

Appendix 4

PRODUCTION CODE ADMINISTRATION FILES

The Production Code Administration (PCA) files are held in the Margaret Herrick Library, which is part of the Center for Motion Picture Study in Los Angeles, under the aegis of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (AMPAS). The files are primary documents containing correspondence between the PCA and the film studios on individual films from 1927 until 1967. The PCA's task was the oversight of all Hollywood films to ensure that they complied with the industry guidelines set out in its Production Code (Code) of 1934. Given that films could not be shown in the vast majority of the theatres without Code approval, the files should reveal the debate between the film producers and the regulatory authority which would touch on the relationship between film and society and issues of the time.

The Code had been established in 1930, following Will Hay's 1927 'Don'ts and Be Carefuls' guidance to the industry. However it was not strictly enforced until 1934 when Hollywood sought to fight off external regulation by the Roosevelt administration and also moved to prevent boycotts, by religious groups, of films they considered depicted low moral standards. The Code was amended several times with a comprehensive review in 1956, which removed or softened almost all of the prohibitions previously included. A further review in 1966 virtually removed the PCA's supervisory power. The PCA was disbanded in 1968.

Production Code Files

According to the web site of the AMPAS, the files contain 'a variety of material, including film reviews and other articles; correspondence, primarily between the Motion Picture Association of America and studio officials and representatives of special interest groups; inter-office memos and memos 'to the files'; code certificates; analysis charts; synopses; credit sheets; theatre and book reviews; and censor board reports.'¹ Despite this there are problems. There is not a file for every film while the contents of each file varies. Some have a considerable amount of correspondence, others very little. There are very few letters from the studios and those that exist express objections to the way they have been treated in comparison to another film rather than being part of a dialogue with the PCA.² The files

mainly contain copies of correspondence sent by the PCA to the head of the studio who had submitted a script for advice and approval. The advice given was both general and specific. Joseph Breen, the first administrator, developed a standard letter format which he sent as the first reply whether a script had been submitted or just an outline. This contained warnings against the explicit sexual depiction of women's bodies, e.g. they should be covered up with no breasts showing, and to tone down violence. There then followed, if a script had been submitted, specific references to events and implications in the script using words like 'omit' or 'prohibited'. Occasionally there would be a recommendation to consult individuals and organisations on religious representation, ethnic and, more often, animal welfare matters – especially the American Humane Association about the way horses would be used.

Over the years the PCA developed an analysis sheet which, by the early 1950s, was several pages long. The analysis sheet covered the details of the production, who the characters were and their nationalities (if the characters were white Americans they were not recorded), as well as a wide range of sociological factors, the cast list and a synopsis. This detail enabled the PCA to measure the film against the guidelines and therefore gave their comments authority. The PCA also consulted other organisations as appropriate. The main ones were the Legion of Decency, the Protestant Motion Picture Council and The Film Estimate Board of National Organisations. Comments from these three organisations were summarised on a pro forma sheet under the headings of 'class' and 'remarks'. The 'class' was a rating – A, B, or C with C representing immorality - and the 'remarks' a single word comment.³ There are very few of these sheets in the files. Even rarer are summaries of local censor boards and their actions in cutting scenes although sometimes there is just a note of approval. Also included in these files are clippings from newspapers and magazines.

Clippings files

The library has a parallel set of 'clippings' files, which contain mainly film reviews but has some pre-production information. Some of these 'clippings' files include information on micro-fiche. There are also articles on individual films, as for example the serialisation of the Lillian Ross book *Picture*, about the making of *The Red Badge of Courage* in the *New Yorker* magazine.⁴ Whilst many of these files contained a large number of reviews the

majority were from local papers, in the Los Angeles area, industry papers and journals and only a few national papers and journals. The coverage, therefore, was limited and excluded vast areas of the United States and especially the South. Therefore a comparison of popular reactions to Civil War films in different parts of the country is not possible. However, it is possible to look at the relationship of the concerns and comments of the PCA to those of the reviewers.

The Production Code in Action

The comments in this section refer only to Civil War films as identified in Chapter I.

