Chapter 2
EARLY CINEMA AND NEWS OF WAR
Authenticity, artifice and deception

INTRODUCTION

The cinema emerged in the mid-1890s during an era of widespread militarism and ongoing warfare. Conflicts in various parts of the world were one of the chief subjects for news reports and presentations in the existing media, such as lantern shows, panoramas, newspapers and illustrated periodicals. So almost by default, the new medium of cinema had to follow suit. But how? The illustrated periodical (see previous chapter) was the most obvious model, and I would argue that, whether it was by direct influence or otherwise, this was indeed the model which cinema followed in its representation of war.[1]

Faced with the difficulties of photographing modern warfare, the illustrated periodical had hit upon a working consensus of presenting war news in two visual formats: photographic images to show the overall context, and artists' impressions to show the all-elusive moments of action. Within the space of a few years, the cinema came up with a similar bicameral solution: to use war-related actuality shots to show the context, personalities, etc; and staged scenes including fakes to represent actual conflict and to make more pointed comments on the war.[2] I discuss some theoretical aspects of these practices below.

But this was not a stable state of affairs. As we have seen with the illustrated periodical, a gradual shift took place towards the photograph and away from the artist's impression (a shift which Bazin calls a growing 'feeling for the photographic document'). I suggest that a similar evolution took place in early cinema. A 'feeling' for photographic realism or authenticity developed, indeed had governed actuality filming of warfare from the start. In contrast, staged war scenes were by definition 'artificially arranged' and, while such films were popular in the period I cover, one can detect a current of unease at this type of scene.[3] This unease was reinforced by reports of various kinds of war films being fraudulently presented as the real thing. Within a few years, dramatised war films and fakes virtually died out as genres, and a new orthodoxy was established, with news – including war news – being covered almost exclusively in actuality footage.

THE EARLY WAR FILM: CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT

The militarised world of early cinema

As I have noted in the previous chapter, the nineteenth century was an era of almost continuous small colonial wars and conflicts. By the time the cinema arrived on the scene in the 1890s this imperialist militarism had reached its zenith. At the end of 1895 (at about the same time that the Lumière films were

first screened to the Paris public), the New York *World* was summarising the past twelve months as a period racked by 'wars and bloodshed', listing conflicts from Abyssinia and Madagascar to Haiti, Lombok, Samoa and all across Latin America. Evocative maps showed the numerous parts of the world where these wars, massacres, native uprisings, riots and bloodshed had taken place.[4] [Fig. 1 and 2]

The ensuing few years, as the cinema was emerging and developing, were just as violent. This was a time of changing global patterns of power. The waning of the Ottoman and Spanish empires (and others), and the resurgence of British, American and Japanese spheres, were played out from the 1890s to the First World War in a series of small wars in various parts of the world.[5] Back home too there was a pervasive militarism, with the armed forces and uniforms being ubiquitous in everyday life.[6] The cinema therefore began and developed in a world of war and conflict.

What's more, a relationship between the military and the photographic and moving image was well established even before the cinema came along, and some of the earliest photographic representations of war were instigated or commissioned by national war ministries.[7] These ministries in several countries also helped to sponsor research in chronophotography (several of Anschütz' and Marey's series photographs were for war research, for example), and when cinema itself arrived, films were used to record the effectiveness of munitions. Connections between cinema and the military quickly flourished. Films were employed as part of national publicity or recruiting campaigns, to offer the public a positive view of the way of life of the soldier or sailor, and to show the efficiency and readiness of the nation's forces (military propaganda in effect). Examples include the film work of the German naval league or Robert Paul's series of 1900, *Army Life*.

Furthermore, from soon after the première of the cinématographe in 1895, the armed forces and warfare became one of the major commercial film genres. Many of the Lumière films depict soldiers training or parading or on exercises, with 'Vues militaires' forming substantial catalogue sections from their first catalogue in 1897. Several of the other early film companies were equally keen on filming war and soldiery, none more so than Biograph, and the genre 'Military' took up no less than 33 pages in their catalogue (the second biggest category after 'Comedy'), including scenes at military bases and the like.[8] In short, cinema and the military were intimately acquainted from the very first.

The problems of reporting war on film

As well as these general scenes of the military in training or on exercises, some people proposed or hoped to capture moving images of military adventures in faraway lands. Conflicts in various parts of the world were already one of the leading subjects for reports and exhibits in the existing media: as we have seen, panoramas, battle paintings, lantern shows, as well as newspapers and illustrated periodicals, all featured representations of current wars.

But as stills photographers had discovered, capturing warfare would not be a straightforward proposition. By its nature war is dangerous and difficult to record in any medium, let alone film, and in the late nineteenth century was getting harder, for two reasons. I have mentioned the first in the previous chapter: the nature of war was changing (at just the time cinema arrived). All the early filmmakers were frustrated by this change, and early war cameramen, with their large, noisy cameras and without telephoto lenses (see Appendix), were constantly frustrated.[9] The other problem was that official regulation and censorship were becoming stricter, again at just the time of cinema's beginnings, and this had an important and negative effect on all kinds of reporting. As we shall see, cameramen like Bitzer in Cuba and Dickson and Rosenthal at the Boer War were much hampered by official regulation and interference.[10] As a result of these problems, few of the films taken in war zones in the first decade of cinema captured any actual battlefield action.

Yet filmmakers had to show something related to the war. 'War is news', as journalists say, for war evokes intense interest in readers or viewers.[11] War on screen promised big profits to those exhibitors who could come up with something. But given the problems of filming at the front, how could filmmakers represent war in the most relevant, vivid, but also authentic form?

Early war film genres

Newspapers, illustrated periodicals and other pre-cinema news media reported on news and war using a range of sources and images. If one looks at the pages of an illustrated periodical of the pre-First World War era, one can see this spread of different types of news images to cover an important story. There are photographs, featuring stories about people and places related to the event, as well as artists' impressions and caricatures. What is most interesting from our point of view is how quickly filmmakers arrived at a similar solution; soon they started presenting war on screen in an analogous manner, employing a combination or mixture of genuine and 'artificially arranged' images.

This solution which they had come across broadly entailed using actuality images to provide the context of the war and authentic background detail, and staged scenes to illustrate the conflict dramatically – more than an actuality film could ever do. Several different types of war-related actuality films emerged in this era, as well as fakes and symbolic films.[12] Sometimes the two different kinds of films – actuality and staged – were programmed together in a rich mixture or 'montage', serving to portray the war in a fairly rounded manner.

