



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)
June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore**

Panel T12P03 Session 1

Interest Groups, Political Parties and Public Policies

Title of the paper

Re-evaluation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 as A Bottom-up Cultural Policy by Interest Groups

Author(s)

*Takao, Terui, University of Warwick, UK,
secondselfsynergy@gmail.com*

Date of presentation

29th June, 2017

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to elucidate how the first governmental support for the British film industry by the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was promoted by interest groups. The legislation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was made possible by the discussion and statement by interest groups which claimed multiple value of film and rationales of film policy as cultural policy to realise not only industrial but also political and cultural goals. The industrial organisations, intellectuals and newspapers contributed to the spread of such policy idea and made impact on the realisation of the Cinematograph Films Act.

Keywords

British Film, Film Policy, Policy Rationale, Cultural Policy, Policy Rationale

1.Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to elucidate why and how the first film policy to support the domestic film industry by the British government named the Cinematograph Films Act(CFA) of 1927 was realised in the interwar period. In order to answer this question, I am going to focus on the policy rationales and policy ideas which justified and encouraged the realisation of governmental intervention on the domestic film industry. As the presenters of such rationales and ideas, this paper especially focuses on the activities of the interest groups and lobbyists who directly and indirectly influenced the process of policy shaping. In the following sections, firstly, I am going to overview the general information about the CFA of 1927. Secondly, the theoretical discussions about the policy rationales of cultural policy is presented. By clarifying theory and frameworks of cultural policy rationales, the contribution of this case study about the CFA of 1927 to the research of cultural policy is also clarified. Thirdly, I am going to analyse the activities of the interest groups who tried to make influence on the realisation of the CFA of 1927. In analysing these activities, considering the

characteristics of the cultural policy, both direct interest groups such as industrial organisations and wider groups of organisations such as the newspapers and intellectuals are referred to. Although these wider groups were not always attended the conflict in policy arena, they shaped the policy ideas and discourses which determined the directions of the film policies in the UK. Finally, the contribution of the research of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 to general discussion on both public policy research and cultural policy research is shown in the concluding part of this essay.

2. Cinematograph Films Act of 1927

2-1. General Information

The Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was the first legislation by the British government to support the British film industry. The Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was introduced to protect and promote the British film industry, especially the production sector, by introducing the so-called Quota system. The Quota system forced the exhibitors in the UK to exhibit certain amounts of the British film in their theatres. Furthermore, the legislation also banned commercial customs called the block-booking and advanced-booking which benefited the Hollywood film companies. The purpose of the legislation was explained as to protect and encourage the British film producers from the threatening expansion of the Hollywood film industry in the domestic market of the UK and the British Empire (Low, 1979).

Even though its impact and usefulness was controversial and minor amendments were constantly made, the Quota system to protect the British film industry was sustained and accepted as necessary governmental policy until the emergence of the New Conservative government in the 1980s (Hill, 1996). The Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 can be evaluated as historical example of governmental intervention to protect domestic economic sector, which is totally opposite to the logic of the Neoliberalism. Therefore, understanding the background

of the realisation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 shows us how the British public policy was characterised and structured before the emergence of the Neoliberalism.

The film policies to support and protect domestic film industries were commonly introduced in other European countries including Germany and France in the same period. The existence of these policies imply the common background which required the governmental intervention to protect the national film industry, which was the emergence of the Hollywood film industry in the European market. Therefore, the pieces of prior researched about the film policies in the inter-war period has been mainly discussed and analysed in the contest of the relationship between Hollywood-European film industries (Saunders, 1994; Ulf-Moeller, 2001). These pieces of research show that the Quota system in other European countries show that the spread of the Hollywood film was recognised as not just economical but also cultural threat to the domestic audiences.

Although some researchers refer to the contemporary discourse about cultural importance of film, prior research of the Cinematograph Films Act mainly focuses on the economic aspect of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 and activities of industrial organisations such as the Federation of British Industries (Street, 1985).

However, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 can and should be re-evaluated as cultural policy to promote not just the British film industry but also the British film culture. This is because the political elites intended to promote the British film culture and realise not only economic but also cultural or political goals through the film policies.

The implicit characteristics of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 can be identified in the discussion in Parliament. The speech by Philip Cunliffe-Lister, the president of the Board of Trade, is one of the most representative statement about the importance of the governmental support for the domestic film industry.

It is based on a realisation that the cinema is to-day the most universal means through which national ideas and national atmosphere can be spread, and, even if those be intangible things, surely they are among the most important influences in civilisation. (HC Deb 16 March 1927 vol 203 cc2039-112)

Furthermore, before the legislation of the Quota system, the concept of Cinematograph Films Act was discussed in Parliament and educational and political values of film was referred there as below:

But the cinema is not merely a means of entertainment. It is really one of the most, if not the most, important instruments at present for the furtherance of trade and of education and, more than anything else perhaps, of political propaganda (HL Deb 14 May 1925 vol 61 cc273-94)

These speeches can be characterised by their stress on the values of work of the British film not just as an economic commodity but also as cultural and political instrument. The policymakers intended to realise the film policy to present national atmosphere and political propaganda to the audiences. In this sense, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 should be identified as not just an example of industrial policy but also as cultural policy to make use of cultural potential of national film because they were designed to shape and influence national culture which was expected to be represented in authentic national cinema.

The policy intention of the cultural and political use of film can be identified in the discussion by those in the opposite position for the film bill as well, such as the Labour Party politician, Ramsay MacDonald. His comment in the discussion in Parliament against the Film Bill in 1927 shows such intention as below:

There is one serious reason—I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman did not seem to be aware of it; at any rate, he said nothing about it—why every one of us is interested in British films being shown abroad, and that is that British films should uphold to foreign nations a better conception of the moral conduct and social habits of people who profess to belong to the leading nations of the world than, unfortunately, is the case with so many films that are being exported, for instance, to China (HL Deb 14 May 1925 vol 61 cc273-94).

Again, it should be stressed that even the protests against the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 itself shared the concept and recognised the necessity of governmental support for the British film industry. The common belief behind such consensus was the identification of political and cultural value of films.

As the Quota system did not contribute to the increase of the number of highly evaluated film works, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 has been underestimated in the historical analysis of the British film industry and film policy. However, the realisation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 implies two essential shifts of the film policies. First, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 shows the characteristics of the film policy from restriction to promotion. Before the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927, the film and film industry had been recognised as cheap entertainment consumed the people in the working-class. The attitude of the government was represented in the policies before the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927. As Hunnings(1967) and Low(1979) show, the main policies dealing with the domestic film industry before the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 were censorship and taxation on the film industry and the production of the British film had never been encouraged before the legislation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927.

The second important trend reflected on the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was the identification of plural values of the British Film. As is shown in the discussion in Parliament,

the British film was identified as not only economically but also as a cultural and political value. The justification of the film policy was valued in this respect and film was expected to influence the audience in more positive way. Film started to be recognised as educational medium rather than just an economic commodity or cheap entertainment.

As Bennett (1995) discusses, the identification of educational value of arts and justification for the governmental support for such art works was common trend in the history of the British cultural policy. He claims that the use of culture in the civilising mission was one of the rationales of cultural policies and such policy concept can be identified since the statement in the Nineteenth Century thinkers such as Matthew Arnold and the Romanticists. In this respect, the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 was the first governmental policy which reflects the such rationale of the cultural policies in the UK.

2-2. Historical Impact of Researching the CFA of 1927

The research of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 and policy rationales behind is meaningful in developing the research of the history of the British film policies in two ways: the identification of the emergence of the British film policy and the evaluation of the cultural policies before Neoliberalism became huge trend in public policy.

