was a 'red sympathiser', Schary, as Luraschi suggests, made further efforts to demonstrate his anti-communist credentials. *The Hoaxters* was a 36 minute documentary produced by Schary from material compiled by Victor Lasky and William Herbert and released with the endorsement of the State Department, the FBI and the Psychological Strategy Board. The film likened the lure of communism to 'that of the old-time medicine man whose phony brew promised to cure everything, being swallowed cheerfully by the gullible until rigor mortis set in'. Narrated by a host of MGM players, 'the film carefully traces the tortuous foreign policy of the Soviet Union toward this country, showing how it has periodically reversed itself, always with its goal being the sovietizing of the world under Russian domination, just as Hitler planned to nazify the planet under German rule. News clips are used to help what proves to be a logical and forceful demonstration of the menace of communism to all freedom-loving people'. (*Hollywood Reporter*, 4 December 1952). Countering the communist 'lies' were 'the big truths'—as uttered by Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Stevenson, J. Edgar Hoover and others, documenting 'the United States' record for peace since 1945 and before, starting with UNRRA, the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, NATO, SHAEF, the Voice of America, the Berlin airlift and, now, the atom bomb' (*Variety*, 4 December 1952). The film went on to win the Academy Award for best documentary.

[51] Robert Vogel was a close friend of Luraschi's. According to *Vogel's Oral History*, he was responsible for showing Luraschi the ropes when he arrived in 1933 and they had a close working relationship—with Vogel recommending Luraschi for positions in the Motion Picture Society for the Americas and on Academy Award committees. Here, Luraschi was cautiously pushing Vogel forward—providing much more personal information than with any other candidate, but at the same time distancing himself a little. Perhaps Luraschi was wary of Vogel's involvement with the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals, for he was evidently uncertain of the CIA's opinion of such right-wing groups. Vogel also apparently had second-thoughts about his membership, and later recalled the hysteria:

I think I saw things in scripts that I was dreaming. We got *too* concerned. We got too worried. We created evils that didn't exist ...

There was a *great* fear in all the studios that the Communists were trying to take over the industry. And we would read scripts—I know Luigi did it at Paramount, I did it at MGM—and read things into it that weren't there on account of our fear. The slightest little indication of dissatisfaction with something about our system, *boom!* became Communist propaganda.

(See *Robert M.W. Vogel Oral History* by Barbara Hall, AMPAS, 200.)

[52] The role of the story department included providing synopses of all new material considered for production possibilities. The reader in the department would also make an appraisal of whether it was worth developing the material. If no producer had a personal interest in the material, this appraisal could easily determine whether a project progressed or not.

[53] Mogens Skot-Hansen arrived in Hollywood in September 1950. According to *Variety* he was 'available at all times to writers and studios who have ideas to develop':

Neither Skot-Hansen nor the studios is [*sic*] interested in the moment in an all-out propaganda pitch for the success of the UN and world cooperation. Well-versed in the picture business, Skot-Hansen, who scripted the prize-winning *Day of Wrath*, is helping

direct film-land's influence into steadier channels—the realization that the UN is now a integral part of everyday life, and that support of its aims and ideals requires no excessive out-of-the-ordinary activity.

The job being done here for the UN is part of the overall effort of the Department of Public Information of the World Organization. Work, under the Films and Visual Information Division, is concerned with the production, stimulation and distribution of informational films ...

Hollywood's part in the program, however, is more dramatic. The primary goal is to inject a UN theme into entertainment pictures so that the basic message of the organization—the need for cooperation on a world scale—can be delivered without distorting or impairing in any way the entertainment value of the film in question. The project definitely is not on a propaganda level ... What is aimed for is familiarity through continued reference to the UN and its activities ...

'We have something definite to sell,' Skot-Hansen points out. 'The UN is not just an office building in New York. It is the focal point of many human, dramatic stories. I have approximately 1,000 stories in my files that could serve as bases for strong entertainment projects.'

(See H'Wood as World Peace Envoy, *Daily Variety*, 27 September 1950.)

- [54] As the *Hollywood Reporter* noted, the complex plot of *Peking Express* made great play on 'the political disunity affecting the Chinese people'. Joseph Cotten played Michael Bachlin, a doctor attached to the United Nations, on his way to perform a delicate operation on the head of the underground resistance at Peking. Marvin Miller played Kwon, a communist guerrilla and black marketeer who seizes the train. Bachlin is used as a hostage to get his son back who has left Kwon to join the nationalists—led by the man on whom the doctor is to operate. If his son is not freed, the doctor will not be allowed through to save the resistance leader. However, it transpires that Kwon's wife had been acting against him and had arranged for the son to be seized by the enemy so that his father could not corrupt him. Kwon's support of the communists is revealed to be ideologically hollow and selfish, for he has been double-crossing the Party by extorting money for UN-shipped penicillin.
- [55] Barney Balaban had been the president of Paramount Pictures Corporation since its formation in 1936.
- [56] 'Pilade' remains unidentified.
- [57] Orville Anderson arrived in Hollywood in October 1952, with a remit to explore 'ways and means of telling the Hollywood story in foreign countries'. He had a background in newspaper publishing, had worked for the Office of War Information and, following the war, was appointed information officer in the foreign service auxillary. He had held several positions at Rome as a secretary in the foreign service. His work in Hollywood was a short-term assignment. His report, delivered in March 1953, reveals that the State Department wanted to improve the image of Hollywood abroad, using the film capital as an exemplar of the American way of life, business and art (see a copy of the report in the Appendix). However, much of his energy seems to have been diverted into strengthening cooperation between the State Department and the industry. The MPAA seems to have particularly concerned with sorting out the procedures by which the State Department set up tours of studios for foreign dignitaries, and with coordinating the Voice of America broadcasts which involved film stars. Both issues had been of particular irritation to the MPAA International Committee during Luraschi's chairmanship, which perhaps explains some of his antagonism. (See memoranda in International Committee File 1948-52, AMPTP Collection, AMPAS.)
- [58] *The Battle of Russia* was the fifth in a series of orientation films made by Frank Capra's army film unit. It focused on Russian resistance to foreign invasion, briefly recounting the repelling of the Germans in 1242, of Charles XII of Sweden in 1704, of Napoleon in 1812 and of the Germans again under Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914. The recent Nazi attack is depicted in detail. The producer's synopsis describes the version of history it related:

In 1934 Russia joins the League of Nations and warns its European neighbors to arrest German aggression under Hitler with collective force, but to no avail. Hoping to buy time to rearm, the Russian sign a non-aggression pact with the Nazis on 21 August 1939. After Germany is blocked by Britain on their western front, however, they turn eastward toward Russia. Reactionary leaders in the Balkans sell out to Hitler for

protection, and Yugoslavia and Greece are overpowered. Meanwhile the Russians brace themselves for an attack, which comes on 22 June 1941 ... By December, 500,000 square miles of Russian land has been taken. But Russian strategy is to bend without breaking, yielding territory but sucking the enemy in deeper and blunting the invader's wedge formation. Moreover, the Russian people see the war not simply as a matter of territory but as a struggle for life and death; every Russian is a soldier participating in a total war. And while generals win campaigns, people win wars.