The two main concerns of the PCA were sex and violence. The term sex can be broken down into a number of categories. The main ones were those of revealing parts of a woman's body, nudity, open-mouth kissing, adultery, affairs, prostitution and any statement or any scene that might have a sexual implication – very often referred to by the PCA as 'innuendo' - whether it was direct or just implied. The sensitivities of the PCA were so strong that it led to such prohibitions as in *Border River* (1953) where the Mexican General Calleja could not put a ring in the bodice of his mistress⁵ or to the sexual implications of the words 'food' and 'breast' in *The Horse Soldiers* (1959).⁶

The problem of prostitution and prostitutes exercised the PCA even more. They were concerned that women should not be identified as prostitutes nor should the places where they worked be seen as bordellos - as for example in *Raintree County* (1957).⁷ Even as late as 1965, when the Code was almost meaningless, the PCA was insisting that prostitutes should not talk about wedding rings.⁸ The other area where the PCA was particularly and consistently unrelenting was the implication or overtness of sexual perversion. This is seen in the suggestion of incest, in *Another Part of the Forest* (1948); in Susanna's request to be whipped and in her hysterical excitement during the smashing of the dolls which leads on to 'sexual intimacy' in *Raintree County*; and the demand that 'queer' should be changed to 'quitter' in *Advance to the Rear* (1963).⁹

When it came to the inclusion of violence the PCA was concerned that this should be as limited as possible, despite the underlying nature of the narratives located during or just after a bitter civil war and with many situated in the 'uncivilised' west. Apart from the general nature of violence its concerns included specifically brutality, gruesomeness, and

killing. There were two other areas, which come into the category of violence but which can be treated separately - they are lynching and violence against women.

Lynching is an illegal act of murder and the Code had set out to uphold the best values of society and to be 'responsible for direct moral progress' presenting 'correct standards of life..... subject to the requirements of drama and entertainment.'¹⁰ The PCA was very well aware of how America was perceived throughout the world through its representation in Hollywood movies. 'All countries' states Raymond Moley, 'now recognise the immense power of American motion pictures in advertising all sorts of American products.'¹¹ One of those 'products' was the American way of life, which included the democratic process and respect for law and order. In the second half of the 1940s this took on a political as well as a moral dimension with the start of the Cold War and the demonisation of the Soviet Union with its undemocratic totalitarian government. The PCA therefore took every opportunity to ensure that the rule of law was upheld and to protect the integrity and position of law officers: lynching was seen within this context. In *The Romance of Rosy Ridge* for example the PCA stated that 'lynching must be in the context of due process of law' and, in *The Woman They Almost Lynched* (1953), that the lynching should become a hanging – 'an authorised execution.'¹² Yet the PCA's moral perspective also seemed to be driven by other considerations. In 1947 Joseph Breen wrote to Harry Cohn that '(f)rom the viewpoint of political censorship, please protect yourself regarding these scenes with the nooses.'¹³ Three years later the advice was to remove the direct representation of lynchings to an off-camera occurrence otherwise the 'local boards would delete' the scene.¹⁴

There were similar comments in 1956 but they were addressed more to commercial considerations at a time when Hollywood was trying to reposition itself to meet the challenge of television and the changing nature of the cinema audience. The overseas market, the PCA said, would delete any lynching scene¹⁵ and the overseas market had by 1953 overtaken the domestic box office returns, accounting for 60% of the total.¹⁶ Altogether seven films had lynching as part of the narrative – the last one being in 1956 which was the year after the Emmett Till murder and in the middle of the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama.

Violence towards women had not been specifically identified in the Code or in any of the amendments. The first mention was in 1949 when Warner Brothers was warned about

excessive violence and ‘especially to women.’¹⁷ In the mid-to-late 1950s the warnings reflected the concerns for the overseas markets. In 1956 Geoffrey Shurlock tells Col. Jason S. Joy to omit the implications of wife-beating as there is a ‘bad public reaction to scenes of men brutalising women.’¹⁸ One year later he writes to Miss L Buntrock that a ‘shove’ should be substituted for a ‘vicious back-hand blow’ as ‘knocking down women is highly objectionable throughout the world.’¹⁹ However by the mid-60s Hollywood was in a different environment. Despite warning against sadism in the script for *Incident at Phantom Hill* (1966) – namely firing into a dead body – the PCA’s comments to change the ‘pistol-whipping’ of a woman to a knock by hand did not come with any qualification about its possible effect within the domestic or overseas markets.²⁰ Violence had now become part of America’s daily life in the brutal reaction to the Civil Rights movement, the Cuba missile crisis and the assassination of President Kennedy. Yet the reduction of violence, brutality and gruesomeness was an ever occurring comment by the PCA balanced by the ‘correct standards’ of supporting the law and law enforcement.