As I will show in this thesis, several sub-categories of war films soon emerged. Three kinds of actualities may be identified: films shot in the conflict-zone (the rarest); 'war-related films', which show people, places or events connected with the war; and arranged films, which were shot in the conflict zone with genuine troops, but in which the action was 'set-up' to be filmed. Staged films I divide into re-enacted (fake) films, which depict particular incidents or battles using costumed performers or scale models; and symbolic

films, which use costumed actors in allegorical scenes, mainly of national triumph. In my Introduction I have listed these types of early war films in more detail.

ACTUALITIES

Event and representation – a theory of visual news

To date, though some fine historical work has been done, neither media theorists nor historians have paid much attention to analysing the *stylistic features* of the early (or indeed later) news film, and its close relation, the war film. As far as I am aware, there is no 'theory of visual news', which would help explain how film news material is selected. In the absence of such a theory I would like to offer my own analysis of some principles which seem to have governed the filming and selection of shots for early war and news production and exhibition. (And I suspect that similar principles govern almost any news medium: newspapers, photography, or film.) I warn readers that this is quite a theoretical section, and those who wish to avoid such abstractions may move straight on to the 'Staged Films' section.

In representing an event, I suggest that visual news journalists (including non-fiction film producers and exhibitors) try to obtain news images which are as 'conceptually close' to the original event as possible. 'Close' in this context means with a factually strong, 'indexical' connection to the original event. (See **Box** below for more on this type of connection).

Box:

Signs of war: the special, 'indexical' character of actualities

News images are, in the language of semiotics, 'signs' for the events they represent. This theoretical approach helps to clarify what is special about actualities (and why they are of more news-value than, say, faked films). Semiotic theory puts visual signs into three main categories: icon, index and symbol. An 'index' is a sign which is a sample of, or is contiguous with, its signified. An 'icon' is a sign which looks the same as (has a 'topological similarity to') its signified. A 'symbol' is a conventional link between the signifier and signified (without similarity or contiguity).[13]

Staged films fall into the two latter semiotic categories. Fake films are iconic, in that they look roughly the same as the signified event, the battle, but have no actual, physical connection with it. Staged allegorical films are symbolic, for they represent ideas/themes such as national ideals, and do not depict the specifics of the war. Actualities, including war-related actualities, are indexical, for they depict people or places which were *physically present* at the events of the war.[14] It is this indexical property of actualities – the film effectively being a *sample* of events/people/places from the war – which makes these films so special, so authentic.

How do we guage the strength of an 'indexical' connection between an event and its representation? The connection is conceptually stronger where the representation includes authentic elements, 'markers', from the original event. Any news event may be described by a minimum of four 'markers' or descriptors: participants, action, place and time. In other words, the event involved specific participants who went through certain actions at a given place and time. (These are the equivalent of the reporter's mantra, 'who, what, where and when'.) The aim of the filmmaker in trying to represent the event in actuality images, is to obtain films which match on at least one of these four markers.

In the case of a battle, the minimum conceptual distance, and therefore the 'perfect' news film representation, would be to have cameras rolling at the battle itself. In this case we would be making a faultless match in all four respects or markers: showing the original participants taking part in the actual event at the original place and time. This was the reason why newspapers and film companies spent such a lot of money sending war correspondents and cameramen to the front to try to capture the 'perfect' representation. And cameramen occasionally did manage to film shells exploding and the like; but for the reasons we have gone into earlier, they were rarely able to do even this much.

Thus, in the absence of a 'battle film', a series of secondary possibilities would confront the film producer or exhibitor. He would be searching for, or commissioning, what one might call 'related' footage or 'close substitutes'. That is, films which are as 'close' to the original event as possible, in terms of including any of the four descriptors or 'markers' as the original event – the same participants or space or time or action. An example of the *same participants* would be a shot (filmed anywhere) of the soldiers/commanders who fought in the war. An example of the *same location* would be shots of the conflict zone (filmed at any time). An example of the *same action* would be a film of charging troops (any troops) to give an idea of the genuine charge.[15] (See **Table**). Incidentally, producers might well use existing films for these purposes, so long as they fulfilled the requirements.

Strengthening connections to the events

Of course, if a match could be made on two or more descriptors together, so much the better: for example, a film of the participants (i.e. troops) filmed near the time and place of battle would be better than those same troops filmed in a different time or place (e.g. a shot of troops en route to the war is better than a shot of troops filmed a few months before war broke out). Ideally the process would begin in the war zone with a cameraman on location, and if he couldn't obtain footage of actual conflict, then as a second priority he could at least film general activity of troops in the war zone, such as soldiers in camp or marching to the front line, or artillery being moved into position.

Table:

WAR-RELATED ACTUALITIES: connections between various kinds of war footage and the war itself. Listed in the left-hand column, A to E, are some common types of war-related actuality footage shown in the early era. The next column gives an example of that type of film; and the final four 'marker' columns list whether that type of film depicts/matches the original place, time, personnel or events of the war.					
Type of film ▼	**Example** ▼	**Filmed at or near site of battle?**	**Filmed at or near time of battle?**	**Featuring the actual troops?**	**Depicting the events of battle?**
A. Action during/near actual battle	Rosenthal's film of fighting outside Pretoria (Boer War)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
B. Troops, refugees, etc in war zone	The day before Omdurman (Sudan War)	Yes	Yes/No	Yes	No
C. Troops or commanders, elsewhere or en route	Troops en route to Cuba (Spanish-American War)	No	No	Yes	No
D. View of the country/place where battle occurred	Chinese street view (to illustrate the Boxer uprising)	Yes	No	No	No
E. Similar event to the battle	A parade-ground charge (to represent the charge of the 21st Lancers)	No	No	No	Yes

The following are three brief examples of actual war-related films screened in the early era, which illustrate some of these principles. (1) A film of the region of the Nile: this was appropriate to illustrate the Sudan War, as it depicted the same or a similar location. (2) Shots of American troops training: this was suitable to depict the Spanish-American War, as these same troops would later go to fight in Cuba. (3) A shot of troops in the Philippine War: this comes nearer to the 'ideal' of a film of 'the war itself', for it shows the participants in

the war zone, near the time when skirmishes were actually taking place.

The point about all these kinds of images is that they had a direct, indexical connection under at least one of the markers, to the original event; thus they were in a sense a part of, sample of, what had taken place. The **Table** illustrates my main points, showing how these various kinds of shots were connected to a war, and their differing 'closeness' to it.