Directed by Anatole Litvak, it was given theatrical release in 1943—shown in Russia with a prologue by Stalin himself—and nominated for an Academy Award for best documentary. (Synopsis in *Why We Fight* clipping file, AMPAS.)

- [59] Edmund Beloin was one of Bob Hope's favoured writers, penning *The Lemon Drop Kid* and *My Favorite Spy* and was also responsible for 1949's *Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*. *Gringo* was never made.
- [60] Luraschi may have been successful in blocking development of this project at Paramount, but the scenario was taken elsewhere. *Lisbon* was eventually made in 1956, produced by Ray Milland (who also starred) and released by Republic Studios. Maureen O'Hara replaced Joan Crawford. From the plot summary in *Hollywood Reporter* 1 August 1956 it is easy to see why Luraschi was concerned about the O'Hara/Crawford character: 'Milland plays an adventurer operating with his power boat out of Lisbon, making a very good living by smuggling. He is approached by Claude Rains, an international financier specializing in illegal deals, to pick up at sea an American businessman who has been held by the communists for ransom. Maureen O'Hara is the wife of the American. She has bypassed the U.S. State Department and its efforts on her husband's behalf to deal directly with the Reds for his release. At first it seems her interest is that of a loving wife. It develops that she cannot inherit her elderly husband's millions, however, until he is proved dead. She wants him out of the communist hands, but dead, so she will be in control of his money.'
- [61] Released as *The Naked Jungle*, Heston played Leiningen, the tough plantation owner who carved his empire out of the South American jungle. The local commissioner is his closest friend—but he seems more of a colonial Britisher than a Brazilian. The film comes close to celebrating Western colonialism: Leiningen is obsessed with imposing order and civilisation on the corrosive wilderness, but this is tempered this with a benevolent respect for the 'natives' and their culture. While Leiningen employs native labour on his plantation, a scene is introduced to demonstrate that he does not treat them as slaves or chattels, as one of his more 'European' (undoubtedly Germanic) neighbours does.
- [62] Released June 1954. See notes 70, 73 and 75 for further detail of changes made.
- [63] Reference to Charles Wilson, the president of General Motors, who had just been appointed by Eisenhower as Secretary of Defence. He expanded upon his famous remark by using his position in government to proclaim that a new roads system was vital to the nation's security needs.
- [64] The documentary committee for the 25th Academy Awards for 1952 (presented in 1953) was chaired by Sidney Solow, president of Consolidated Film Industries and a member of the documentary committee since its inception. The other 13 members consisted of Luraschi, William Gordon (Luraschi's counterpart at Universal-International), Lester Beck, George Bilson (executive producer of short subjects at RKO), John Burton (production manager for Warner Bros. Cartoons), Hal Elias (head of MGM's cartoon and short subjects productions), Cedric Francis (director of shorts at Warner Bros.), Jules White (director of shorts for Columbia), William C. Menzies (producer-director with United-Artists), Harriet Parsons (producer-director at RKO), Frederick Y. Smith (president of American Cinema Editors), Harry Tytle (cartoon and shorts producer at Disney), Malvin Wald (screenwriter, including *Naked City*). Unsurprisingly, *American Harvest* was not nominated. (Information supplied by Barbara Hall, AMPAS.)
- [65] Actually entitled *Autobiography of a Jeep*, this was a 1943 documentary film written by Joseph Krumgold, directed by Irving Lerner and produced by the Office of War Information's Overseas Branch. It was the success story of the jeep, whimsically 'told' by a jeep itself (voiced by Robert Sloan), showing exactly what the vehicle could do. Its implications was that this 'remarkable little machine' was 'a symbol of America's presence throughout the world'. (See Richard Dyer MacCann, *The People's Films: a political history of US Government motion pictures* (New York, 1973), p. 144.)
- [66] Anderson's report is reproduced in full in the Appendix below. Positive results—at least in terms

of cooperation and mutual support between the industry and State Department—were already being heralded. Reed Harris, head of the department's International Information Program told a Senate Select Committee that 'Hollywood has shown increasing awareness in recent months of the need for sending films overseas which can improve and not hurt our international relations ... the motion picture industry has shown a thorough realization of the importance of telling the proper story about American overseas.' Anderson's report was an analysis of further ways in which the 'proper story' could be told through and by Hollywood. (See State Dept. lauds H'W'D pix exports, *Variety*, 29 January 1953, p. 3.)

- [67] The Voice of America was the international radio service of the State Department's foreign information programme. The Smith-Mundt Act of 1949, which authorised the American Government to engage in overseas propaganda, had provided for 'an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people and policies'. (See Holly Cowan Schulman, *The Voice of America: propaganda and democracy, 1941-1945* (Madison, WI, 1990), pp. 189-90.) At the time Luraschi was writing, however, Senator McCarthy was preparing an assault on the Voice of America, launching in February an investigation into 'whether the contents of these programs have been interests of the United States'. Luraschi was evidently attuned to such anti-communist sentiments, but the Voice of America had long been a particular irritation to him and the International Committee of the MPAA. Arrangements for Voice of America units to interview motion picture personalities were supposed to be handled by the Hollywood Coordinating Committee—but frequently the Voice of America approached studios directly, or tried to go through the International Committee—which created friction. Hollywood broadcasts were being handled by the New York office of the Voice of America and the MPAA wanted a Hollywood office to be established—the studios were particularly anxious about the lack of script approval they had in these broadcasts. Eddie Schellhorn, Luraschi's lieutenant at Paramount's foreign department, angrily told the Voice of America that 'The day of saying two words in French over the radio by an American movie star is passed. We have too much at stake to let players, especially big names, make an ass of themselves' (Schellhorn to Lew Danis, Voice of America New York, 15 October 1951, Voice of America file, AMPPT Collection, AMPAS).
- [68] The final screenplay for *Houdini* was delivered by Philip Yordan on 5 September 1952. In scenes dealing with Houdini's return to America after having taken Europe by storm, Arthur Simms, a reporter from the *Observer* is the only journalist who takes an interest in the escapologist. Houdini sets up a demonstration of his escape from an Iron Maiden for the American press, but only Simms turns up—and he really only comes along for the free cocktails and is drunk even before he arrives. This scene was reshot, so that no reporters respond to the invitations. Simms instead witnesses another Houdini stunt, in which he is suspended in a straightjacket from a skyscraper. However, this change created a continuity problem. In a later scene Simms and Houdini pay a visit to a fraudulent medium and when a fake ghostly apparition appears, the journalist jokes that 'in my drinking days I could have explained it' (*Houdini*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).
- [69] *Money From Home* featured the role of jockey, Bertie Searles, a 'red-nosed Englishman, age indeterminate', first seen driving under the influence, with a bottle of whisky beside him. His alcoholism was not removed from the script—it was necessary for the comedy that he pass out from drink, so that Jerry Lewis could take his place in a crucial race. Richard Hayden was cast in the part, but this made slight difference to the caricature (*Money from Home*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).
- [70] Luraschi seems to have had little success in curbing drunkenness. *Elephant Walk* featured a group of British tea plantation owners in Ceylon. They have formed an informal club, known as the 'Saturday Night Regulars', whose activities basically consist of getting drunk and playing bicycle polo every weekend. As they play their game 'two servants stand with a tray of drinks. During the play the players reach out and grab a drink.' In the draft script, the only man to remain sober was an aloof American secretary, sardonically observing the British in their follies. This remains in the film, and all the British get drunk and behave like overgrown schoolboys, but a concession was made in the final screenplay by putting a drink in the American's hand, thereby erasing the condescending tone of disapproval (*Elephant Walk*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS). Frances Stone Saunders suggests that this concern with drunks was simply a move to eliminate 'the negative stereotypes' and replace them with 'characterizations which represented a healthy America' (Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 293). This is undoubtedly