Law and order is part of what one might call the moral values that infused the thinking of the authors and administrators of the Code. The PCA condemned narratives that suggested that ‘murders go unpunished’ (*Red River*, 1947), that ‘thieves get away with their stolen goods’ (*Copper Canyon*, 1950), that law officers are ‘killed’ (*Santa Fe*, 1951), that there is ‘justification and glorification of murder’ (*San Antone*, 1953), that a lynching can be justified (*The Woman They Almost Lynched*, 1953) and that there should be far more condemnation of criminal activities (*The True Story of Jesse James*, 1957).²¹

Individual acts that transgressed ‘correct’ social values were also condemned. The PCA wanted O’Meara in *Run of the Arrow* (1956) to make a moral comment before shooting Lt. Driscoll to reduce his agony as he is being skinned alive; Kate, the partner of the notorious and brutal guerrilla leader Quantrill in *Kansas Raiders* (1950), needs to indicate that she has a moral reason – as well as an expedient one - for leaving him; while illicit relationships, adultery and affairs are continually castigated. In *Raintree County* (1957) the relationship between John Wycliff Shawnessy and Susanna Drake before their marriage is condemned as having ‘no sense of moral wrongdoing.’ However the condemnation of ‘illicit sex between the leading characters’ in *Band of Angels* (1957) is overlaid by racism. Their ‘illicit sex’ should be ‘replaced by desire.....[and] because they are master and slave sex should only take place after marriage.’ The treatment is too romantic and there

are ‘no compensating moral values as required.’²² There is no question that the sanctity of marriage – despite the divorce rate – continued to be central to male-female relationships, part of the ‘higher types of social life’ that the Code espoused. In its only positive comment made about the films under review the PCA praised the dignity of the wedding ceremony in *The Legend of Tom Dooley* (1959).²³ Two years later in *The Wild Westerners* (1962) the PCA was demanding that the divorce be changed to annulment.²⁴

The PCA’s self-appointed guardianship of moral values extended to semi-philosophical statements such as ‘The sun shines only half the time – the other half is night’ which was deemed unacceptable because of its ‘bluntness’ in 1946.²⁵ Perhaps one year after World War II the PCA felt that positive statements about the future were required. An even starker and more threatening comment – ‘war’s nothing but legal murder’ – was rejected the following year as it conveyed that ‘all men who fought in the last war are murderers’²⁶. The Cold War was now under way, as was the strong anti-communist agenda. Possibly the PCA did not want Hollywood to appear to undermine the armed services as America squared up to the Soviet Union. Ten years later the PCA objected to ‘life wasn’t meant to be lived for what’s right or wrong’ as it was ‘bad philosophising.’²⁷ Perhaps it was felt that this undermined the whole nature of American values, which were under challenge from the godless and immoral Soviet Union. This was underlined by the consistently strong stand taken by the PCA to ensure that the moral centre of the community, the church, and its ministers were protected and portrayed with due reverence.

Comments about irreverence were made in over half the film scripts although the main objections were to the use of words like ‘damnyankees’, ‘Jeez’, ‘Hell’, ‘Lordamighty’, ‘God’, and ‘damn.’ Churches should not be the scene of fighting (*The Raid*, 1954), ministers of religion should not be seen as carrying guns or siding with violence (*The Searchers*, 1956) nor should their characters be demeaned as self-righteous, over-bearing and without dignity (*The Deadly Companions*, 1961).²⁸ The sensitivities of the religious audience were also considered with comments about the depiction of fundamentalist attitudes in *The Guns of Fort Petticoat* (1957) and *The True Story of Jesse James*. However there is no comment about the ex-Confederate officer who returns to his home town as a preacher carrying his guns to get the community’s attention (*Stars in My Crown*, 1950) or to the use of an old mission church, in the manner of the Alamo, as a defensive building against the attacks of Mexican outlaws and Indians (*The Guns of Fort Petticoat*,

1957). Presumably defending America from a Christian building gave the defenders added strength and moral superiority to overcome the alien attackers in a Cold War context.