Firstly, the CFA of 1927 should be researched because it was the first attempt of governmental policy to support national film industry and film culture. Before the CFA of 1927, the film was recognised as cheap entertainment which should be regulated or restricted. However, when the policymakers and lobbyists claimed that the British film production should be protected through the CFA of 1927, film started to be recognised as a form of serious art which should be supported by the state. Therefore, the evaluation of the CFA of 1927 and rationales behind it shows how film was recognised as a target of governmental encouragement and what values of film were identified by the government.

Secondly, the analysis of the CFA of 1927 is also meaningful in identifying the characteristics of cultural policies before the emergence of the Neoliberal ideology. A lot of pieces research of cultural policies in the International Cultural Policy identify the emergence of the ideology of the Neoliberalism was quite important trigger to shape contemporary cultural policies and it was true. However, the research of the CFA of 1927 can elucidate the rationales and visions of cultural policy before the appearance of the Neoliberal ideology. The research of the CFA of 1927 is especially helpful in understanding the alternatives of neoliberal cultural policies because of its historical background and characteristics. The CFA of 1927 was established when the Conservative government decided to change the direction of its economic policy from liberalism to protectionism. The governmental intervention to support domestic film industry was designed as a milestone to realise such radical shift of the economic policy. As the basic concept of the neoliberalism is its stress on the encouragement of free-market competition by privatisation and application of free-market principle in the policy sector, the clear contrast between protectionist film policy and neoliberal cultural policy is identified.

However, I don't mean to stress only the difference between the CFA of 1927 and contemporary cultural policies which are based on the Neoliberal ideology. Or rather, there are also similarity and continuity between the contemporary cultural policies and the CFA of 1927. The continuity of the film policies and the common characteristics of the British cultural policy is unique combination of the rationale of economic values and cultural values. The analysis of the CFA of 1927 will show how supporters of the film policy justified the governmental support for the national film production and the rationales behind such policy identifies the common characteristics of the British cultural policies.

3. Policy Rationales of Cultural Policies

The rationale of cultural policies is one of the prominent issues in researching cultural policies

because it is directly related to the fundamental question of cultural policy: “why government should support the art and if so, how?” Therefore, the rationales behind cultural policies have been analysed by several researchers by overviewing the sets of multiple rationales and application of these rationales to each case study.

In the field of the research of cultural policies in the UK, not only the researches of contemporary cultural policy in the UK, but also researchers of historical process of cultural policies identify policy rationales and key concepts behind the realisation of a group of cultural policies in the UK. These rationales are based on the expected values of art itself. Gray (2000) clarified the importance of the policy concept named “commodification” which is characterised by the stress of exchange value and economic use of art in promoting public policies including cultural policies. Furthermore, Bennett overviews the policy rationales which accelerated the development of cultural policies in the UK. According to his research, cultural policies in the UK have been justified and encourage from several perspectives; laissez-faire, national prestige, economic importance, civilising mission, correcting the market, and post-war reconstruction and the welfare-state (Bennett, 1995). The rationales of cultural policies and expected benefits of providing cultural policies are also discussed as contemporary policy documents. For example, the statements named *Creating Cultural Values* by Holden (2004) overviews what are the expected impacts of contemporary cultural policies. Moreover, the values of culture and rationales of cultural policy are also important topic in the field of cultural economics as Throsby shows in his evaluation of multiple values of art. These cases show how policy rationales and expected valued of culture is discussed and analysed in the UK.

One of the characteristics of cultural policy sector is the variety of policy rationales in justifying the realisation of these cultural policy, which is partly because of the ambiguity and multiple value of the arts themselves. Beffiore and Bennett (2008) overview the historical discussion about values of arts both in positive and negative way and their research clearly

shows the wide variety of the impact of the arts on society both in positive and negative ways. Carey (2005) also discusses good value of the arts and such evaluation of the arts has been repeated in both the art world and policy arena.

The values of the arts and rationales of cultural policy themselves are quite important policy ideas which influence and sometimes determine the policy process. The role of ideas is establishing contemporary paradigms which shapes the politics. Therefore, the justification of cultural policy as idea should be discussed in understanding why certain policies are promoted and realised.