true, but Luraschi tended to voice his concerns about international reception quite specifically and here he may have been responding to the perceptions of American vices in Islamic countries, particularly at a time when the Soviet Union was seeking closer ties with the Arab states. It may, of course, be a projection of Luraschi's own sense of probity and dignity or even a prohibition hang-up, but the listing that he provides suggests that the CIA had specifically asked him to look out for drunks.

- [71] Y Frank Freeman was the vice-president of Paramount Pictures directing studio operations from 1938 to 1959. He also held the position of chairman of the board of directors of the Association of Motion Picture Producers from 1947 until 1966 and had been president of the Association during the Second World War.
- [72] It is noteworthy that Freeman could feel 'very strongly about the whole matter' of erasing drunks, but 'very cold' to the idea of injecting African-Americans into screenplays, even in the token fashion that Luraschi had suggested. Whether this reflects Freeman's own racial attitudes is unclear (no biography has been written on him), but it certainly illustrates the caution that film makers displayed in the 1950s, becoming increasingly unwilling to address social issues—particularly civil rights—and risk alienating any part of a declining domestic market.
- [73] The story of *Elephant Walk* involved a tense romantic triangle between Ruth (the English heroine), her husband (the plantation owner) and his American secretary, Wilding. Filmed in Ceylon, the studio wanted to take advantage of the location and one of the scenes developing the romantic tension between Ruth and Wilding was played at 'the ruin at Polonnarahu, featuring the huge, fifty-foot prone Buddha with Ananda, his mourning disciple, standing at his head' in a jungle clearing. The Limited Distribution Script of November 20, 1952 played this with humour:

Ruth: I wonder what's the history behind this?

Wilding (easily): Sort of interesting. In the fourth century BC, the Great Prince of the North, one Shlem Oberang-dulla, conquered Lanake with ten thousand foot and a thousand and one elephant cavalry. The extra one was for Shlem, I gather. Shlem ... desired the daughter of the vanquished ruler, a lovely old hag of twelve named Avidma Faratanga—meaning Lady of the Orchids, by the way. Avidma returned Shlem's passion in a highly mature manner—and religion was dead throughout the land for centuries thereafter. Hence, this.

Ruth: How did you ever have time to learn all that?

Wilding: I made it up, just to keep you fascinated. You won't let me talk about real things. How beautiful you are, for example.

In Revised Final dialogue this was excised. They still come to the remains of the shrine. Wilding (renamed Carver) simply tells Ruth that it is a stature of the sleeping Buddha and Ananda. Ruth replies 'It's all so beautiful—and still. I feel like we're trespassing' and so they move on (*Elephant Walk*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).

- [74] In *Money From Home*, Lewis and Martin come to the aid of an impoverished female stable owner, who desperately needs her horse to win the derby, so that a rich middle-eastern sheikh will buy the thoroughbred from her. In the script delivered on 2 March 1953, the character of the Pasha had been given the more outlandish name of 'The Poojah of Bahloop'—but the description was pure caricature:

a portly Easterner dressed in a white tropical suit and wearing a satin turban ... He is surrounded by his manservants, native musicians, several eunuchs and at least a dozen wives, all of whom wear identical robes complete with veils over their faces, only one is short and fat.

Romo Vincent was cast in the role, with a number of scenes in which Lewis—in order to hide from gangsters intent on fixing the race—is disguised by Dean Martin as member of the harem (*Money From Home*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS).

- [75] Dr Pereira was played by Abner Biberman and described in the scripts as 'a cultured-looking Sinhalese of around thirty years old, in a palm beach suit,' who tends to the plantation owner when he breaks his ankle and organises efforts to contain a cholera outbreak. Appuhamy, the principal manservant at the plantation is more of a caricature—a kind of 'Gunga Din' faithful native servant, devoted to the memories of the early colonial days. In the revised final screenplay of 27 February 1953, Appuhamy was given a new death-bed speech, which gave credit to

'forwarding-thinking' men such as Pereira, as much as to the colonists, for the advances that were being made.

Appuhamy: A day will come when my people will no longer fear inoculation. They will listen to the Master—and Dr Pereira, as I did. They will learn. They are learning fast.

(*Elephant Walk*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS.)

- [76] Heston played the lead Ed Bannon whose 'hatred of the Apaches is as deadly as it is unrelenting. He knows them—their tricks—their lies—he lived with them as a boy until he sicked on their cruelty and ran away.' He doesn't share the army's faith in the peace talk with the Indians and sees this mistrust justified when Toriano (Palance) leads them on the warpath again. Luraschi did succeed in affecting minor changes to the dialogue, but without altering Bannon's characterisation or his ultimate vindication, the effort was largely futile. In September, 1952, the script read

Bannon: I'm warning you. You can't deal with Apaches like you can with other Indians.

Kirk: You should know Apaches.

Bannon: When you were *that* high and learning arithmetic I was that high and learning how to cut a man's throat so that it takes him nearly a day to die. That's Apache.

As released, the dialogue merely replaced 'Apache' with 'Toriano':

Bannon: I'm warning you. You can't make deals with Toriano.

Kirk: You should know Toriano.

Bannon: When you were that high and learning arithmetic I was that I learning how to cut a man's throat so that it takes him nearly a day to die, and that's Toriano.

(*Arrowhead*, Paramount Script Collection, AMPAS.)