Linked to ensuring the promotion of good Christian images is the PCA's attitude to suicide. There were four films where this is mentioned. In three of these the PCA argues caution so that the 'suicide' should not be seen as a 'glorification' of the act - whether it is the blinded Quantrill coming out of the cabin surrounded by Union troops with his guns blazing (*Kansas Raiders*) or in *Raintree County* with the disturbed Susanna wading into the water in a 'love suicide' knowingly sacrificing herself for 'the two lovers.'²⁹ *Raintree County* is the last film where there is any comment on suicide.

There is one further area that exercised the PCA considerably in terms of 'moral values' and that was what was termed 'vulgarity'. To the PCA vulgarity was a mixture of offensive words that generally had sexual and semi-religious connotations. For example there was objection to 'we'll drown the bastards' in *Friendly Persuasion* (1956); 'spilling your seed on the majestic Lost Cause' in *Alvarez Kelly* (1966); 'there isn't anything left to trade' in *Tap Roots* (1948); and the term 'nutcracker' for 'saddle' in *Run of the Arrow* (1957).³⁰

Most of the 'moral' and 'value' comments are made with regard to films released up to 1957, afterwards there are far fewer - apart from those relating to irreverence. The year 1957, therefore, seems to be a watershed in the PCA's attitude to the implementation and interpretation of the Code. Films released in subsequent years were subject to the revised Code with its 'liberalising' amendments. This can be seen in the PCA's attitude to race. Of the ten films where a comment has been made, only one is after 1957 and that is in the film *Journey to Shiloh* (1968). Four of the films related to African Americans, four to Native Americans and two to Mexicans. Initially the attitude of the PCA appeared to be supportive to the three groups in not wanting to see them demeaned. For the African Americans the comment was always to remove the epithet 'Nigger' as much as possible or, in *Journey to Shiloh*, to see if 'darkies' was 'offensive to colored people generally.'³¹ For the Native Americans it was to tone down the brutality and for the Mexicans not to make them look like buffoons, as in *Horizons West* (1952). On one occasion, in 1950, the PCA referred the producer to the Association of American Indian Affairs who were 'prominent and serious minded citizens' as the PCA is 'concerned that this minority group is faithfully

represented.’³² However, this was the only referral to an outside organisation, which might give expert advice on the accuracy of the representation of minority groups. It parallels the general attitude of filmmakers to do their own research and not ask the opinion of those qualified to give a more accurate understanding of context and events. The underlying attitude of the PCA was to go along with the representations of these minority groups, as presented in the scripts, and draw attention only where there appeared to be an excess of brutality.

The Searchers gave an interesting insight into their standards of racial norms. During the initial search for the two abducted girls Ethan comes across a dead Comanche. In the original narrative Ethan wants to take his scalp. The PCA objects, calling it a ‘savage act’ – that is something that is done by savages, the uncivilised Comanches, and something no white man would do.³³ Instead Ethan fires two bullets – one through each eye to prevent him entering the ‘spirit land.’ Nine years later firing into a dead body is called ‘sadism.’ – but this is white to white.³⁴ As *Cue* magazine commented in 1965 when reviewing *Major Dundee* (1964), ‘when an Indian kills it is butchery, when a white officer kills it becomes high adventure.’³⁵

The PCA did not comment on the many scenes in films in which African Americans were made to look as if they had no will of their own and were there apparently to provide ‘colour’ or background authenticity. Nor was there any comment on the most stereotypical representations of African Americans in the John Ford film *The Sun Shines Bright* (1953) at which even reviewers were surprised.³⁶ Yet when it comes to (white) ministers of religion and the church, as has been noted above, the PCA was scrupulous to preserve their integrity and status as culturally important figures and symbols of white civilisation.

Film Reviews and Reviewers

Film reviewers only see the finished product. They are not party to the comments and negotiations between the PCA and the producers and directors. What they see, therefore, may be very different in emphasis, tone and narrative to the original concept. The reviewers form a number of categories of reception, which reflect the popular cultural response to movies: industry papers, local and national newspapers, industry magazines and national magazines. Industry papers such as *Motion Picture Daily* and *Variety Daily*

and local newspapers in Hollywood such as the *Hollywood Reporter* and *Los Angeles Times* not only review the films on release but also give information at the pre-production, production and post-production stages. Other newspapers review the films on release in their area while magazines can take more time and can give a deeper consideration.