The common characteristics of these cultural policy rationales is the categorization and analytical discussion of each rationale. However, as the research of the CFA of 1927 in this paper show, the rationales of cultural policies and values of culture are frequently mixed and confused. Some supporters of the same policy use different rationales to promote the same policy and they share the policy goals and they don't share the vision of ideal cultural conditions. In order to identify such confusion of policy rationales, I am going to evaluate the economic and cultural values of film discussed in the paper.

4. Ideas and Rationales of the British Film Policy Presented by Interest Groups

4-1. Federation of British Industries

As is the same with other fields of national policies, the interest groups played an essential role in realising the legislation of the first governmental policy to support the domestic film industry. They attempted to influence the policy process by providing technical knowledge and information including the draft and concept of the CFA of 1927 itself to those who were directly related to policy process such as members of Parliament and key persons of the Board of Trade. Thus, these groups of interest groups can be identified as the most typical and direct lobbyist.

In the case of the CFA of 1927, one of the most influential lobbying group was the

Federation of British Industries (FBI). The Federation consists of interest groups of several industries including the British film industry and it contributed to realization of the CFA of 1927 because it recognised it was necessary to promote protectionist industrial policies and film policy was the milestone of change of the policy direction in the interwar period.

According to the analysis by Sarah Street, the purpose of the FBI's lobbying for the realization of the CFA of 1927 is to make use of the legislation for the protection of the British film industry as a symbolic beginning point for the protectionist policies in other sectors (Street, 1985).

The FBI published weekly journal named the *Kinematograph Weekly*, which was not only useful in understanding contemporary film culture, but also how the promoters of the Cinematograph Films Act attempted to persuade the political elite and general audience in that period. In this magazine, several professionals made comments on controversial issues such as competition with the Hollywood film industry and governmental supports for the British film industry. For example, in this magazine, Robert Donald, a business person in the film industry, deepened the discussion of the Quota system by claiming its usefulness by referring to his experience in Germany (Lincoln, 1926, p.27). As the idea of the Quota system and its importance was debated based on the recognition of threatening expansion of the Hollywood film industry even in articles in the *Kinematograph Weekly* in 1925, this magazine played an essential role as a medium to present the ideas of policy visions and share contemporary conditions among those who were interested in the British film industry including political elites (*Kinematograph Weekly*, 1925).

Furthermore, the more direct influence by the FBI on political elites can be recognized in the articles on the *Kinematograph Weekly*. For example, in August in 1925, the report which had been presented to the Board of Trade by the FBI was presented in the *Kinematograph Weekly*, which meant that the FBI had a time and a place to communicate with the board of the

President of Trade, who played a quite important role in the discussion of the CFA of 1927 (Kinematograph Weekly, 1925). The Board of Trade also expected the FBI's contribution to developing the structure of the British film policy, and the Board of Trade and the FBI exchanged the drafts of the Cinematograph Film Acts (Times, 15 December, 1925; Kinematograph Weekly, 6 August, 1925).

Moreover, later historians identified close ties between the FBI and the government. For example, in the case of the CFA of 1927, it is claimed that an "implicit pact was made between the Board of Trade and the Federation of British Industries" (Petrie, 1991). These historical analyses clarify the influence of the FBI on the governmental body and implies the bottom-up influence on the first British film policy.

In general, the FBI made impact on the realisation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 in positive way. The organisation made proposal about policy ideas and concepts of the Quota system and attempted to persuade policymakers including the president of the Board of Trade to realise the CFA of 1927. The reason why the FBI contributed to the realisation of the CFA of 1927 was that the Quota system was expected to stimulate the investment on the British film industry. In this sense, the key rationale behind the activity of the BFI can be said as economic value of film. However, at the same time, the statements by the BFI was not limited to the economic value of film but also political and social value of film was stressed.