In addition to markers within individual films, another factor which added to this sense of 'connection' to the original event was when several such films were programmed together. This was being practiced by showmen by the time of the Spanish-American War, when various kinds of war-related films as well as lantern slides were all programmed together. The aim was to present a rounded account of the war in one programme, by building up various images related to it (which had markers from the original event): troops on the march, commanders being feted, the country where it happened, etc. Some showmen added to the authenticity effect by having the films presented by someone who had been an eye-witness or participant in the war. And music and sound effects provided an extra emotional resonance to the presentation.

In summing up this section I would re-iterate that war-related actualities were chosen based on their close or indexical connection/relationship with the events of battle. Even if the connection was only on one marker – for example, showing the same troops on parade – it was still valued as an 'authentic' document related tangibly to the war. I would further argue that as the news film developed in the early years, this indexical, authentic quality was increasingly valued, as opposed to the staged or fake film – much as the 'photographic document' was increasingly favoured in the pages of illustrated periodicals in preference to the 'artist's impression'.

STAGED FILMS, INCLUDING FAKES

As I have described above, early producers and showmen, in making a selection of actuality films to represent a war, would try to commission or select shots which had some kind of indexical connection with the events. But in addition to these films they also had another option, to choose 'artificial' or staged films. Such films still had a 'connection' to the war, but it was a different kind of connection, of an 'iconic' or 'symbolic' kind. This threw up some interesting issues about authenticity, issues which I will discuss below.

Staged war films in context

Let me initially describe the two main kinds of staged war scenes – fakes and symbolic films – in some more detail. The first category of early staged war film was the 'fake'. Such films depicted events such as battles or skirmishes by staging them with actors or with scale-models.[16] They might be based on real events (usually the case with scale-models) or made-up battlefield incidents. Such kinds of films had some forerunners in other media: in life-model magic lantern slides, in plays and other performances. In these earlier forms, a war event was staged, often in story form, usually with 'our' side

being the victor.

As we shall see in Chapter 3, the first fake or re-enacted war scenes were produced in 1897, depicting the Greco-Turkish War, and in the following years several other wars were similarly dramatised in this type of film. These films varied in their level of realism: some – notably the scale-model re-enactments – were relatively convincing; others, with their theatrical explosions, smoke, hand-to-hand fighting and heroic and dramatic deaths were not. But realistic or not, such fakes were a way of offering news-hungry cinema audiences a dramatic representation of the current war, which, unlike the actualities, included some visible conflict. Such fakes could be very popular: one contemporary writer stated that the only successful battle scenes he had seen were staged scenes, adding that, 'these have been received with thunders of appreciative applause by music-hall patriots'.[17]

The second category of early staged war film – which is often left out of the discussion in favour of fakes – was the allegorical or symbolic film. Such films often made a pointed comment on the events, depicted through national figures such as 'Britannia' or 'Uncle Sam': usually it was a message of national pride and/or imperial conquest. One sees an analogous use of such symbolic figures in other media leading up to and including this period, which might well have been an influence on this film genre. For example, a London stage spectacle of 1885 entitled 'Britannia', has the eponymous figure roused from her well-earned rest (following years of empire building) to protect Britain from competitor nations. By the 1890s and later, pageants and so-called 'patriotic extravaganzas' staged in Britain regularly featured symbolic figures representing the home nation as well as the colonies.[18]

These kinds of national figures are also to be seen in magazine illustrations. For example, in the run-up to the Spanish-American War, *Leslie's Weekly* regularly enlisted the figure of Uncle Sam: the cover of the 17 March 1898 issue has a cartoon of Sam menacingly checking the sharpness of his sword, captioned, 'Uncle Sam is ready'. And at the end of April the cover has Sam standing determined before the Stars and Stripes, captioned, 'Remember the *Maine*'. [Fig. 3 and 4] So when symbolic films were first shown, the public would have been familiar with the style and characters, for these elements mirrored what had been appearing for years in other media.

The advantages of fakes

While genuine films could effectively depict the physical details of a war zone, staged films could help audiences to experience some of the emotions of the conflict. Some people in the film industry in the 1900 era were strongly in favour of staged war films, especially fakes, and believed that these films were a boon. The most forthright in this matter was the film dealer, John Wrench & Son. The Wrench company released many of the Mitchell & Kenyon enactments of the Boer War and Boxer uprising, and boasted that these were not only 'very entertaining', but were 'an excellent substitute for the real thing', being 'more sensational and exciting' than genuine films.[19] The company published a clear and candid statement (perhaps the first) of the advantages of faking as a means to represent war. Their text simultaneously

explained why modern warfare was un-filmable, promoted the fake genre, and denigrated actualities:

> 'We intend issuing from time to time a number of these so-called 'Faked War Films'… as we find from our experience that they are infinitely more exciting and interesting to an audience than the so-called 'Genuine War Films', as the latter will never be anything more than scenes of soldiers or sailors parading &c., before the camera in time of peace. It would be more appropriate to call them 'Genuine Peace Films', for it is a sure thing that the times were never more peaceful than when the films were taken. It is absolutely impossible to take a film of a genuine battle scene or any film of fighting, as, apart from the danger, modern warfare is carried on with the armies or navies miles apart, and therefore the subject does not lend itself to cinematography.'[20]

With this landmark statement extolling the benefits of 'faked war films', and in openly describing such films as fakes, Wrench was being very straightforward. There was no attempt to hoodwink customers into thinking these might be genuine films. Some other companies too (though not all, as we'll see) presented their fake films clearly labelled as such. In this way, these re-created war scenes were not seen as a *deception*, for they were labelled for what they were: mere representations. As Frank Kessler puts it:

> The connotation of "fraudulent intention to deceive" that [the word fake] carries with it, is certainly inappropriate when a staged scene is labelled as a "representation".'[21]

Thus on the face of it, these films, if presented for what they were (fakes), might be seen as a perfectly legitimate, honest way to illustrate or bring to life the otherwise un-filmable moments of battle, not as a fraud on the public. However, while that might have been the theory, the actual reputation of these films was somewhat different. I would suggest that such films were not entirely regarded in a neutral fashion, and were not universally considered an entirely 'legitimate' genre. Indeed, there was considerable unease about such films (especially about re-enacted or fake films, rather than the symbolic kind). The disquiet was, I would argue, on two related matters: the acted, artificial nature of these films, and issues of deception.[22]

The problem of artificiality

One might wonder why fakes were regarded in an ambivalent fashion, when their 'equivalents' in illustrated magazines – artists' impressions – had been accepted without demur?[23] I suspect that it was because there was a belief, naïve perhaps, in the basic 'truth' of film: that it could and should be used to record the real world, and that it was or should be more objective than other media. One author in 1900, comparing written accounts of warfare with actuality films of the same, noted:

> 'A written description is always and forever the point of view, more or less biased, of the correspondent. But the biograph camera does not

> lie, and we form our own judgment of this and that as we watch the magic screen.'[24]

This idea that the 'camera does not lie' indicates this belief that the cinematograph was or should be a mirror of the real world, whose basic mission was to record real life as it really was. I suggest that when this photographic process became the bearer of fakes and manipulated scenes – particularly in relation to the emotive subject of war – it was as if a category had been transgressed. This is reflected in terminology.