Most of the newspaper reviews were concerned with the overall quality of the film, the narrative, the cast and their performance and the technical qualities and did not comment on the ideas or values expressed, nor alluded to the film's relationship to current events. Eighteen of the sixty-six films, which had a PCA file, either had no review material or the reviews did not contain anything more than comments about the quality of the film and a summary of the story. This was far more apparent in the 1960s. The reissuing of the Code in 1956 marked a significant change in the PCA's approach to the many issues it had once tried to control for the public good by banning or severely limiting their representation and discussion. But there were other factors which were seriously threatening the film industry: the rise of television, the fall in theatre audiences, the movement to the suburbs and away from the main theatre concentrations, the increasing influence of foreign films and Hollywood's continuing financial crisis. The films released from 1957, were produced after the landmark *Brown* decision of 1954 changed the racial climate from one of repression, subservience and disregard to the beginnings of recognition and inclusion, while the substantially revised PC enabled a whole range of subjects to be dealt with in a more open and realistic way – the subject of race in its many forms being one. However, from 1960, despite the nationally planned celebrations for the centennial of the Civil War, the increasing racial tension saw Hollywood distance itself from representations of the conflict with a dramatic reduction of films set in that period until 1964. There were also changes in the pattern of comments made by reviewers in these periods.

Although there were comments³⁷ from thirty-one newspapers and journals the vast majority came from three sources – *Variety* (36), the *Hollywood Reporter* (24) and the *New York Times* (28) – amounting to 58% of all the comments. Next came the *Motion Picture Daily* (10) and the *Hollywood Times* (8). The seven journals contributed only ten reviews. While there were differences in style and approach between the newspapers what was more remarkable, taking the comments as a whole, were the similarities. Unfortunately, the south and south-west were not represented although some comments make reference to whether a particular film would be well received there.³⁸

Reference has already been made to the fact that reviewers were not aware of the changes that had been made to the film prior to release. Reviewers however sometimes referred back to, and made comparisons with, the source of the story – normally a novel.³⁹ Given this different perspective it should not be surprising that the reviewers, in the main, focused on entirely different aspects of the film. On the other hand the reviewers may have been reflecting a popular consciousness that was considerably at variance to, and far more tolerant, than that of the PCA. (The 1950's was of course the era of the Kinsey Report into sexual relations between adults.) Whereas the PCA was concerned very much with representations of sex and illicit relationships, violence in all its manifestations, law and order, irreverence and moral values, reviewers saw and commented on a different set of attributes. These revolved around American identity and American values, the identification of myth and the film's relationship to current events. They also showed a higher degree of popular consciousness in racial comments and in their attitude towards the South.

The one category that both the PCA and the reviewers seemed to share was the one relating to values. However the PCA saw these as moral, while the reviewers saw them as more American, values. The PCA would probably assert that the two are indistinguishable and that they did not need to comment on them as they were shared beliefs and that their role was to ensure that non-American or non-moral values were not shown or glorified in any way. These shared values emerge in the 'plea for tolerance among neighbours' and the 'honest toil, neighbourly love and thrift' in *The Romance of Rosy Ridge* (1947); the triumph of 'good over evil' in *The Sun Shines Bright* (1953); the 'touching display of the nobility of man' and the 'ordered happy lives of simple morality and genuine love' in *Friendly Persuasion* (1956); the indication that the Union soldiers would be hanged - but this is to take place 'off camera' - in *The Great Locomotive Chase* (1956); the show of 'loyalty, devotion and courage' in *The Proud Rebel* (1958); and the display of 'gallantry' in *The Horse Soldiers* (1959).⁴⁰

Just under half of the categories of comments had sufficient numbers to give an indication of reception. What might be called 'conservative,' status quo categories – American values, myth, pro-South and racist comments – fell dramatically and consistently after 1956. Those categories that were more 'progressive' or 'liberal' and in touch with changes

in the political environment – anti-racist, American identity, current affairs, recognition of ethnic actors and, interestingly, reconciliation – all rose after 1957. It appears that the years 1957-59 were the most politically sensitive for reviewers and provided a watershed in their attitude towards Hollywood.