4-2. CEA (Cinema Exhibitors' Association)

Whereas the Federation of British Industries and its publication named the Kinematograph Weekly accelerated the realisation of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927, there are another interest group which was against the CFA of 1927 named the Cinema Exhibitors' Association(CEA). The organisation consisted of the representatives of the exhibitors in the UK and the organisation still exists even today(although the name was changed to the UK Cinema Association). The reason why the CEA was negative to the CFA of 1927 is obvious considering

the characteristics of the Quota system and contemporary film industry. The CFA of 1927 was designed to limit the exhibition of foreign films in order to increase the production of domestic film, which means the serious risk to the exhibitors which gained popularity by showing the foreign and Hollywood films. Furthermore, the ambiguity and difficulty of the definition of the British film itself caused the attack to the quota system by the exhibitors. In order to make pressure on both policymakers and general public, the CEA used its journal named the Bioscope to show the risk of the Quota system and process of lobbying to change the CFA of 1927.

However, even though the CEA was negative to the Quota system, it contributed to the realisation of the governmental support for the domestic film industry by enhancing the status of the British film and presenting the multiple values of film in the UK. For example, the Bioscope in 1926 July showed the activity of the EMA to present the value of the British film in educational activities to the participants of the Imperial Educational Conference of 1926 (The Bioscope, 1926). Such activities were useful in promoting the educational value of the film and such recognition was critically important in the realisation of the CFA of 1927. As is shown in the previous section, the political debate over the CFA of 1927 was based on the identification of educational and political value of film and the statements and activities by the CEA indirectly contributed to the justification of such policy rationales behind the CFA of 1927.

4-3. Newspaper Editors

The last and most important element of the bottom-up activities in the legislation of the CFA of 1927 was the crucial role of quality newspapers in defining the characteristics of the British film and setting the policy agenda by attracting public interest.

In the twentieth century, many newspapers started to publish articles about the British film and critical reviews by the intellectuals appeared in the 1920s. The dramatic increase in the number of articles in popular newspapers was the result of the expansion of the film as a

popular form of the entertainment in the UK, and the focus by these media on the film implied the increasing importance of the film for the readers.

Furthermore, the important point is that these media proclaimed the cultural and social importance of the film (Street, 1985). One of the most aggressive articles which proclaimed the importance of the British film is “The Foreign Film and the English Soul” posted in the Daily Mail in 1925, which expressed the spread of the Hollywood film was the “an attack on the English soul; and the battle for good English films is the battle for England’s soul”. These statements were based on the recognition that film was not just an economic commodity but a social and cultural good.

The intellectuals who sought the legitimation of the film also used these papers to make claims about the improvement of the British film industry such as “Films the Public Want” and “Films We Do Not Want” in the Daily Mail by Barry (Wasson, 2002). Moreover, the Daily Mail in April 1925 identified the political importance of film from “patriotic consideration” and claimed that “the people without adequate expression of their national ideals on the screen are without the most powerful sociological influence of the present day”, which explicitly shows the Daily Mail’ identification of the political and social value of film (Daily Mail, 1925). These quality newspapers which claimed social and cultural importance of film were definitely influential in determining the direction of debates about the CFA of 1927 in Parliament. For example, in the debate in 1925, one of the MPs used information from the Times and referred to it as below:

I read in yesterday's "Times" an account of the film which has just been produced at one of the London theatres, and the "Times" makes this reference, which is typical of my experience of American films which I have seen both in American and here: The truth is perhaps that in many of those matters English and American tastes differ so far that they cannot be reconciled

(HC Deb 16 March 1927 vol 203 cc2039-112).

Considering these statements, it can be claimed that the articles of quality newspapers had a definite impact on the political elites and its claims were influential on the legislation of the British film policy.