The very word 'fake' is not neutral; it implies an intent to fool, to deceive; it suggests a somewhat disreputable activity. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* gives one meaning as, 'alter so as to deceive'. And it is not as if this disparaging word 'fake' in relation to these films was a later term: it was used at the time to mean this kind of re-enacted film. In August 1900 both Wrench and Philipp Wolff stated openly in their ads that they could supply 'faked war films' of the Boxer conflict. These were different companies placing separate ads, showing that this term 'fake' was indeed a current one.[25] [Fig. 5]

But while Wrench and Wolff in this context might have used the term in a relatively dispassionate and 'unashamed' fashion, this attitude to fakes remained a minority position. Others were more judgmental. Charles Urban of the Warwick Trading Company defined 'fakes' (Boer War staged scenes for example) as 'counterfeit' films.[26] Similarly, a few years later, *Cinematography and Bioscope Magazine* in an article on this subject, defined the word 'faked' in relation to films as meaning, 'any attempt of deception'.[27] All this suggests that there was some suspicion and mistrust of these films, despite the evident benefits of the fake genre which Wrench had enunciated. And attitudes were even more critical when it came to how fake films were presented.

The problem of deception

Fake films would probably have been acceptable to many people if they were presented (as Wrench did) straightforwardly, for what they were: as artistic, artificially-made, *illustrations* of the events. The real problem arose if they were advertised, sold or introduced dishonestly, with the claim or implication that they were genuine recordings of war.

Some film companies, and probably most, were perfectly frank and honest when describing fakes in their catalogues. As we have seen, the Wrench company presented their war fakes with some pride – 'an excellent substitute for the real thing'. R.W. Paul headed his list of Boer War fakes in his catalogue as, 'Reproductions of Incidents of the Boer War', so there was no doubt that these were fakes. But some manufacturers' film catalogues and ads were vague about the nature of their war films: for example, Walter Gibbons' ad listing 'the latest Chinese war pictures' failed to mention that these were fakes, and only the dramatic action described in some of their synopses would have enlightened purchasers.[28] The Warwick Trading Company, under Charles Urban, regularly warned customers about such vague descriptions, and that such vaguely described films were usually fakes.[29] In relation to the Boxer events for example, Warwick stated:

> ‘Beware of so-called sensational war films of the Chinese crisis. These films are only representations, photographed in France and England. Don't be misled into the belief that they are genuine.’ [30]

Some people were indeed being misled about such films. In December 1900 a lantern trade journal published an answer to a puzzled correspondent, one E. Anderson, who had sent in a circular which advertised a film of the Boxer uprising (probably the M&K film, *Attack on a Mission Station*).[31] He seems to have been under the impression that this was a genuine film record of an attack, but the journal quickly disabused him of this idea:

> ‘We have received the circular which you enclosed and note that you think it wonderful that some cinematographic artists should be on hand to photograph the attack on a Chinese mission house or station. You appear to take matters too seriously, for the whole thing is a fake picture – a sort of pantomime scene enacted in this country with scenic backgrounds. We think makers of fake films should state so on their circulars.’

But it was not necessarily in the immediate interests of producers to state on their circulars that theirs were fake films (‘pantomime scenes’) for the following reason. It is likely that, all other things being equal, an exhibitor and his audience would prefer a genuine film record, so if the nature of the film could be kept vague on the circular, more exhibitors might be tempted to purchase (though, as I discuss below, there were risks in this strategy). The deception might then move one stage along, for the exhibitor in turn might be tempted to mask the nature of the film from his customers, the audience.

Audiences were indeed being deceived on this basis, and in some cases were taken in by fakes, or at least were left in some doubt. We have examples of this, notably for films of the Greco-Turkish War and Spanish-American War, which I’ll quote in the respective chapters. Leyda suggests that Boxer fakes, ‘were presented to audiences as authentic records of those events’, and while I have seen no firm substantiation of this, I think it likely. Further evidence comes from the fact that experts at this time were offering advice on how to tell if a film were a fake or not: often the counsel was that spectators should ask themselves if the action depicted were *plausible*. (See **Box**) I submit that such advice wouldn’t have been offered had spectators not been expressing doubts about the matter.

Box:

How to spot a fake?

In the early years of cinema, advice was sometimes offered in periodicals about how to spot fake films. This strongly suggests that viewers – and perhaps exhibitors – were sometimes unsure whether particular films were genuine or otherwise. The nature of the advice varied, but one theme emerged from a number of commentators: the principle of *plausibility*. In particular, these writers pointed to fakes which were filmed from implausible battlefield positions where the cameraman would have been caught in the gunfire.[32]

This implausibility point was made by filmmaker G.A. Smith in 1899, who commented that because 'people want to see battle-scenes', filmmakers turn them out 'by the dozen', but that such films were often manifestly detectable as fakes on the grounds of camera position:

'You see, you can't take a picture of a battle without getting into the thick of it, – the range of the cinematograph is not large, – and if an enemy saw you turning the handle of a machine on three legs, pointing a long muzzle at them, they, being wholly illogical and unscientific, might conclude that you were practising [sic] with some new kind of Maxim and smokeless powder. The chances that you would be alive to take the pictures back to an admiring British audience would not be hopeful.'[33]

A similar point was made in 1900 by an American newspaper in challenging the authenticity of a film purporting to show US troops charging Philippine rebels. In order to have filmed it, the paper pointed out, the cameraman would have to have placed himself in the direct line of fire.[34]

