For example, during the developmental phase of shortwave broadcasting, Fejes comments that there was explicitly no "larger political purposes in mind" (60) on the part of the commercial broadcasters and that the government only began to see an application of shortwave broadcasting to international politics in Latin America in the mid 1930s, after the Germans had initiated an impressive program of their own. More telling, however, is that Fejes' detailed account of industry-government antagonism during the late 1930s and continuing well after the outbreak of World War II in 1939, demonstrates convincingly that both government and industry policy in the United States was clearly reactive to Germany's use of shortwave broadcasting to reach audiences in Latin America.

There is no questions that once the United States entered World War II, and the government took effective control of the communications industry, that the mass media (as well as other segments of the United States population) joined whole heartedly in the war effort. Also, I have no difficulty with the proposition that World War II shortwave broadcasting to Latin America served as the model for the post World War II Voice of America.

However, on the basis of Fejes' own evidence, it seems to me difficult to sustain the thesis that American shortwave broadcasting either saw itself or actually served as part of the cement holding the United States Latin American commercial empire together. My own conclusions, based on the reading of Fejes' three substantive chapters, are as follows: (1) once it became clear that there were little commercial return on shortwave broadcasting, American private networks did very little except to actively resist the creation of a government owned broadcast facility; (2) that when prodded by the government (which was concerned primarily with Nazi Germany, not Latin America), private broadcasters did increase shortwave service to Latin America, but that this consisted largely of replays of domestic programming; and (3) that not until actual United States entry into World War II did overt propaganda concerns become incorporated into American shortwave broadcasting. These conclusions may possibly fit a theory of media imperialism; however, they seem to be adequately explained by virtually total societal mobilization behind the war effort.

Reviewed by: Walter C. Soderlund
University of Windsor

Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics and Law
Bruce A. Austin, editor,
Vol. 2 Norwood, New Jersey:
Ablex, 1986. 264 pp. $37.50 cloth.

No clear principle unifies this work apart from a negative injunction: treatment of specific texts and all the tools of textual analysis shall be left at the door. Since the majority of film scholars have a primary interest in textual analysis, the Current
Research series of annuals would seem to be intended to help fill something of a gap in film scholarship and to address a somewhat wider audience of those who study industries, mass media, or social behaviour from a variety of perspectives. This leaves a lot of ground to cover which this volume copes with via a smorgasbord approach. The Ablex letter to reviewers informs us that the volumes will be suitable not only "as texts for upper-level undergraduate and graduate courses, but they will be of interest to scholars and industry professionals." Given the range of the articles the letter is no doubt correct.

Three rough dichotomies can be made among the articles. First, they range from critical to administrative research. Work like Gina Marchetti's "Subcultural Studies and the Film Audience" is clearly critical research; it poses some significant, provocative questions about the uses of the media by groups labelled deviant in some sense while articles such as Steven Knapp and Barry L. Sherman's on "Motion Picture Attendance: A Market Segmentation Approach" or Manjunath Pendakur's on "Canadian Feature Films in the Chicago Theatrical Market" shade closer to the production of knowledge of a sort and in a form that would be of direct use to the industry itself. (Hollywood or Canada, respectively; a matter of some importance I would think).

Second, the articles tend to divide into summaries and surveys, on the one hand and more original research on the other. Articles like Garth S. Jowett's on the perception of the film industry as a social force from 1918 to 1945, Bruce A. Austin's survey of the film industry's response to new technologies like cable television and videocassette machines, and Calvin Pryluck's on the "Industrialization of Entertainment in the United States," stress the summary format although each is well-informed and contributes suggestive commentary of its own. Other articles like Thomas Doherty's "American Teenagers and Teenpics, 1955-1957," Richard Alan Nelson's "Before Laurel: Oliver Hardy and the Vimp Company, A Studio Biography," Clifford G. Christians and Kim B. Rotzoll's "Ethical Issues in the Film Industry," and especially Steve Lipkin's "The New Wave and the Post-War Film Economy" offer a significant degree of new knowledge. (Even if the chief discovery of the Christians and Rotzoll field study is that ethics are subordinate to the deal, their substantiated examples provide quite useful insight into how such a position is articulated by the practitioners themselves.)

Third, the articles range from the strongly empirical through conventional primary and secondary source research to an appreciable emphasis on the conceptual framework of cultural studies and interpretative methodologies. This latter emphasis is strongest in Marchetti's discussion of subcultures and the former in Martin F. Norden and Kim Wolfson's "Cultural Influences on Film Interpretation among Chinese and American Students," although even this article in spite of its "dyadic interactions," "six-item Likert-type conflict scale," and statistical data analysis also replaces a
simplistic notion of cultural "effect" with the more conceptually sophisticated concept of "logical force."

In sum, the something-for-everyone approach undoubtedly works and a great deal of the audience target announced by Ablex may feel that they have been served by this volume. Without going to the other extreme of a single theme or issue, it may be that many readers will be better served if the three dichotomous classifications discussed here become reduced to two or perhaps one. When Mao wished to let a hundred flowers blossom, I'm not sure his happiness would have multiplied infinitely if he had been surrounded by endless fields of them.

Reviewed by: Bill Nichols
Queen's University

Making It: The Business of Film and Television Production in Canada

The reading of the recent book, Making It: The Business of Film and Television Production in Canada, produced a vivid recollection of Francois Truffaut's statement about the cinema in La Nuit Americaine. Truffaut, himself, played the filmmaker who was in the process of shooting a movie. During his spare moments, he would read books about Renoir, Hitchcock and Hawks. His nights were filled with a recurring dream of a young boy in Chaplinesque garb stealing stills of the movie, Citizen Kane, from a theatre. The intellectual and subconscious goals were, however, subverted by the exigencies of the film he was shooting. Problems with actors, producers, and investors resulted in constant alteration in the execution of the script. When the leading actor died suddenly, the insurers demanded that the film be completed as expeditiously as possible. Truffaut’s initial desire to make a great film was replaced by the pragmatic acknowledgment that his responsibility was simply to finish it and recoup the investment.

The contributors to Making It, all of whom are practitioners, understand well the pragmatics of filmmaking in Canada. The book chronicles for the reader the detailed procedures which the producer must follow, from initial script development to distribution, in order to make a film. The would-be professional, after reading it, would have a fairly specific idea about where to look for investment, the requirements demanded by government funding agencies, how to prepare a budget and the necessity of adhering to it, and how to negotiate rights with distributors. The producer is regarded as the central motivating force who balances the interests of the creative staff, the investors and the distributors. Besides being a good negotiator he must have, or have access to those with, business acumen and legal expertise.