- [77] Heston was an early and ardent supporter of the civil rights movement, organising a group from Hollywood to join Martin Luther King's march on Washington. Yet his attitude towards American Indians was far more ambiguous than that displayed toward African-Americans. Native Americans—a 'politically correct' term which Heston expresses disgust for in his autobiography—had the historical baggage of having fought and killed many Whites and Heston's opinion seems to have been shaped by the images of the Western, which he then acquiesced in. Commenting on Jack Palance's performance, Heston recalled 'He played the part with a deep ferocity that was mesmerizing. I've never seen an Indian role better done.' The irony of perpetuating negative stereotypes of the Indian while simultaneously fighting for civil rights went unnoticed by Heston, who recalled that during the production of *Major Dundee*: 'while I'd been off chasing Sam Peckinpah's Apaches, Congress had passed the Civil Rights Bill' (Charlton Heston, *In the Arena* (London, 1995), pp. 119 and 336.)
- [78] Both Audrey and Katherine Hepburn had been sought to play alongside Yul Brynner. The postponement of production following Katherine Hepburn's lack of interest was announced in *Variety* on 5 February, p. 2.
- [79] There is no reference to this project in the Kirk Douglas papers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Billy Wilder's papers are not available. (The only reference to a Wilder project from around this date in Douglas' papers is *Wild Harvest* (Ray Stark to Douglas, 20 February 1953, 1-f.8)). Nor is there any mention in the well-researched Wilder biography, *On Sunset Boulevard* by Ed Sikov. However, the article that evidently inspired Wilder was indeed one by James Michener, entitled 'The Facts About the GI Babies' Michener wrote the piece expressly to refute 'one of the cruelest lies being circulated by the Communists against the United States ... that our soldiers have callously abandoned 200,000 illegitimate children in Japan'. The problem revolved around the 'foolish' Japanese cultural belief 'that their race is unique and pure, unsullied by outside blood', which meant that children who were illegitimate, orphaned or of mixed blood were 'sharply discriminated against'. Lacking family status, in a culture where the family was responsible for protecting its members, finding them employment and a spouse and providing care in illness, children sired by GI fathers during the American occupation found themselves excluded from society. Michener explained this, but argued that the scale of the problem had been grossly exaggerated, estimating instead only 3925 such babies and documented efforts by the government and individual GIs to face up to their moral responsibilities—ensuring that previously unrecognised marriages were legalised or that the children were given financial support or even adopted by American couples. However, while Michener countered

communist charges of American inhumanity (the evident appeal for Wilder), the account of American soldiers' behaviour in seducing Japanese girls cut directly across Luraschi's policy of improving the moral image of Americans abroad. The issues of 'illicit' sex and miscegenation would have presented a serious Production Code problem anyway. Sikov noted that Wilder only had to complete *Sabrina* to fulfil his contract with Paramount and was, at this stage, preparing to leave the studio and set up his own independent production company. That he consulted Luraschi on what would have been a non-Paramount project indicates the respect Wilder had for Luraschi's familiarity with the censors and their 'tastes' and he evidently hoped that Luraschi's input would save him some trouble further down the road. Here, therefore, Luraschi's day-to-day involvement and the rapport he had built up with film makers in his role as head of censorship put him in an ideal position to enforce the CIA's agenda. (See James Michener, Facts About GI Babies, reprinted in *The Reader's Digest*, March 1954, pp. 5–10. Additional notes from correspondence with Ed Sikov, September 9, 1999.)

[80] D.A. Doran, executive assistant to Don Hartman, head of production at Paramount.

[81] Edna Ferber's *Giant* had been published in October 1952, having first been serialised in the *Ladies Home Journal* in June. George Stevens leased the rights to film it, forming a general partnership with Edna Ferber and Henry Ginsberg on 4 May 1953. However, according to a brief note written by Stevens' secretary in December 1952, something had evidently made Stevens and Ginsberg cautious about investing in the project. Ginsberg 'talked with David Brown ... 20th Century's Story Editor, to discover if the major studios had any reason for *stepping away from this property*' (my italics). *Variety* had reported in May that the studios were clamouring for advance copies and Brown could find no satisfactory reason for their reversal of interest in the book. Perhaps Luraschi had indeed been successful in 'killing' the project within the studio system, tainting it as 'un-American'. However, the fact that *Giant* was eventually produced independently indicates the difficulty that any external agency would have faced in the 1950s in trying to control Hollywood. (See Note by Julie A. to Stevens, 24 December 1952, 56-f.702, George Stevens Collection, AMPAS.) The elements which disturbed Luraschi were a key theme in both the novel and the eventual film, with conflict in the relationship between Bick Benedict (Rock Hudson) and his new wife Leslie (Elizabeth Taylor) centring on her shock at the underprivileged and underpaid Mexicans working at the Reata Ranch. The Benedict family is shown, in the main, as a sort of feudal structure which is arrogant in its relationships with other people, contemptuous of Mexican-Americans and as accustomed to riding roughshod over the rights of other people. This attitude, prevalent in all the Texans, makes Leslie feel like an outsider. The story conjures with Bick's prejudice when his son marries Juana, a Mexican-American nurse and he is confronted with a mixed-blood grandson. The novel rests on the sentiment that the next generation is more capable of handling racial prejudice, the development of the family reflecting social change over time. Stevens, however, rewrote the ending to suggest that Bick undergoes something of a regeneration himself. The novel has Leslie and her family being turned out of a roadside burger-bar because of Juana's color. Bick is not present and the novel ends with his confrontation with Jett Rink (James Dean, in his last film). Stevens transposed the order of the scenes, making the racial issue the focus of the ending, rather than the personal animosity between Rink and Benedict. Thus Bick was given the famous last scenes, where he stands up for his daughter-in-law and grandson and for other Mexican-Americans who are turned out of the restaurant, taking on the racist owner in a fistfight, even though he knows he will take a beating. Racism may be ingrained in Texas, suggested the film, but regeneration was something that was possible now, not just in the future. (See Censorship Memo, Carl Milliken to Henry Ginsberg, 14 December 1954, in *Giant* files, Warner Bros. Archive, USC; annotated novel (35-f.456) in the George Stevens Collection, AMPAS).

[82] *Thunder in the East* was a badly timed project, set against the turmoil in India following independence. The story concerned a rebel army laying siege to the city of Ghandahar and an opportunistic American pilot, played by Alan Ladd, out to make a fast buck and willing to sell his planeload of arms to the highest bidder. The pacifistic prime minister of Ghandahar refuses to negotiate and confiscates the arms to prevent Ladd from selling them to the rebels. Ladd makes another attempt to profit from the situation, offering to fly members of the old British colonial establishment out of the city for an exorbitant fee. Only when his plane is destroyed by the rebel leader, does Ladd fight on the 'right' side, and the prime minister is finally convinced that armed resistance is the only option. The film was completed in 1951, but its dark and depressing portrayal of politics in India and the amoral American anti-hero, led the State

Department to protest and it was held up for 2 years before being released in the US. It was never released in India or Pakistan.