Racist comments were more directed to ‘Indians’ than to African Americans - reflecting the much lower profile of the latter in films until the mid-1950s. In *Tap Roots* (1948), for example, Boris Karloff played ‘an Indian’ though ‘quite a civilised one’; an ‘Indian’ chief provides a ‘comedy moment’ in *Santa Fe* (1951); the ‘Redskins’ are denounced for ‘stupidity’ in the way they attack the beleaguered whites in *Escape from Fort Bravo* (1953); Martin, in *The Searchers*, is called a ‘semi-civilised half-breed’ who ‘in his grief reverts to pure Indian’; and *Run of the Arrow* is called an ‘Indian cruelty pic.’ The first comment regarding African Americans comes in a review of *Friendly Persuasion* by the *New York Times*, which is not a comment but an omission. In identifying the Birdwell family the reviewer includes all the animals who have names, but not Enoch, the African American, who has an intimate relationship with the household but whose status is never described. A year later Sidney Poitier’s role as Rau-Ru in *Band of Angels* is described as ‘a beloved slave who gets fancy notions of brotherhood’ at the same time as Orval Faubus, Governor of Alabama, was denying African American children the right to enter Little Rock Central High School. That is the last racist comment recorded by reviewers up to 1968.

In contrast to the racist comments, almost all the anti-racist comments relate to African Americans. The *New Yorker* points out that despite the fine liberal phrases in *The Romance of Rosy Ridge* about ‘wanting a free country for all folks’ the film does not include one African American. A placid town in the South ‘erupts into racial bigotry’ when ‘greedy townspeople attempt to drive off an old Negro by hiding under the cloak of the Ku Klux Klan’ in *Stars in My Crown*. John Ford is accused of ‘live and let live’ despite the ‘attempted lynching’ of a young African American boy in *The Sun Shines Bright*. Several reviewers note approvingly the ‘racial issues’ raised in *Band of Angels* and the origins of racial consciousness in *Raintree County* whilst, in 1968, *Journey to Shiloh* is seen as an ‘attack on racial prejudice.’⁴¹ In line with the increasing acceptance of African Americans as part of the American nation there is increasing recognition of them as actors. In the period up to 1956 there are only two comments but these are followed by four in 1957-59.

It is in the final period that anti-racist comments with regard to Native Americans appear as they, too, are beginning to gain recognition on the back of the Civil Rights Movement's success. *Cue* magazine's comment has already been noted while *Variety* notes that the 'Yaqui Indians are *for once* (emphasis added) pictured as the good guys.'⁴²

Although there was growing recognition of ethnic minorities and their roles and abilities in these films, throughout the period American identity was still seen as white and often emphasised and celebrated in the face of attack from the savage enemy – the 'Indian.' This is seen in *Two Flags West* (1950) where 'intense hatreds' between Northerners and Southerners, due to the Civil War, are 'buried' in their fight against 'a common enemy; 'or in *The Guns of Fort Petticoat* (1957) in which a 'group of Southern women are protected by a Yankee'; or in *How the West Was Won* (1962) with the 'sorrow of fellow countrymen at war with one another; and in *Major Dundee* (1965) when the Confederate officer 'changes from having no flag to supporting the Union flag and dying with it.'⁴³

Whilst reconciliation of North and South is a strong and continuing theme in the films and is closely allied to representations of American identity, it is only commented on by reviewers in seven films, with the majority occurring between 1957 and 1959. It would seem that there was a move both to reach out to the southern white community in the wake of *Brown* and the consequent resurrection of racial violence, and also to recognise the message of the coming centennial celebrations – that all whites are Americans regardless of the bitterness and hatreds engendered by the Civil War. This view seems to be summed up in the *New York Times* reception of *The Horse Soldiers* that it is 'in centennial mood.....(and is) reflective of the gallantry of that tragic war.'⁴⁴