Even though both were influential media in the realisation of the CFA of 1927, the Kinematograph Weekly published by the FBI and quality newspapers had starkly contrasting differences on the merit and expected contribution of the British film. Whereas the articles in the Kinematograph Weekly focused on the economic aspect of the British films, articles of the quality newspapers were more likely to stress the social merit of the films. The important point is that the statements by the quality newspapers about the social and cultural role of films were transferred to the debate in Parliament. Clear examples of such debates are below:

It is based on a realisation that the cinema is to-day the most universal means through which national ideas and national atmosphere can be spread, and, even if those be intangible things, surely they are among the most important influences in civilisation. (HC Deb 16 March 1927 vol 203 cc2039-112)

But the cinema is not merely a means of entertainment. It is really one of the most, if not the most, important instruments at present for the furtherance of trade and of education and, more than anything else perhaps, of political propaganda (HL Deb 14 May 1925 vol 61 cc273-94)

Without the claims about the social and cultural impact of the film in the quality newspapers, the governmental support for the British film industry might have been discussed and justified only in the respect of economic merit. However, because of the direct and indirect influence of

the quality newspapers, the importance of the CFA of 1927 was discussed in Parliament in respect of the film's cultural and social impact.

The role of the quality newspapers show that contemporary newspapers contributed to the legislation of the CFA of 1927 by defining the policy problem and setting agenda by attracting the attention of political elites and providing information to them, which also clarified the bottom-up aspect of the legislation of the CFA of 1927 by the private actors in determining the national film policy.

4-4. The Film Society

Another important interest group which influenced the CFA of 1927 was the intellectual movement that attempted to legitimate film and establish the status of film as a form of serious art.

Bauman(2007) introduced the useful framework to understand the process that film was recognised as important culture which should be respected and supported. She picked up the key factors which encouraged the legitimation of Hollywood films such as critical reviews in newspapers and intellectual movements in the academic and Art world. Even though Baumann's framework is used to explain the situation in the Hollywood film industry in the 1960s, the same perspective can be applied to the analysis of the activities of British intellectuals in the 1920s because such legitimation can be used in explaining the reason why film started to be recognized as such important medium especially in the 1920s.

Firstly, the intellectuals in that period started to spread their critical reviews about film works and contributed to the legitimation of British film. As Wasson's research about the history of critical reviews of the British film in newspapers such as the Daily Mail and Spectator, the intellectuals' writings about film at that period was an attempt to answer "the questions about how to write about film's social, political and cultural significance" (Wasson, 2002). This

movement was parallel with that in the 1960s' US shown by Baumann and resulted in the similar transformation of the film from just a form of entertainment to a genre of high art. Such intellectual movement can be discussed as an important factor to accelerate the transformation of the British film policy from regulation to encouragement based on the identification of multiple values of films.

The emergence of critical reviews which contributed to the promotion of the status of film in the 1920s corresponded with the appearance of new genre of films. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, new kinds of films such as literary film started to be distributed (Burrows, 2009). These works stimulated the critical reviews and encouraged the statements about the cultural and artistic importance of the British film. Such relationship between film art and rationale of film policy implies the necessity to understand the transformation of culture itself in considering the reason why certain cultural policies are realised.

Secondly, the intellectual circles including the Film Society launched their projects to establish "alternative film culture in Britain in the 1920s" (Sexton, 2002). The Film Society not only attempted to establish the critical discourse about film review, but also provided the opportunities to exhibit highly evaluated art films in the UK. These movements also accelerated the rise of the status of film as a serious art.

It should be noticed that such intellectual movement was not isolated from contemporary political and economic situation. One of the most prominent examples was a writer, Ivor Montagu. Whereas he published artistic reviews about contemporary films and played an important role in establishing the Film Society, Montagu provided educational programs to inspire the British film industry and attempted to reform the censorship organised by the British government (Turvey, 2002).

The direct causal relationship between the CFA of 1927 and legitimization of British film as a form of high art could not be identified, but considering the discussion in Parliament about film

as not just economic commodity but influential art work, the intellectual movements in the same period can be evaluated to have had a definite impact on the legislation of the CFA of 1927 as a bottom-up movement from the art world outside the political establishment (HL Deb 14 May 1925 vol 61 cc273-94).