- [83] Robert Taylor played Tibbetts in the Melvin Frank and Norman Panama production for MGM.
[84] The first treatment for what was to become *Strategic Air Command* was delivered by Beirne Lay Jr on 27 April 1953. Its opening lines, explaining what the screenplay sought to demonstrate, confirms Luraschi's influence:

We are not a warlike nation. This is our greatest strength and our greatest weakness—a strength because citizen soldiers fight, when they must, better than regimented automations, and a weakness because we tend to take this latent strength for granted.

James Stewart's character, Lt Col. Robert 'Dutch' Holland, is called back into service to form the B-47 unit. He questions this, giving Castle, his commander, a chance to explain what Luraschi wanted to be made clear, reassuring the rest of the world that they were safe in America's hands:

Castle: Look, Dutch, it's a different job now. We don't need kids in SAC. We need old hands. Like you. Experience.

Dutch: But where's the fire? I just don't see the necessity.

Castle: You would if you were in my seat. Do you realize we're the main thing that's keeping the peace? By staying combat ready we can prevent a war. Dutch, if I didn't believe that, if my commanders and crew didn't believe that, I couldn't get a single airplane off the ground. (*Strategic Air Command*, Paramount Script Collection, AM-PAS.)

- [85] A front-page article in *Daily Variety*, 6 January 1953 had indicated that, due to the 'institution of an economy program, some production letouts ... plus Paramount's big backlog', the studio was likely only to have *Elephant Walk* and *New Kind of Love* on the production schedule for the first 6 months of the year—all other production on the lot would be from independents. 'Studio's potential production total for the year is now estimated at only 18 films, of which 10 will come from the independent units' (*Daily Variety*, 6 January 1953). On 30 January MGM similarly announced that the studio would trim its 1953 production schedule from 38 to 30 films (*Daily Variety*, 30 January 1953, p. 1).
- [86] Directed by Julien Duvivier, *The Little World of Don Camillo* dramatised the post-war clash between the communists and the Catholic church in Italy by pitting the village priest against the newly elected communist mayor in a struggle for the people's support. The film was based on the consistently best-selling book by Giovanni Guareschi, which had been a selection of America's Book-of-the-Month Club. There was no ambiguity in Guareschi's 'loathing' of the communist Party. He had received the 'honour' of being publicly denounced by the chairman of the Italian Party. Printing enormously popular cartoons in his paper, *Candido*, Guareschi had ridiculed the communists, showing them each week doing something ineffably stupid in following the party line to the letter. The impact this had in deflating the communists was credited with a substantial share in the party's defeat in the 1948 elections—in which, ironically for Luraschi, the CIA had also intervened with substantial funding of propaganda. (See interview with Guareschi in *New York Times*, 17 December 1950, p. VII. 13.) However, Bosley Crowther's review in the *New York Times* suggests that Luraschi was not alone in his reading of the film:

A closer look at the picture ... reveals that the fundamental conflict in its vitals is not between any socio-religious doctrines but between the natures of two stubborn men. While the priest is distinctly motivated by his own sense of moral rectitude and of outrage and indignation at the presence of the Communists in the town, some of which is unquestionably reflective of his strong religious beliefs and disciplines, he is not a responsible mirror of the policies of the Roman church. And the Mayor, while he wears the Communist label, has no apparent ties with Uncle Joe. He is just a hard-headed peasant who wants to help the people of his town.

But even though neither priest nor Mayor is a genuine substantial doctrinaire and the conflicts between these two stalwarts are mainly tangles of their personal pride and zeal, thus completely eliminating any political significance, there is still a great deal of sound instruction in its happy philosophy. For what is being said in this droll picture ... is that

people are basically decent and amiable animals, whatever their ingrained prejudices and egotistic urges are. (*New York Times*, 11 January 1953.)

- [87] By the middle of February, McCarthy's investigation of the Voice of America was in full swing and had taken on the familiar tones of a witch-hunt. McCarthy had scheduled televised hearings for the week beginning 20 February but had already declared on 13 February that 'there are some people in the Voice of America who are doing a rather effective job of sabotaging Dulles's and Eisenhower's foreign policy program'. The hearings accused the Voice of America of 'mismanagement and subversion' and errors in judgement. These ranged from problems such as the building of transmitters in locations which the Russians could jam, to the numbers of incomplete broadcast projects made by the Voice of America in Ceylon which were interpreted as symbolic of the whole. Credibility was given to the charges when Dr Wilson M. Compton, the director of the International Information Administration, resigned on 18 February conceding that some funds had been 'wasted'. At least one Voice of America employee committed suicide over the allegations. Miss Nancy Lenkeith, a disgruntled former-employee on the French desk, was one of the first witnesses to appear and made the lurid accusations that the editor of the French section, Troup Mathews, had tried 'to recruit her into a Communist-style community of free-love!'. Lenkeith also charged Mathews with being 'sympathetic to the teachings of Karl Marx' and claimed that she had been dismissed because she had written 'a favorable review of Whittaker Chambers' book *Witness*'. Though he issued a vehement rebuttal in the press, Mathews was never invited to answer these charges. Of greater consequence to the Voice of America as a whole was the charge that communist propaganda had been broadcast. This revolved around a State Department directive of 7 March 1952, which had suggested that good things said about the US by Soviet-endorsed authors would be effective counter-propaganda. The Voice of America had also been using statements by communist leaders to show that many of the claims contradicted each other and the realities of life behind the Iron Curtain. However, the State Department automatically responded to McCarthy's assault on this policy, ordering on 20 February that no material from books or other works of communists or controversial authors could be used by the Voice of America under any circumstances. Seemingly, *Giant* was included on this list. In the following months, McCarthy's lieutenants, Roy Cohn and David Schine toured the State Department's information outposts abroad and announced that they had found 30,000 books by 'pro-communist' writers. Once again, the State Department retreated under pressure and books by Howard Fast, Dashiell Hammett, Langston Hughes, Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann and even Thoreau were withdrawn. Eventually, the furore died down, partly because McCarthy overstretched himself, but mainly because Eisenhower and C. D. Jackson acted to consolidate the administration's propaganda programme (including the Voice of America) in the new United States Information Agency, which came into effect in August 1953. (See Schulman, *The Voice of America*, p. 190, Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p. 193 and reports in the *New York Times*, 13 February to 7 March, 1953.)
- [88] William Gordon, head of public relations, foreign affairs and censorship at Universal-International was succeeding Luraschi as chairman of the MPAA's International Committee for the year 1953-1954 and was an obvious contact for Anderson. Luraschi had already mentioned this Schary-Anderson meeting in his letter of 24 January—an indication that he was running out of news to pass on to 'Owen'.
- [89] Refers to Eric Johnston, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America and Kenneth Clark, the director of the MPAA's public relation's department in New York.
- [90] With a background in film production, John Murray Begg had been the assistant chief of the Department of State's Motion Picture and Radio Division, later holding positions in the division of International Information and Cultural Affairs. When Anderson did indeed take up his appointment as first secretary and consul at Mexico City in April, Begg became the MPAA's principal contact at State. An internal MPAA memo from Kenneth Clark to Clarke Wales, dated 26 March 1953, records that Clark was pressing Begg to find a replacement for Anderson. Apparently 'Mr Begg would be prepared to establish an office in Los Angeles if he could receive proper assurance in advance of active industry cooperation' (State Department Tie-Up file, AMPTP Collection, AMPAS). Plans were evidently put on hold while the organisation of the United States Information Agency occurred and Begg took up a position in the new agency. Arthur Alan Compton, like Anderson, was employed in the State Department's Foreign Service, having been second secretary at Vienna in 1951. Frances White served as United States Ambassador to Mexico from 1953 to 1957. He had previously seen service as Assistant Secretary

of State in the Herbert Hoover administration and had considerable experience in Latin American affairs.