In an important article on film fakes in the *Photographic Chronicle* in 1902, the writer used this same idea of the impossibility of the camera position to puncture the reputation of several specific films, exposing them as fakes. For example, he mentions a fake film of the Boer War, filmed in Britain and depicting an armoured train in Natal with soldiers firing from the interior. He notes:

'It is quite certain that no such picture could be taken during a real armoured train skirmish, for the operator with his camera must have been outside the armoured train, and exposed to the cross fire of friend and foe. The same remark applies to some of the pictures of infantry in action in a trench, where the point of view is from the front.'[35]

In one case, some more general advice, again based on plausibility was offered, in a somewhat tongue-in-cheek manner. In a trade journal of 1900 a correspondent asked how he could distinguish genuine films from sham war films using 'life models' (a term from the lantern world, meaning actors). The journal's pundit replied to the effect that this could largely be done by common sense:

'… for instance, in one film we have heard about, there is a hand-to-hand encounter between Boers and British, all realistic in its way, but the effect is somewhat spoilt by reason of the fringe of an audience appearing on the picture occasionally. Thus, when one sees gentlemen with tall hats, accompanied by ladies, apparently looking on,

common sense would at once pronounce the film of the sham order. The same may be said of films showing soldiers lying and firing from behind "earthworks," composed of nicely arranged straw.'[36]

I suspect that the number of films which did actually show ladies and gentlemen watching, or which featured 'nicely arranged straw', would have been fairly minimal, so this response was probably not completely serious. However, the general point was valid, that viewers should look critically at films, and one further piece of advice or opinion from the time makes this point well. A writer in mid 1900 stated that he believed some of the so-called war films then being shown were not filmed in South Africa and added: '…it may be generally assumed that the more thrilling the incident depicted the less amount of truth there is in it'.[37]

In this regard, we need to remember that these audiences in the early years of cinema included many of what one might called 'untrained spectators'. These early spectators might not have had the experience or knowledge to perceive the difference between a genuine and a fake war film. This is firstly because most people had never seen an actual war so they wouldn't know exactly what the real event looked like; and secondly, even if they knew about war, spectators had no way of knowing how such real events would translate into moving images. While in some cases the faking would probably have been evident even to the most naïve spectator – some of Méliès' more fanciful war re-enactments, for example – in the case of other less stylised, more naturalistic fakes (e.g. Amet's model-based naval reconstructions) the signs would be less evident.

DECEPTION OF VARIOUS KINDS

Such innocent spectators constituted a customer base that was ripe for exploitation. And it is clear that several forms of deception were practiced in this era, both in regard to fakes and other kinds of war films. One activity which was probably fairly widespread was false or misleading description.[38] We have seen that this applied to fakes, in that these were sometimes announced as genuine films, and it also applied to actualities. A new or existing film might be re-titled or mis-described at the distribution or exhibition stage to pass it off as something more war-related than it really was. For example, a shot of troops filmed at manoeuvres might be claimed by an exhibitor to have been filmed in the war zone. A specific instance of misleading description occurred during the Spanish-American War when a film of a battleship was exhibited, and claimed falsely to be the celebrated *Maine* (I discuss this incident in Chapter 7).

A similar instance was the case of a spectator who found that a film, announced by the compère as 'Boer Artillery in Action', was in fact a shot of one artillery piece manned by an inexperienced crew, filmed in a location that clearly wasn't Africa. The viewer later concluded that probably this was a shot of some volunteers on a training exercise in England. Actually it is quite likely

that it was a shot of artillery firing (advertised in December 1899), which had been filmed at a French company before being supplied to the Boers.[39]

A related, though even more subtle example of this effect of wording on the meaning of shots, occurred at about this same time in the context of shows of West's 'Our Navy', in films relating to the siege of Ladysmith in the Boer War. West's shows were advertised in the *Times*, to include shots of 'Naval guns in action as at Ladysmith'. This wording, 'as at', made it clear that these shots were not the real thing. But then, from 19 to 22 December the wording changed to miss out the 'as', so becoming simply, 'Naval guns in action at Ladysmith'. This change might have been a typo – and from the 23rd December it was back to the original wording – but this instance shows what a difference a single word can make, and perhaps some customers did indeed turn up expecting to see a film of battles in Ladysmith itself.[40]

Another practice which went on at this time, analogous to faking, was what I call 'arranging'. In the war zone, rather than shooting regular military operations, the cameraman would 'set-up' actions with troops specially for filming: for example, troops might be asked to pretend to charge or shoot at an off-screen (non-existent) enemy for the benefit of the camera. A variation on this was where an earlier military operation which hadn't been filmed, would be re-enacted for filming purposes, and then presented as if it were the original operation. For example, during the Philippine War, cameraman Ackerman filmed a re-enacted infantry expedition across a mountain range, 'performed' by the same regiment which had been on the genuine mission. This filmed version was then presented in exhibition as authentic.

All in all, by 1900 there were several kinds of deception taking place in war films, including faking, arranging and mis-description. Deception was therefore being practiced in several genres of both staged films and actualities, and at several points in the film production / exhibition process. How seriously did the public regard such practice? Jonathan Auerbach has written about audience attitudes to fake and mis-described films, and suggests that their false status was less important to audiences than how thrilling they were. He argues, with respect to the re-titled film of the *Maine*, that for audience and makers:

> '…the quest for sensation tended to render the opposition between fact and fiction relatively moot. Whether the projection on the screen was the actual battleship *Maine* or another ship posing as the *Maine*, the phantom image was immediate, vivid, and powerful, capable of invoking intense patriotic responses from the cheering vaudeville audiences.'[41]

Auerbach may be right, that for some spectators the nature of the film – genuine or otherwise – was less important than its effectiveness as cinema; but I do not believe that this applied to all spectators. And in most of these cases of mis-description or re-titling – including the *Maine* example – audiences never discovered that the film presented to them was a fraud. They might have *suspected*, but that was all. If they had discovered for sure that they had been misled it's likely that they would have objected. But in the years

around 1900, increasing numbers of exhibitors and spectators did discover that they had been misled, and their concern, as expressed in the press was growing.

THE FATE OF FAKES

Earlier in this chapter I tried to answer the question: why did staged representations of war become such a common genre in early cinema?[42] My answer was that they answered a need, which non-fiction could not meet, for a more dramatic representation of war. The obvious question to ask at this point is: if they were 'needed', why then did these films, especially fakes, disappear as a genre? And disappear they did. From soon after the turn of the century, fakes and other staged war films progressively vanished from the film catalogues and showmen's programmes. There was a brief rally for fakes during the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-05, but the next major conflicts, the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, were little faked, and the same applies to the First World War, apart from isolated instances.[43]

I would suggest two major reasons for the eclipse of fakes. Firstly, a realignment and increasing rigidity in the balance of film genres meant that fakes were increasingly out of place in the film business. I will discuss this in more detail in my Conclusion. But I believe that there was another, perhaps more fundamental reason, and this is to do with the subject I have been discussing above: the question of authenticity, reliability and trust.

