

Introduction

Building and Analyzing Movie Magazine Networks

Eric Hoyt and Kelley Conway

In a 1938 editorial entitled “The Brother Overseas,” *filmindia* publisher Baburao Patel proudly announced that his Bombay-based magazine would now publish excerpts from America’s top film reviewer. “As the most eminent critic in America, he is held in reverence by the producers and the cine goers in general,” wrote Patel.¹ The critic in question did not write for *The New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Photoplay*, *Life*, or *Variety*. Instead, *filmindia*’s brother overseas was Peter S. Harrison.

“Who doesn’t know Mr. Pete Harrison?” asked Patel. It was meant to be a rhetorical question, but—if truthfully answered, then or now—the answer would be “most people.” Harrison was not well known by the US public, but he occupied a unique niche within the film industry. For the previous two decades, he had been publishing *Harrison’s Reports*, a weekly review service “free from the influence of film advertising.” That distinguishing feature—no motion picture company advertising—was emphasized on the front page of every issue, right below the title.² One consequence was that subscriptions to *Harrison’s Reports* cost substantially more than other, larger US film industry trade papers of the 1930s, such as *Motion Picture Herald* and *Boxoffice*, because Harrison’s production and distribution costs could not be offset by ad revenue.³

While Patel trumpeted the advertising-free nature of *Harrison’s Reports* as a sign of the critic’s credibility, he downplayed the identity of its core audience: US exhibitors, especially small to midsized independent exhibitors, who loyally subscribed to *Harrison’s Reports*. They read the paper for film reviews that they considered more trustworthy than those in the other papers, as well as for its fiery editorial page that validated their anger and resentments toward the major



FIGURES 0.1 and 0.2. The May 1938 issue of *filmindia* proudly announced the contributions of Pete Harrison, who reviewed films for US exhibitors in his publication, *Harrison's Reports*.

movie companies. Contrary to Patel's claims, most US cine goers had never heard of Harrison, and most producers probably wished that they hadn't. Over the years, Harrison had developed the nickname "Poison Pete" for his reviews that poisoned the exhibition market for pictures that he panned, frequently on grounds that films were too salacious or downbeat.⁴



Mr. Pete Harrison, Editor, "Harrison's Reports" New York.

Feared and admired, this eminent critic provides a beacon light of guidance to thousands of exhibitors all over the world by his impartial and trenchant opinions on pictures and of men behind the American film industry.

When reprinted in the pages of *filmindia*, however, Harrison's words took on a new and different light—the opinions of America's most eminent critic, not "Poison Pete," the partisan warrior for independent exhibitors. Moreover, Patel's framing of Harrison as a critic revered both by moviegoers and by producers fit the hybrid nature and dual address of *filmindia* (see figures 0.1 and 0.2). Patel's *filmindia* was

not alone in this regard. Whereas most US film publications of the 1930s could be neatly divided between the categories of “trade papers” and “fan magazines,” the majority of film magazines published elsewhere in the world addressed both the industry and the public together. Hybridity was the norm, not the exception.

Harrison’s words circulated beyond the US and India, too. In 1934, *Cinelandia*, a Spanish-language magazine published in California and distributed across Latin America, reported: “Las películas de los estudios de Artistas Unidos son las que más dinero han producido durante el año, según una estadística publicada en el ‘Harrison’s Reports’” (The pictures from the United Artists studio are the ones that have received the most money produced during the year, according to a statistic published in “Harrison’s Reports”).⁵ Nine years later, *Cine-Mundial*—another Spanish-language film magazine published in the US—featured a quote from Harrison within an advertisement for *Los Tigres Voladores* (*The Flying Tigers*, 1943), distributed by Republic Pictures and starring John Wayne.⁶ Like *filmindia*, *Cinelandia* and *Cine-Mundial* catered to industry members and film fans alike.

In other cases, Harrison functioned less as an eminent critic and more as an innovator and role model. Argentina’s most important film industry trade paper, *Heraldo del cinematografista*, modeled its entire format on *Harrison’s Reports*. Editor Chas de Cruz emphasized the independence and integrity of his trade paper, founded in 1931. He promised that *Heraldo del cinematografista* would be “a service of criticism, information and analysis, free from the influence of cinematographic advertising.” Impressively, the Buenos Aires trade paper outlasted *Harrison’s Reports* by nearly three decades, finally folding in 1988.⁷

How did a newsletter, narrowly pitched toward independent US exhibitors, become adapted and transformed for readers in Argentina and India? What industry practices, business needs, and audience demands explain the process of magazine networking and adaptation? And how did film journals in China, France, Iran, South Korea, and elsewhere position themselves as speaking to the industry, film fans, or both? These magazines communicated news and ideas about the movies and, in doing so, fostered the creation and spread of film cultures—communities, both imagined and real, invested in cinema’s ability to entertain, educate, make money, bring people together, and/or be a great art form. How did that process play out in different times and places? And what did it mean?

The book that follows seeks to answer these questions, excavating and analyzing the histories of film magazines published around the world. An edited collection featuring twenty chapters from leading film historians, *Global Movie Magazine Networks* explores the histories and connections across film journals published in countries such as Argentina, France, Italy, India, Germany, China, Iran, Russia, Mexico, and South Korea. While movie magazines are frequently cited as sources, they are far less often centered as the objects of study. By analyzing specific magazines for their hybridity and heterogeneity and by situating these publications globally as part of an exchange of information and ideas about

cinema, the contributing authors of *Global Movie Magazine Networks* collectively reframe and expand our understanding of historic movie magazines.