- [91] David Penn had been an announcer for the Office of War Information in 1942–1945 and transferred to the Department of State as a radio commentator in 1946. The 1952 Biographic Register indicated that he was currently in service with the Department's division of international broadcasting, but his name does not appear in the 1953 Biographic Register. There is no evidence in the MPAA's files of his arrival in Hollywood. George V. Allen was a career foreign service officer who had been with the Department of State since the 1930s. He was appointed US Ambassador to Yugoslavia in 1949 and the US Ambassador to India and Nepal on 11 March 1953. He was to go on to serve as Director of the United States Information Agency from 1957 to 1961. (Information provided by David Haight, archivist at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kansas.)
- [92] *Birth of a Nation* had been re-released in Britain in November 1952 in an edited version with background sound added, which had been prepared by D. W. Griffith in 1930. As an 'art-house' release, its impact in the UK was minor and reviewers in the film journals felt that present-day audiences would find little 'entertainment appeal' in its 'old-fashioned theatricality' (*Monthly Film Bulletin*, January 1953, pp. 3–4). The British Film Institute has no record of the journal from which Luraschi quotes, but similar thoughts did occur in the left-wing press, particularly to the reviewer in the *New Statesman* (8 December 1952). 'Quite certain that the melodramatic impact of the film will be to prejudice audiences against Negroes', the *New Statesman* drew attention to the current international racial tensions—'Malan [prime minister of South Africa] prohibiting free assemblage and Kenya in danger of guerrilla warfare'—and argued that 'to choose this moment for its revival is at best a piece of gross insensitiveness'. The *Daily Worker* (22 November 1952) declaimed, rather more wearily, 'as if there were not enough *new* fascist films around ...'
- [93] Luraschi's antagonism towards the Voice of America project has already been noted. The information he here imparts to Owen was lifted verbatim from the minutes of the International Committee meeting of 3 March 1953. The State Department had agreed in March 1953 to provide a 'personal history background' on all visitors referred to the MPAA. According to his papers, Nassif had been a respected journalist in Cairo as a diplomatic correspondent and foreign editor during the war. In the post-war years he lectured at the American University in Cairo, acted as a United Nations correspondent and had worked for Voice of America since 1950, becoming news editor of the Arabic Voice of America in 1952 (MPAA Foreign Visitors, 1951–1953 file, AMPAS).
- [94] Clarke 'Duke' Wales was the Studio Publicity Director for the Motion Picture Association, responsible for the MPAA's press office and also acted as the liaison with the State Department for Voice of America and the visits of foreign dignitaries.
- [95] From 1947 until 1956, when the award for foreign language film became a regular category, special rules governed the selection process. A nominations committee was made up of two members of each studio foreign department and two members of the Academy's board of governors. This committee reviewed all foreign films released commercially in the US and then reported to the board of governors 'for their guidance and information'. The governors of the Academy would then view a selected number from this short list, and their vote—not that of the general membership of the Academy—would determine the recipient of the award. Luraschi, of course, was on the nominating committee and evidently he allied with Vogel and others to exercise their influence over the governors' decision. The limited number of people involved in this process and the conservatism of the governors (principally studio moguls) would have made this comparatively easy. (Information supplied by Barbara Hall.)
- [96] Pauline Kael called *Forbidden Games* 'the greatest war film since *La Grande Illusion*'. Adapted by Francois Boyer from his novel *Editions de Minuit* and directed by Rene Clement, the film 'deals with what a little French girl in the Battle of France strangely makes out of the idea of death'. Set in 1940, the girl's parents and her puppy are killed when German planes machine-gun the crowds trying to flee the invading army. A French farm boy befriends her and takes her and her limp animal to his home—explaining that, being dead, it must be buried. The reviewer in the *New Yorker* of 25 October 1952, explained that

From then on, with a dainty sort of fixation on this service to death, she and the enslaved boy establish an animal cemetery for dead butterflies and moles, which becomes their secret garden, and for which he begins stealing crosses from the country

cemetery. It is the de Maupassant touches of the fights between his family and their neighbors, and the culmination of a cemetery brawl over the stolen crosses, that is so funny—so humanly true.

The film did win that year's honorary award for best foreign language film and in 1954 Boyer's screenplay was also nominated by the Academy.