Trust, deception and authenticity

As I have mentioned here and in my previous chapter, there was a growing tendency and desire in this era for authenticity in the media – the 'feeling' for the photographic record which Bazin mentions. Yet, in defiance of this trend, through the proliferation of fakes and the publicity surrounding them, early war films were becoming associated with deception. In a 1900 interview with the filmmaker G.A. Smith, the interviewer noted, in a very telling phrase: 'The topic of war-pictures naturally led up to the interesting subject of "fakes".'[44] This implies that by this point films of war were inextricably associated with faking in the popular mind. Compounding the problem were the issues of mis-description and other cases of deception regarding war films which I have detailed above. All this meant that cinema was becoming associated with misrepresentation and a lack of authenticity, and there was some danger of losing the trust of customers, and therefore damaging the entire business.

Let us look at this issue of trust in relation to fakes. Wrench, above, made the case for film fakes, and one can make a more general case too. I will start with an analogy. One might think that no-one likes a 'fake' of any kind, everyone wants the real thing, but this is not always so. We may prefer to buy a fake diamond ring, for example, for it costs so much less than the genuine article. And in so doing at least we end up with a ring of *some* kind, which is almost as good as real. But what if we were misled; what if we wanted and expected (and paid for) a real diamond, yet received the fake? If and when we

find out, we are likely to feel very aggrieved, especially if we have been charged the cost of the genuine jewel.

Truthful description is equally important with respect to the motion picture business (or indeed any other business). And here we come back to the problem we discussed earlier: fake films presented as genuine, and actualities mis-described to make them seem to be real war films. The mis-labelling, mis-description is the key problem.[45] The description and/or title given to a film are crucial; audiences buy tickets on the basis of what they are told they are going to see. If the film does not live up to the advertised description they are likely to feel dissatisfied. In the case of a re-enacted film (fake), if the film is advertised/promoted or introduced by the showman as such, an audience would likely accept it, but if it is fraudulently presented as genuine – or similarly if an actuality is re-titled as something else – the audience might well object if they discover the deception. If the deception were publicised, the likely negative reports would undermine the trust of customers, and therefore have an injurious effect on his show, and perhaps on the wider film business.[46]

Trust is the key point. As a number of economists and business historians have argued in recent years, trust between individuals is an important factor in the overall success of business (and of the wider national economy). Trust, as economists see it, is a bond which reduces transaction costs and helps create a more frictionless economy; where it is absent, businesses tend to remain small and isolated, and fail to develop wider links.[47]

As far as the early film industry went, it seems that leading figures saw that a betrayal of trust between film industry and public was taking place. Charles Urban, as we have seen, warned his customers about fakes or 'representations'. He saw that such deception ultimately would have a detrimental effect on the reputation and future of the business. Of course one cannot know that these issues were being discussed among film companies at this time, for such discussions would have remained private, but I think it very likely, for faking and deception were receiving critical comment in the press. And if discussed in the press then film companies would realise that this was a concern among the public too.

I would suggest that the growing institutionalisation of the film industry might have channelled and focused a growing concern about faking and deception. Business historians tell us that trust is associated with the rise of voluntary and business organisations. In the years after 1900 a number of film trade associations were formed, informal at first and then on a more official basis, and these helped to regularise good practice.[48] Such bodies might well have helped to discourage or root out the more blatant forms of misleading advertising and indeed faking as such. In any case, whatever the mechanism, fakes did progressively disappear, and war news started to be presented through actualities alone.[49]

***

In the remainder of this thesis I trace the origin and development of filmed war news in the half dozen years from 1897. In this brief period, staged war films, including fakes, initially blossomed as a form, before disappearing a few years later. By today's standards, these 'artificially arranged' movies seem like a bizarre kind of film to depict warfare. Yet at the time they filled a need, and became quite popular with audiences.

But we should also bear in mind that in this period too, all the wars which were faked were also covered by actuality cameramen, involving these pioneer operators travelling to the war zones to film what they could with the basic camera equipment of the day. It is these cameramen who are in a sense the main players of our story, for while fakes disappeared, actuality filming of wars continued, in an ongoing quest for the authentic image, right up to the present day. Filming warfare is almost certainly the most difficult and risky type of location filming, and it was these early cameramen who pioneered this kind of reporting, thereby laying the groundwork for news cameramen ever since.

Notes:

---

[1] It is worth adding that sometimes magic lantern shows too mingled photographic and drawn/painted slides, but I suspect that the lantern was less of a model for the early war film than the illustrated periodical, for the lantern was not such a *topical* medium. In any case, the drawn images that lantern shows employed were sometimes adapted from those in periodicals.

[2] I am indebted to Frank Kessler for this insight that the staged film is the cinematic equivalent of the artist's impression on the page, while the actuality film is analogous to the photograph.

[3] Méliès' phrase, 'artificially arranged scenes' is a useful term for describing dramatised films in general (including staged war films), as are two other shorthand terms used in the early cinema period: 'posed' or 'made-up' films.

[4] Coloured supplement to *The World* 15 Dec 1895. The maps/illustrations were by the artist Outcault, and are a fine example of the high quality of art which often appeared in America's newspaper supplements in this period (though many of these newspapers have now been discarded).

[5] Just from 1895 to 1899 there were nine wars involving Britain, including four small wars in Africa, and campaigns in Sudan, South Africa (Boer) and the Indian frontier. See 'Wars of the Queen's reign', in Henry Sell, *Sell's Dictionary of the World's Press… 1900* (London, c1900), p.403. Various imperial powers were considered to be on the wane in the period running up to the First World War, including Spain, China, Russia, Mahdist Sudan, and the Ottoman empire. Lord Salisbury in a famous speech called these former powers the 'dying nations', notably Spain after 1898, and Turkey.

[6] Anne Summers, 'Militarism in Britain before the Great War', *History Workshop Journal*, no. 2, Autumn 1976. Summers is referring to the turn of the century in Britain, but the same militarism was seen in other western nations too, as well as in Japan.