5. Conclusion and Further Research Questions

The purpose of this paper is to elucidate the impact of interest groups on realising the first governmental support by the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 in the UK. In order to understand the direct and indirect influence of the interest groups in the CFA of 1927, this paper focused on how multiple values of the film was presented and reflected on the policy process of the legislation. The focus on such evaluation of discourse about value of film is meaningful because the debate in Parliament and statements by policymakers show that the rationales of the CFA of 1927 were supported by the identification of cultural, educational and political values of film. Thus, how such values of film were presented is closely connected with the establishment of the policy ideas and rationales of the CFA of 1927.

The CFA of 1927 was directly presented and encouraged by the interest groups and media such as the Federation of British Industries and quality papers. They claimed that the governmental support for the British film production was required in respect to political propaganda and economic interest, which was reflected in the statement by the president of the Board in Parliament.

At the same time, the interest groups such as the Film Society and Cinema Exhibitors' Association also contributed to the justification of the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 by enhancing the status of the British film as important culture. The point is that these actors were not necessarily supportive for the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927 itself, but their arguments indirectly set up the foundation of the discussion and policy rationale of the Films Act.

The focus on multiple and indirect identification of the value of film is important in

understanding the background of certain cultural policies. This is because of the ambiguity of culture itself. The value of culture is quite slippery and the rationales of cultural policies are much less unclear than other fields of policies such as welfare policies and industrial policies. Film is especially ambiguous because it appeared as new medium and its political and social values were not shared or established in the beginning of the twentieth century. Therefore, the rationales and justification of the first governmental policy by the CFA of 1927 were discussed and justified from several perspectives and interest groups attempted to attend the policy process by presenting several values of film.

In order to elucidate the roles of several interest groups in presenting the multiple values of films which were used as policy rationales, I have analysed the statements and discourse of these actors shown in papers and journals. Some of these statements were directly referred to and used in the policy process, but others were more indirectly reflected on policy ideas about promotion of political or social value of film. In order to understand the influence of these actors in realising the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927, it is useful and required to analyse the relationship of key persons and organisations to identify the process of spreading the rationale of the British film policy.

<Bibliography>

Aldgate, A. and Richards, J., 1999. *Best of British: Cinema and Society from 1930 to the Present*.

London: I. B. Tauris.

Anthony, S., 2011. Imperialism and Internationalism: The British Documentary Movement and the Legacy of the Empire Marketing Board. In: Grieveson, L. and MacCabe, C., 2011. *Empire and Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan on behalf of the British Film Institute.

Baumann, S., 2007. *Hollywood Highbrow: From Entertainment to Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Beffiore, E. and Bennett, O., 2008. *The Social Impact of the Arts: An Intellectual History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bennett, O., 1995. Cultural Policy in the United Kingdom: Collapsing Rationales and the End of a Tradition. *European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 1, pp. 199-216.

The Bioscope, 1926. Educationalists Visit Studio: British Instructional's Fine Work. The Bioscope. 14 June, 1926, p. 23.

Carey, J., 2005. *What Good are the Arts?*. London: Faber.

Committee on Imperial Economic Sub Committee. (1926) *Imperial Conference, 1926*. London: The National Archives. (CAB 32/59)

Committee on Unemployment. (1925) *The Position of British Film Production*. London: The National Archives. (CAB 27/154)

Daily Mail, 1925. The Foreign Film and the English Soul. Daily Mail. 16 Apr. p. 8.

Daily Mail, 1925. British Empire Pictures: From a Film Correspondent. Daily Mail. 16 Apr. p. 16.

Dickson, M. and Street, S., 1985. *Cinema and State: The Film Industry and the British Government 1927-1984*. London: BFI.