- [97] *High Noon* had won the New York Film Critics' best picture award for 1952 and early in January Stanley Kramer had booked the film for a special run at the Apollo Theatre in Hollywood to draw attention to it during the Academy Award nomination race (*Variety*, 12 January 1953, p. 5.) *High Noon* was nominated as best picture, but lost out to *The Greatest Show on Earth* (which was released by Paramount). However, Gary Cooper did win as best actor and Dmitri Tiomkin picked up the Oscar for scoring and song.
- [98] Foreman had been subpoenaed by the HUAC in April 1951 while writing the script and knew that he would be blacklisted after refusing to cooperate. Consequently, he rewrote the script, adding elements which made it an allegory of how fear affected people in Hollywood. (See Jeffrey Meyers, *Gary Cooper: American hero* (New York, 1998), pp. 239–249.)
- [99] Foreman kept credit for his screenplay and received an Academy Award nomination, but Stanley Kramer dropped him as associate producer, publicly disavowing Foreman 4 days after he appeared before the committee.
- [100] According to biographer Jeffrey Meyers, Kramer and Fred Zinnemann had considered Cooper as perfect casting as Will Kane, 'whose idealism opposed indifference and evil'. Cooper himself relished the task: 'The sheriff I was asked to play was different than any I'd ever known or heard about because Sheriff Kane had to stand alone, literally, against the lawless. It was a challenging role—and I loved it.' Pressure was put on Cooper to leave the film, by Louis Mayer and Walter Wanger among others, but Foreman recalls that Cooper personally stood by him. (See Meyers, *Gary Cooper: American hero*, pp. 239–249.)
- [101] The author's familiarity with these two prelates is another indication of Luraschi's Catholic heritage.
- [102] *Flowers of St. Francis* was made in 1949, but its release was held up by the controversy raging over Rossellini's *The Miracle*—which had been labelled 'blasphemous' by Cardinal Spellman. The film recounts some of the events in the life of the future saint, Francis of Assisi and his twelve disciples, illustrating his message of love, peace and freedom. *Variety* noted that 'standout among the several episodes are one in which hardly a word is spoken, describing Francis' nighttime encounter with a leper whom he kisses; the winning out of Brother Juniper's blind and simple faith over a tyrant's fierceness; the one in which Francis and the Brothers go out into the world to preach the word of God' (*Variety*, 27 September 1950). Luraschi's comments echoed those of the Catholic-run *Motion Picture Daily*, which found that 'the purpose of the film is obscure. Some viewers undoubtedly will feel that Rossellini was motivated with the same ends as that of the authors of the original book. Others will conclude that Rossellini, although he worked with the collaboration of several priests and used Franciscan monks for most of the roles, was trying to make St. Francis and his followers appear as fools' (*Motion Picture Daily*, 11 October 1952).
- [103] This paragraph is highly revealing of Luraschi's vigilance on issues affecting his Italian and Catholic heritage. Seymour Lipset had found Italian Catholics were 'among the most pro-McCarthy groups' in America. Luraschi certainly perceived communism as a threat to both aspects of his identity and accepted the conservative Catholic position—which was readily absorbed in American political rhetoric—that communism was a Christian heresy. (See Patrick Allitt, *Catholic Intellectuals and Conservative Politics in America* (London, 1993), p. 81.) Gabriele D'Annunzio's play *La Figlia di Iorio* was written in 1903. The plot concerns Aligi, a shepherd who takes Mila (Iorio's daughter) into his home to protect her from lustful yokels. In the primitive and superstitious village, this is seen as a profanation of his betrothal rites. Mila becomes regarded as a 'public woman' and when Aligi kills his father for raping her, he is condemned to a barbaric death. Mila saves Aligi by declaring to his accusers that she bewitched him and she dies in a funeral pyre. Recognised as 'one of Italy's most important poets and political figures', D'Annunzio's prestige and fierce nationalism (he had led a band of volunteers in seizing Fiume in 1919 to impede the post-war treaties) had been exploited by Mussolini's Fascist Government. At the other extreme, Alberto Moravia found his name on Mussolini's list of subversives following publication of *The Fancy Dress Party*, a 1941 satire of the Second World War fascist leaders. Moravia was forced to flee Italy in 1943. His works after the war, most notably a series of *Roman Tales*, were focused on 'working-class' characters and the superficiality of the

bourgeoisie. However, Luraschi was not simply concerned with Moravia's involvement on the project because he was avowedly anti-fascist or socialist. In 1952, the Catholic Church had placed all of Moravia's books on the *Index of Prohibited Books*. Ostensibly, this was because critics described his works as pornographic for their extensive use of sex to describe man's relationship to reality, but Moravia had courted anti-clerical controversy with *Il Conformista* in 1951, which contained a thinly veiled attack on the sexual hypocrisy of the Italian clergy. Thus, Luraschi's comment that the Vatican could be used in opposing the project is perhaps not so laughable as it at first appears. The film version of *Daughter of Iorio* was apparently never produced, so Moravia's involvement remains unclear. His interest in cinema, however, was evidenced when he became the film critic for *L'Espresso* in 1957. (See John Robert Woodhouse, *Gabriele D'Annunzio: defiant angel* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 212–215, Thomas Erling Peterson, *Alberto Moravia* (New York, 1996), p. ix and Luciano Rebay, *Alberto Moravia* (New York, 1970), pp. 4 and 26.)

Appendix

Orville Anderson spent 5 months collecting information and speaking to many figures in the industry. His report on 'Type of General Information on Hollywood Which Should be Disseminated Abroad', was filed in March 1953 and is reprinted below.

The report was found in the State Department File of the AMPAS Collection at the Margaret Herrick Library in Los Angeles. It was accompanied by a letter from 'Duke' Wales, the MPAA's official liaison with the State Department, assessing the value of Anderson as a Los Angeles-based connection between Hollywood and the government:

Today I had an hour-and-a-half session with 'Andy' Anderson of the State Department. I think he is going to be an invaluable asset to us here, and I am sorry that there seems to be no prospect that his assignment will be permanent.

We talked at some length about the visitor problem and I believe that with his help we can greatly relieve the pressure. For one thing, with a State Department representative here, we can confine our efforts ... to the business of showing visitors our studios and setting up desirable contacts with industry representatives; we should not need to be responsible for sightseeing expeditions and similar entertainment ...

As I told you, some members of the International Committee here had asked that all requests to them for studio visits come through my office ... This will make some change in your allocation of visitors between Addison Durland and myself. If a studio visit is the principal objective, the visitor should be referred to this office ... In the case of a foreign film industry or government representative whose main interest in censorship or other control of film content, that would be Addison's province; if such visitors incidentally want to see studios—as they usually do—I will set up the visit ...

Anderson is going to undertake also to solve the problems we have had here with Voice of America, as well as working out a basis for increasing the amount of Hollywood material that goes into the State Department's foreign press service. In both instances we should benefit. Anderson will not be able to stay here past the first of May, 1953. I hope before then that the need of having someone like him here will be clearly enough established so that the State Department will have a suitable successor to him lined up.

Meanwhile I think we should be very much encouraged over the fact that he is going to be here long enough to help get things in order.

Clarke H. Wales to John McCarthy, 22 October 1952.

'Type of General Information on Hollywood Which Should be Disseminated Abroad': Report made by Orville Anderson to the State Department

I. Hollywood as a Characteristic, Private U.S. Industry

A. Enterprise, Capital Risk, Distinctive Features, etc.

Serious finance and economic publications abroad will use sound, informative articles which explain and illustrate the dynamics of the U.S. economic system. That Hollywood is an organized, self-con-

tained industry is rarely appreciated. In fact, many foreigners have a vague idea that it is a sort of grab-bag endeavor and that the U.S. Government plays some kind of role in both production and distribution.

Logical Themes: *Fortune*-like studies of the economics of American motion pictures would be well received. These should include comparisons of risks involved in such well-known enterprises as book publishing and legitimate stage production. Stress should also be placed on the areas of competition and the benefits—the improved products—which come from this competition.

B. Associations, Guilds, Unions, etc.

A distinctive part of the U.S. is the ability of its citizens to team-up, to organize on a thousand fronts for their own welfare. It is instinctive and normal with us but a never-ending source of interest for serious students abroad. Although these self-starting organizations cut through the fabric of U.S. life—from do-good civic clubs to the AMA—Hollywood, by itself, (from unions and guilds to MPIC) represents a whole field of study.

Logical Themes: Because of a global, pre-determined interest in almost anything concerning Hollywood, articles of varying length on Hollywood organizations would have editorial appeal. Common to all would be the advantages of cooperation ('two heads are better than one', 'in union there is strength', etc.). Indicative of the potential is the following list:

1. Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences
2. Production Code Administration (PCA)
3. Motion Picture Industry Council
4. Labor Unions and Hollywood
5. Screen Directors Guild
6. Screen Writers Guild
- Etc., Etc.