- ¹ Available from: oscars.org/mhl/sc/motionpic-116.html (accessed 20 April, 2003).
- ² Letter from Stan Sheptner to Milton Hodenfield 12 February, 1959, PCA file on *The Legend of Tom Dooley* (1959).
- ³ Arlene Hui, 'Liberalising the Hays Code: the Case of *Duel in the Sun*' at a seminar at University of London, 25 October, 2001.
- ⁴ *New Yorker* 24 May to 21 June, 1952.
- ⁵ Letter from Joseph I. Breen to William Gordon at Universal, 29 May, 1953, PCA file on *Border River*.
- ⁶ Letter from Geoffrey M. Shurlock to Walter M. Mirisch (Mirisch Company), 10 September, 1958, PCA file on *The Horse Soldiers*.
- ⁷ Letter from Geoffrey M. Shurlock to Dore Schary at MGM, 2 February, 1956, PCA file on *Raintree County*.
- ⁸ Letter from Geoffrey M. Shurlock to M.J. Frankovich, Columbia, 18, October, 1965, PCA file on *Alvarez Kelly*.
- ⁹ Breen to Gordon, 1 August, 1947, PCA file on *Another Part of the Forest*; Shurlock to Schary 2 February 1956, PCA file on *Raintree County*; Shurlock to Robert M. Vogel, 5 May 1957, PCA file on *Advance to the Rear*. The title of the film at the time of the letter to Vogel was *The Company of Cowards*. Had the release title been known then it is interesting to speculate whether this would have evinced a comment from the PCA!
- ¹⁰ Introduction and general principles of the Production Code (1944 edition).
- ¹¹ Raymond Moley, *The Hay's Office* (New York: The Bobb-Merrill Company, 1945), 221.
- ¹² Letter from Breen to L. B. Mayer, MGM, 8 March, 1946, PCA file on *The Romance of Rosy Ridge*; letter from Breen to J. E. Baker, Republic Productions, 6 October, 1952, PCA file on *The Woman They Almost Lynched*.
- ¹³ Letter from Breen to Harry Cohn, Columbia Pictures Corporation, 13 March, 1947, PCA file on *The Man from Colorado* (1948).
- ¹⁴ Letter from Breen to Franklin King, King Brothers Productions, 8 September, 1950, PCA file on *Drums in the Deep South*.
- ¹⁵ Letter from Shurlock to Meyer Mishkin, 12 June, 1956, PCA file on *Drango* (1957).
- ¹⁶ Ronald L. Davis, *Celluloid Mirrors: Hollywood and American Society Since 1945* (New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1997), p. 61.
- ¹⁷ Letter from Breen to J. L. Warner, Warner Brothers, 14 March, 1949, PCA file on *Dallas* (1950).
- ¹⁸ Letter from Shurlock to Col. Jason S. Joy, Twentieth Century Fox, 30 August, 1956, PCA file on *Love Me Tender* (1956).
- ¹⁹ Letter from Shurlock to Miss L. Buntrock, Allied Artists Pictures Corporation, 16 October, 1957, PCA file on *Quantrill's Raiders* (1958).
- ²⁰ Letter from Shurlock to Kathryn McTaggart, Univesal Pictures Company, 27 January, 1964, PCA file on *Incident at Phantom Hill* (1965).
- ²¹ Letter from Breen to Howard Hawks, Monterey Productions, 22 August, 1946, PCA file on *Red River* (1948); letter from Breen to Luigi Luraschi, Paramount Pictures, 13 April, 1949, PCA file on *Copper Canyon* (1950); letter from Breen to Harry Cohn, Columbia Pictures Corporation, 27 April, 1950; letter from Breen to J. E. Baker, Republic Productions, 17 March, 1952; letter from Breen to J.E. Baker, Republic Productions, 6 October, 1952; memo for file 19 September, 1956, PCA file, *The True Story of Jesse James* (1957).

²² Letter from Shurlock to William Feeder, RKO Radio Productions, 9 April, 1956, PCA file on *Run of the Arrow*; letter from Breen to William Gordon, Universal International, 14 April, 1950, PCA file on *Kansas Raiders* (1950); letter from Shurlock to Dore Scharly, 2 February, 1956, PCA file on *Raintree County*; memo for file by EGD, 14 January, 1956 and letter from Shurlock to J. L. Warner, Warner Brothers, 15 January 1956.

²³ Letter from Shurlock to Stan Sheptner, Sheptner Company, 9 February, 1959, PCA file on *The Legend of Tom Dooley* (1959).

²⁴ Letter from Shurlock to Sol Schwartz, Four Leaf Productions, 20 December, 1961, PCA file on *The Wild Westerners* (1962).

²⁵ Letter from Breen to Howard Hawks, Monterey Productions, 26 August, 1946, PCA file on *Red River*.

²⁶ Letter from Breen to Harry Cohn, Columbia, 21 January, 1947, PCA file on *The Man from Colorado*.