[7] The British military authorities were experimenting with photography from the mid-1850s, and other countries followed. See section 13, 'The Camera at War', in Heinz K. Henisch and Bridget Ann Henisch, *The Photographic Experience, 1839-1914 : Images and Attitudes* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), p. 364-93. The French military, for example, by the late 1850s was employing commercial photographers to document specific military projects, and by the following decade photography was being used by French forces for reconnaissance and map-making. Donald E. English, *Political Uses of Photography in the Third French Republic, 1871-1914* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), p. 8.; Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *Industrial Madness: Commercial Photography in Paris, 1848-1871* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 306-7.

[8] *Picture Catalogue* (AM&B, 1902). The 'Military' section is from pages 155 to 187. On Musser, *Motion Picture Catalogs... Microfilm Edition*. Regarding Biograph's military films see: Stephen Bottomore, '"Every Phase of Present-Day Life": Biograph's Non-Fiction Production', *Griffithiana*, no. 66/70, 1999/2000, p.147-211.
[9] One writer in 1902 noted that the contending forces kept moving out of range of the camera and that the cameramen were targeted, which was why, he stated, fake films were made away from the front line, 'when no enemy was near to make things unpleasant'. 'Moving pictures, how made', *The World Today* 3, Nov 1902, p.2081-2. A modern scholar has put this in a different way. Kristen Whissel writes: '...at precisely the historical moment that the cinema's panoramic perception and documentary capacaties held forth the promise of actuality footage of such battles, the cinema encountered a limit case.' To which the fake or re-enactment emerged as some kind of solution. Kristen Whissel, 'Placing the Spectator on the Scene of History: The Battle Re-Enactment at the Turn of the Century, from Buffalo Bill's Wild West to the Early Cinema', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 22, no. 3, Aug 2002, p. 235-6.
[10] As we shall see, General Otis in the Philippines drove correspondents to distraction through his strict regulation of reporting. Little has been written about the regulation of cameramen in early wars, though Hiley discusses this issue. See Nicholas Hiley, 'Making War: The British News Media and Government Control, 1914-1916', Ph.D., Open University, 1984. Suid notes that from about 1913 there were increasing controls on filmmakers trying to portray the US military and warfare. See Lawrence H. Suid, *Guts & Glory: The Making of the American Military Image in Film* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002), p.13-14.
[11] The quality of *significance* is relevant in this context, based on various factors, some subjective, but clearly involving the scale of human/economic impact of the event. This in turn influences the amount of space allocated to it in the media. If one can posit a 'scale of significance', military action and warfare – especially involving the host country – would be at or near the top, because war can affect the destinies of, and lead to the deaths of, thousands of people, and change the boundaries of states.
[12] The 'war shows' during the Spanish-American War offer an example of this practice.
[13] See Winfried Nöth, *Handbook of Semiotics* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990): on p.108 he summarises Sebeok's six species of signs, which include the three kinds which I've described.
[14] Nöth, op. cit., p.113-114. Pierce stated that an 'index' is physically connected with its object, making an organic pair: e.g. weathercock, photograph, a rap on the door, etc. Pierce though (p.461), was ambivalent about the status of photographs, and characterised them as both icons and indices, for they both resemble and have some physical connection with their object. Barthes believed that photographs were indexical, as they imply 'an emanation of past reality'.
[15] Note that one might even categorise staged films in this system, for they may be said to show the same *action* as the original events, albeit *re-enacted* action and not real. However, for my purposes, I prefer to use this typology solely for actualities.
[16] André Gaudreault notes that a main reason for re-enacting is if the events portrayed are inaccessible to the camera, and points out that this applies to past historic events as well as to current unfilmable ones. See André Gaudreault, 'Re-enactments', in Richard Abel, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema* (London ; New York: Routledge, 2005).
[17] BJP 7 Mar 1902, p.183.
[18] Penny Summerfield, 'Patriotism and Empire: Music Hall Entertainment 1870-1914', in John M. Mackenzie, ed. *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), p.28-9. Colonial symbols included 'the pearls of Ceylon', 'the ermine of Canada', etc.
[19] 'Faked War Films', PD Aug 1900, p.35. The explanation of why the company had made the faked films begins with this: 'Our readers are, doubtless, aware of the great difficulty of taking animated views on a battlefield. Apart from personal danger it is almost impossible under modern conditions of warfare to obtain anything like a satisfactory picture of a battle.'
[20] Barnes, 1900 volume, p.108-09, from 'Important Notice' in *The Era* 21 July 1900, p.24. This was at the time when then the films were released.
[21] Kessler states: 'Film historians thus should be very careful when using the term "fake" and make sure to explicitly state what exactly one wishes to refer to.' See *KINtop*, no. 15, 2006.