C. Production Methods, Techniques, Peculiarities, Etc.

Each step in the production of a motion picture has an interest, even a glamor of its own. Though the finished picture is a monolithic product, this is the result of collaboration and cooperation—not one-man performance. Yet the artist and the craftsman each has a broad area in which to create, invent, and to indulge his individual talents. Good motion pictures are democratic achievements—and the step-by-step contributions provide object lessons worth stressing.

Logical Themes: Some of the professions or crafts which would make good overseas copy are:

1. Producers
2. Directors
3. Writers
4. Art Directors
5. Directors of Photography (and cameramen)
6. Directors of Music (and musicians)
7. Screen Story Analysts
8. Costume Designers
9. Unit Production Managers
10. Special Effects Craftsmen
- Etc. Etc.

II. Hollywood as a Community of Citizens

A. Participation in Civic Enterprises (local and national)

Foreign as well as domestic audiences accept the appearance of motion picture stars at benefits, rallies, etc., as matter of course. They vaguely associate these with a star's need for publicity and let it go at that. They have little idea as to the extent of such activity, the sacrifices involved, or of the sincerity expressed. Equally important, the extensive participation of motion picture people *other* than stars is little known.

Logical Themes: Many human interest pieces on this theme would seem to be in order. They might include:

1. Patriotic Efforts (troop entertainment, blood banks, etc.)
 2. Permanent Charities Committee
 3. Motion Picture Relief Fund
 4. Hollywood Coordinating Committee
 5. Political and Social Activities of Individuals
- Etc. Etc.

B. Family and Social Life

Few foreigners have any concept of Hollywood as a definitive, typically American community of families, with children to rear, homes to keep going, and taxes to pay. Articles of this nature, adequately illustrated with photos, would have ready acceptance throughout the world. They should represent a cross-section of the industry, not just the marquee names.

Logical Themes: Some of the most likely areas of interest would include:

1. Individual Families at Home
 2. Religion (churches, variety of doctrines, etc.)
 3. Education (public and private)
 4. Military Service of Youth
 5. Recreation, Hobbies, etc., (Painting, Collecting, Charity Interests, Sports, etc.)
- Etc. Etc.

III. Hollywood as a Cultural Force

A. The American Film

It is inevitable that those schooled in the classical tradition should underestimate a medium as accessible and as acceptable to millions as motion pictures. Too often the foreign writer, educator or other public opinion moulder is a product of the traditional school, and as a consequence that motion pictures—especially Hollywood pictures—never have received due credit in the cultural field.

Logical Themes: Throughout Hollywood are men who understand the world-wide cultural import of the American-type motion picture. The direct Cominform attack on American output (see IV. A, below) suggests that both the industry and the government should combine forces to offset this threat. There should be a veritable flow of material abroad which emphasizes the achievements to date and the potentials of the future. These should range from popular, easy-to-read accounts to scholarly treatises. Some of the more obvious subjects are:

1. Producing motion pictures for the *Family Audience*
 2. Moral and Spiritual Standards
 3. Universality of the Production Code
 4. Psychology of the Happy Ending
 5. Why Entertainment has Priority
 6. 'Oscar' as the International Symbol of Achievement
- Etc. Etc.

B. Contributions to Education (direct and indirect)

Even in the US press there has been inadequate attention given to the day-to-day contributions of films to education, especially to adult education. Newsreels, shorts, and features provide an endless flow of constructive information on history, science, geography, politics, current events, etc. In addition, of course, are the direct contribution to schools, military training, industry, etc.

Logical Themes: Suggestive of the constructive material which could be published abroad are:

1. Teaching Film Custodians
 2. America Sees the World in Films Photographed Abroad
 3. History recreated on the Screen
 4. History of Science in Feature Films
 5. The Saturday Morning Show for Children
- Etc. Etc.

C. Motion Pictures and Art

Whether viewed as creative achievement justifying in its own right the label of 'art', or as a symphony which uses and stimulates other arts, the American film merits the serious study of cultural scholars

everywhere. The availability of films to millions—the quantitative side—should be stressed as well as quality of content. Culture *in depth* is the essence of the American approach and concept.

Logical Themes: Straightforward articles which do not patronize the foreign reader, which avoid 'brag and boast' postures, and which, if possible, carry by-lines of significance are welcomed by foreign editors. Suggested subjects follow:

1. Film Scores as Challenges to Composers
 2. Masterpieces for the Millions
 3. The Musician in Hollywood
 4. Technicolor and the Painter
 5. Animated Motion Pictures
 6. World's Classics to World Audiences
 7. The New Maestro—the Director
 8. Opportunities for the Creative
- Etc. Etc.

IV. Hollywood and International Affairs

A. *The American Motion Picture Abroad*

Many foreigners are sensitive over the predominance of Hollywood-produced motion pictures. Too often they attribute this to the sheer trading ability of American distributors rather than to a chain of factors, not least of which is quality. This quality is subtle because it is two-fold. Hollywood is professional and it is so because through volume, it gets a lot of practice. The other ingredient in international appeal is even less distinguishable. American pictures inevitably reflect the American Way, the American interpretation of life and the world. And most people everywhere sense that this is what they believe in also, even though they haven't got it. That the Communists realize this is evidenced by the 1950 Cominform admonition to 'render the American cinema harmless.'

Skill is required to handle this quality factor abroad. It can be done if the discussions treat separately those elements which produce quality and build a case by understatement rather than by overstatement.

Logical Themes: Research is implied in this area, but some phases of the American film are self-evidently logical:

1. Common Denominators in American Product
 2. 'Fair Play' as an Essence of Americanism
 3. American Films and the 'Underdog'
 4. Characteristic Techniques of American Production
 5. Scenes So Typically American They Could Not Be Produced Elsewhere
- Etc. Etc.

B. *International Character of Hollywood*

Humans everywhere are more favorable toward an enterprise if they realize they have a common bond with that enterprise. Hollywood is an international center in fact, and offers many opportunities for making this known.

Logical Themes: Actually, the ramifications are so many that the subjects appear endless:

1. Varied Nationalities of Individuals
 2. International Themes vs. American Themes in Hollywood Productions
 3. Foreign Correspondents in Hollywood
 4. The International Committee
 5. Advisory Unit for Foreign Films
 6. Hollywood's Fight Against Infiltrating Communists
 7. International Charities
 8. Hollywood Films and world-wide travel
- Etc. Etc.

David Eldridge is lecturer in American film and history at the University of Hull. His doctoral thesis at Cambridge examines the attitudes towards history held by Hollywood film makers as reflected in the films of the 1950s. His article on the Federal Theatre Project and Cultural Anxiety appeared in Borderlines, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1997.