²⁷ Letter from Shurlock to Harry Cohn, Columbia Pictures Corporation, 12 October, 1957, PCA file on *The Guns of Fort Petticoat* (1957).

²⁸ Letter from Breen to Frank McFadden, Panoramic Productions, 16 December, 1953, PCA file on *The Raid* (1954); letter from Shurlock to John Ford, C. V. Whitney Pictures Company, 20 June, 1955, PCA file on *The Searchers* (1956); letter from Shurlock to Charles B. Fitzsimmons, Carousel Films, 10 January, 1961, PCA file on *The Deadly Companions* (1961); letter from Shurlock to Abi Donnelly, Universal Pictures, 22 July, 1966, PCA file on *Journey to Shiloh* (1968).

²⁹ Letter from Breen to William Gordon, Universal International, 14 April, 1950, PCA file on *Kansas Raiders*; letter from Shurlock to Dore Scharly, 2 February, 1956, PCA file on *Raintree County*.

³⁰ Letter from Shurlock to Miss Lorene Buntrock, Allied Artists, 7 September, 1955, PCA file on *Friendly Persuasion* (1956); letter from Shurlock to M. J. Frankovich, Columbia, 9 December, 1964, PCA file on *Alvarez Kelly* (1966); letter from Breen to William Gordon, 11 April, 1947, PCA file on *Tap Roots* (1948); letter from Shurlock to William Feeder, RKO Radio Productions, 14 June, 1956, PCA file on *Run of the Arrow*.

³¹ *Stars in My Crown* (1950), *Band of Angels*, *Raintree County* and *Journey to Shiloh*.

³² Letter from Breen to Hal Wallis, Hal Wallis Productions, 23 June, 1950, PCA file on *Red Mountain* (1951).

³³ Letter from Shurlock to John Ford, 20 June, 1955, PCA file on *The Searchers*.

³⁴ Letter from Shurlock to Kathryn McTaggart, 20 January, 1964, PCA file on *Major Dundee*.

³⁵ *Cue* magazine, 4 October, 1965.

³⁶ *Hollywood Reporter*, 1 May, 1953.

³⁷ The term 'comments' includes one or several different comments in the same review. Occasionally they have been categorised by inference but generally they are the direct statements of the reviewer. Some films too evinced comments from various reviewers, which fitted the criteria for recording. For example there are five for *Raintree County*, seven for *Band of Angels* and five for *Shenandoah* (1965).

³⁸ Examples of this are: *Variety*, 20 April, 1955, comments that *Five Guns West* (1955), was 'a fair bill filler for the outdoor market' (i.e. drive-ins); *Hollywood Reporter*, 12 June, 1959, comments on *The Horse Soldiers* (1959) that 'John Ford so stirringly dramatised the valor of Dixie's resistance that the picture should be as popular in the North as in the South.'

³⁹ Examples are the *Daily News*, 18 September, 1951, on *The Red Badge of Courage* (1951); *New York Times*, 11 July, 1957, on *Band of Angels*; *Motion Picture Herald*, 13 June, 1959, on *The Horse Soldiers*.

⁴⁰ *Variety*, 1 July, 1947 and the *New Yorker*, November, 1947; *Variety*, 6 May, 1953; *New York Times*, 10 February, 1956; *Hollywood Reporter*, 23 May, 1956; *Mirror News*, 18 January 1958; *New York Times*, 26 June, 1959.

⁴¹ *New Yorker*, November, 1947; *Motion Picture Daily*, 1 March, 1950 and *New York Times*, 22 December, 1950; *San Francisco Express*, 30 October, 1953; *Variety*, 10 July, 1957, *Motion Picture Daily* 10 July, 1957, *Hollywood Reporter* 10 July, 1957 and *Los Angeles Times* 8 August, 1957.

⁴² *Cue*, 4 October, 1965, *Major Dundee* (1964); *Variety*, 21 July, 1965, *Arizona Raiders* (1965).

⁴³ *Variety* on *Two Flags West* (1950), 9 October, 1950; *Hollywood Reporter* on *Guns of Fort Petticoat*, 13 March, 1957; *Motion Picture Daily* on *How the West Was Won* (1962), 17 March, 1963; *The New Republic* on *Major Dundee*, 17 April, 1965.

⁴⁴ *New York Times*, 26, June, 1959.