Grieveson, L., 2011. The Cinema and the (Common) Wealth of Nations. In: Grieveson, L. and

- MacCabe, C., 2011. *Empire and Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan on behalf of the British Film Institute.
- Hartog, S., 1983. State Protection of a Beleaguered Industry. In: Curran, J. and Porter, V., 1983. *British Cinema History*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Hill, J., British Film Policy. In: A. Moran, ed. 1996. *Film Policy*. London and New York: Routledge. Ch. 6.
- Holden, J., 2004. *Creating Cultural Value: How culture has become a tool of government policy*. London: DEMOS.
- Hunnings, N., M., 1967. *Film Censors and the Law*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kinematograph Weekly, 1925. To Revive Production: F.B.I.'s Summary of the Rival Plans. *Kinematograph Weekly*. 6 Aug. pp. 30-31.
- Lincoln, C., 1926. Kontingent and Quota: The German Precedent Analysed. *Kinematograph Weekly*. 21 Jan. p. 30.
- Lawrence, N., 2009. *British Cinema and Middlebrow Culture in the Interwar Years*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Low, R., 1979. *The History of the British Film 1929-1939: Films of Comments and Persuasion of the 1930s*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Low, S., 1925. Will the World Be Americanised?. *Daily Mail Atlantic Edition*. 16 Apr. p. 5.
- Lucy, M., 2013. *French Film in Britain: Sex, Art and Cinephilia*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Manchester guardian, 1919. Progress of the Film: British Work Coming to the Front. 30 May, p. 5.
- Manchester Guardian, 1922. Art or Propaganda, The Manchester Guardian, 11 May. p. 6.
- Manchester Guardian, 1936. Cinema In the School: An Industry Handicapped, The Manchester Guardian, 10 Sep. p. 13.
- Petley, J., Cinema and State. In Barr, C. ed., 1986. *All Our Yesterdays: 90 Years of British*

- Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.
- Petrie, D., J., 1991. *Creativity and Constraint in the British Film Industry*. London: Macmillan.
- Rice, T., 2011. Exhibiting Africa: British Instructional Films and the Empire Series (1925-8). In: Grieveson, L. and MacCabe, C., 2011. *Empire and Film*. London: Palgrave Macmillan on behalf of the British Film Institute.
- Saunders, T., 1994. *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema and Weimar Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sexton, J., The Film Society and the Creation of an Alternative Film Culture in Britain in the 1920s. In Higson, A. ed., 2002. *Young and Innocent?: The Cinema in Britain, 1896-1930*. Exeter : University of Exeter Press
- Street, S., 1985. Financial and political aspects of state intervention in the British film industry, 1925-1939. Ph. D. University of Oxford.
- Street, S., 2000. *British Cinema in Documents*. London: Routledge.
- The Sydney Morning Herald, 1931. British Film Industry, The Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Dec. p. 11.
- Times, 1914. Films OF Canadian Life And History, The Times, 7 May. p. 20.
- Times, 1918. Cinemas In Schools, The Times, 21 Aug. p. 3.
- Times, 1919. The Film World, The Times, 15 Dec. p. 18.
- Times, 1925. British Film Industry. The Times. 15 Dec. p. 14.
- UK Parliament. (1927) *Cinematograph Films Bill*, 16 March 1927, HC vol 203 cc2039-112.
- UK Parliament. (1925) *British Film Industry*, 14 May 1925, HL vol 61 cc273-94.
- Ulf-Moller, J., 2001. *Hollywood's Film Wars with France: Film-Trade Diplomacy and the Emergence of the French Film Quota Policy*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Wasson, H., Writing the Cinema into Daily Life: Iris Barry and the Emergence of British Film Criticism in the 1920s. In Higson, A. ed., 2002. *Young and Innocent?: The Cinema in Britain*,

1896-1930. Exeter : University of Exeter Press

Walsh, M., Tackling the Big Boy of Empire: British Film in Australia, 1918-1931. In Higson, A. ed., 2002. *Young and Innocent?: The Cinema in Britain, 1896-1930*. Exeter : University of Exeter Press