[22] Though the first grounds for criticism which I will cover – issues of artificiality – certainly applied to symbolic films too, but fakes made an easier target. I am grateful to Frank Kessler for having clarified my thinking on this, particularly with regard to false claims by exhibitors.
[23] The debate which I outlined in the previous chapter concerning periodical illustrations was about whether they could represent warfare as well as photographs; not a criticism of them as a form *per se*.
[24] 'Pictures that will be historic', LW 13 Jan 1900, p.18. Interestingly, this was written in relation to Carl Ackerman's Philippines filming, which was, as we shall see, anything but a straightforward record of events.
[25] *The Era* 4 Aug 1900, p.24: ads for John Wrench and Son and for Philipp Wolff. Both also listed 'genuine war films' of the Boxer events. The term, 'fake', is consistently used in the article, 'Faked War Films', PD Aug 1900, p.35.
[26] OMLJ Dec 1900, p.154. He noted that such films were made in London, France and New Jersey, and added that, by contrast, all Warwick's films of the war were real, 'taken at the occurrence of the various events in Africa'.
[27] From *Cinematography & Bioscope Magazine*, no. 3, June 1906, published by the Warwick Trading Company. Courtesy F. Kessler in *KINtop*, no. 15, 2006. Film historian Terry Ramsaye, in a well chosen phrase, called such faking, 'the synthetic process of making news pictures'. Terry Ramsaye, *A Million and One Nights: A History of the Motion Picture* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1964 [1926]), p. 403. It was not only war fakes which were regarded in some quarters with distaste, as introducing unwanted artifice into the cinema: in certain quarters, especially in Britain, it was felt that there was something rather inappropriate about the cinema being used for any kind of fiction, whether it be faked war/news or indeed story films. Producer Will Barker was quoted as late as 1914 saying that fiction was, 'a prostitution of cinematography'. See Rachael Low, *The History of the British Film, 1906-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1948), p.146.
[28] Gibbons ad in the *Era* 17 Nov 1900, p.30.
[29] Warwick clearly identified in their catalogue the few fakes they carried. In the wake of the Boxer uprising, the company specifically differentiated between their films shot in China (by Rosenthal) and the few faked films which they distributed: Rosenthal's films were described as, 'genuine Chinese films, taken by our photographic staff now operating in China'. On the other hand, Warwick stated about their 'War in China' series (Pathé fakes) that: 'The films listed in our catalogue under numbers 7204 to 7206, are only representations, photographed in France'. WTC catalogue Apr/May 1901.
[30] *The Era* 10 Nov 1900, p.30. See also WTC catalogue Apr/May 1901, pp.180 and 181; and the mention of the Pathé fakes comes in the supplement to their September 1900 catalogue. To emphasise the genuine nature of the films, Warwick added a comment: 'The following Series are the only Animated Pictures taken in China since the trouble began, and were secured by us at great Expense and much Risk to our Photographers…'
[31] OMLJ Dec 1900, p.168. In this same issue is the first ad for Williamson's new film, *Attack on a Chinese Mission Station*, though I do not believe this to be the film referred to by Anderson, as it had probably been produced too recently. The M&K film on the other hand, had already been advertised and available for three months.
[32] In recent years, film historian Kristen Whissel has written about this issue, referring to the 'impossible position' for the camera in the middle of the disputed territory. She suggests that this position would have given such films away to urban spectators of the time as obvious fakes. But if so – if most people knew these were fakes – why do the articles of the time, which I quote, feel it necessary to explain the implausibility of these films to their readers? My view is that sometimes viewers were genuinely unsure if war films were real or not, hence the advice. Kristen Whissel, 'Placing the Spectator…', op. cit., p. 234-6.
[33] 'A Brighton Kinematograph Factory', *Brighton Herald* 14 Oct 1899, p.2d: this section of the interview is headed 'Making up a battle scene'.
[34] From a Rochester newspaper of May 1900, quoted in George C. Pratt, '"No Magic, No Mystery, No Sleight of Hand": The First Ten Years of Motion Pictures in the Third Largest City of New York State', *Image* 8, no. 4, Dec 1959, p.206. Cited in David Levy, 'Re-Constituted Newsreels, Re-Enactments and the American Narrative Film', in *Cinema 1900-1906: An Analytical Study*, edited by R. Holman (Brussels: FIAF, 1982), p.247.

[35] 'Cinematograph fakes', *Photographic Chronicle* 14 Aug 1902, p.517-8. In the same article the writer criticised other fakes for implausibility, including *The Dispatch Rider*. I mention further examples from this article in the course of some of my chapters.
[36] 'Sham war cinematograph films', OMLJ Mar 1900, p.30.
[37] This comes in the course of a piece about sham films of the Oberammergau passion play in *Church Times* 3 Aug 1900, p.128.
[38] Brugioni calls it 'false captioning' in the context of stills photographs; or Kessler calls it, 're-using and re-labelling existing footage'. Dino A. Brugioni, *Photo Fakery : The History and Techniques of Photographic Deception and Manipulation* (Dulles, Va.: Brassey's, 1999).; Kessler op. cit.
[39] Anonymous letter, 'Was it a fake?' in *Cambridge Daily News* 7 Sep 1938, p.4 (reference from Nick Hiley). The writer was recalling the first films he/she saw in a small Welsh town in the early years of the century. The French guns referred to were two films 'taken (i.e. filmed) by permission before being supplied by the French': advertised as 'War films' by Harrison and Co. Ad in OMLJ, Dec 1899. These were probably Creusot artillery pieces, as this French firm supplied the Boers with several big guns. Several other films of Boer artillery, etc, appeared in 1899, e.g. *Disappearing Gun*. See Barnes 1899 volume.
[40] These examples are from the *Times* on given dates in the 3rd or 4th columns of the classified ads (1st page). Thanks to Frank Kessler for having spotted this subtle difference in wording.
[41] Jonathan Auerbach, 'McKinley at Home: How Early American Cinema Made News', *American Quarterly* 51, no. 4, Dec 1999, p.797-832.
[42] I suggested that they emerged in response to the increasing difficulty of reporting from the modern battlefield, and that their form was partially modelled on the drawn illustration.
[43] It is interesting that M&K, who had been one of the major producers of fakes of the Boer War, did not make fakes of the Russo-Japanese War. Regarding the First World War, one instance of faking occurred when D.W. Griffith, in making *Hearts of the World,* eventually abandoned most of the footage he had shot at the Front and re-enacted or faked it on Salisbury Plain. See Kevin Brownlow, *The War, the West and the Wilderness* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1978). Some important news events were staged in this slightly later period, but as full-blown dramas, not fakes as such: for example, the *Titanic* sinking in 1912. See my book, *The Titanic and Silent Cinema* (Hastings: The Projection Box, 2000).
[44] From V.W. Cook, 'The humours of 'living picture' making', *Chambers Journal,* 30 June 1900, p.488.
[45] See the examples I cite of mis-description in Stephen Bottomore, *The Titanic and Silent Cinema* (Hastings: The Projection Box, 2000). I cite cases of audiences objecting to a substitute *Titanic* film where they were told to expect a genuine one. If the faked images were sufficiently plausible to avoid being detected, the mis-labelling might be said to have worked.
[46] A more specific concern might have been that non-fiction and news films were thought to attract the somewhat higher class patrons, so if the reliability of such films were laid open to question, this might put off these better classes and so impact on profits.
[47] See Francis Fukuyama, *Trust : The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (London: Penguin, 1996). See also Samuel P. Huntington and Lawrence E. Harrison, *Culture Matters : How Values Shape Human Progress* (New York: Basic Books, 2000); and Luigi Guiso, Paola Sapienza and Luigi Zingales, *Does Culture Affect Economic Outcomes?* (London: Centre for Economic Policy Research, 2006); these books cite works by Landes and Banfield.
[48] On this role of business organisations, see Fukuyama and other works cited in the endnote above.
[49] In a sense this eclipse was 'unfair' on fakes, for if presented straightforwardly such films might have been little more controversial than artists' impressions in magazines. But the sense of deception which had surrounded these films took its toll, and fakes, it seems, became the 'fall guy' for sharp and dishonest behaviour in the industry.