Moreover, the book is an expression of the collaborative processes needed to access and interpret these historical sources today. Our University of Wisconsin–Madison colleague Darshana Sreedhar Mini called our attention to the presence of P. S. Harrison within *filmindia*. Nicolas Poppe, a member of our wider research network, helped us understand the important influence of *Harrison's Reports* upon *Heraldo del cinematografista*. Eric Hoyt then brought in his own understanding of Harrison's niche and reputation within the US film industry's trade press. Collectively, we were able to recognize connections and meanings that individually we would have missed.

Additionally, the historical sources analyzed in support of this research were accessible thanks to collaborative digitization efforts. The Media History Digital Library (MHDL, <https://mediahist.org>) coordinated the scanning of *filmindia* from the Museum of Modern Art Library in 2014; *Harrison's Reports* from the collection of John McElwee in 2015; *Cine-Mundial* from the Library of Congress in 2013; and *Cinelandia* from the New York Public Library in 2022. Making those scans discoverable and searchable took additional steps. For each digitized volume, members of the MHDL team entered descriptive metadata, with required fields encompassing both familiar categories (e.g., “title” and “creator”) and fields invisible to users yet necessary for our search engine to function (e.g., date expressed in time zone format, “1938-01-01T23:23:59Z”). The digital images and metadata were then uploaded together to the Internet Archive's servers, which applied optical character recognition (OCR) and generated derivative files, including JPEG2000, PDF, TXT, and XML formats. After the creation of the derivative files, the MHDL team ran Python scripts to index the digitized publications and make them searchable within Lantern, our search platform that connects the user to specific materials hosted by the Internet Archive. It is, finally, at that point that researchers can run full-text searches, browse the results, and locate sources that support or refute their arguments.

Here, we see the integration of research paradigms that are often distinguished as either basic or applied. Basic research pursues the advancement of knowledge without a specific utilization outcome in mind. Applied research is all about utilization outputs—building things that can be adopted and used. There are problems with these distinctions, of course, but the terms persist in the context of universities, funding agencies, and perceptions of research value. In our work, however, we have deliberately sought to blend basic and applied research frameworks. The critical and historical work of analyzing the magazines has developed alongside the practical work of identifying and scanning as many of the magazines as possible. The field of Film and Media Studies benefits from collaborating with archives and putting basic research on the histories of movie magazines into conversation with the applied research of digitization initiatives.

In the remainder of this introduction, we will explore and reflect upon the integration of research approaches at the heart of this project, then explain the organization of the book and preview the chapters that follow. As a starting point, though, we might ask the question—why take movie magazines seriously at all?

BASIC RESEARCH: WHY STUDY GLOBAL MOVIE MAGAZINES?

When making the distinction between research paradigms, the term *pure research* is sometimes used synonymously with *basic research*. Yet designating anything related to movie magazines as “pure” feels almost farcical. These are publications that frequently take on a parasitic quality in relation to the industries they cover. Many of the magazines delight in gossip and salacious details. They report on activities that occur far beyond their pages, and they activate communities that ripple out even further. Movie magazines are many things, but they are not pure.

So, why take movie magazines seriously as objects of research? As film scholars Daniel Biltereyst and Lies Van de Vijver have argued, “movie magazines play an important role in re- or intermediating between the realm of cinema and the audience’s everyday life, practices and imagination.”⁸ Movie magazines—whether trade papers, fan magazines, film society newsletters, scholarly publications, or some combination thereof—provide scholars an array of entry points into the history of both film and journalism. Magazines help us chart the release of films and gather evidence about their circulation and impact in particular places and times. Studying the paper trails left by fans and film societies in movie magazines helps us document the importance of film for specific audiences. With the help of digital search tools, we can chart the ebb and flow of attention paid to studios, guilds, distribution companies, film theaters and exhibition circuits, film festivals, and the work of individual producers, directors, craftspeople, and actors. The texts and images in magazines have long helped historians support their arguments about films, film culture, and film theory. And film periodicals have lives of their own. As analyses of our collection amply reveal, the magazines’ graphic design, rubrics, and circulation—along with the composition and commitments of their editorial boards—reveal rhetorically and aesthetically rich modes of discourse, above and beyond the information such publications can provide about film.

Global Movie Magazine Networks engages with film periodicals in all the ways mentioned above and, more broadly, contributes to the disciplinary turn referred to as the “new cinema history”—an approach that emphasizes the value of investigating cinema’s connection to industry and society, as well as its meaning in the lives of the people who have participated in its exhibition, circulation, and

reception.⁹ In the introduction to the edited collection *Looking Past the Screen*, film historian Eric Smoodin (whose chapter on the French magazine *Pour Vous* is part of this collection) has referred to this basic approach, with its emphasis on non-filmic primary sources, as “film scholarship without films.” Smoodin’s description fits this book as well, with its embrace of a mixed-methods approach to understanding the complex roles of periodicals in facilitating film cultures.¹⁰

Within the new cinema history research paradigm, there has been a small but growing area of scholarship focused on film periodicals. Hollywood fan magazines have received a significant amount of attention over the past two decades.¹¹ Hollywood trade papers are receiving more attention, too, with the publication of Hoyt’s *Ink-Stained Hollywood: The Triumph of American Cinema’s Trade Press* and earlier high-caliber articles by Kathryn Fuller-Seeley, Richard L. Stromgren, and Gregory A. Waller.¹² In contrast to these works of scholarship focused on fan magazines and trade papers in Hollywood, *Global Movie Magazine Networks* investigates the histories of motion picture periodicals primarily outside of the US context, blurring the fundamental categories of fan magazines and trade papers that have governed much of the Hollywood-oriented scholarship.

This book builds upon the 2020 volume *Mapping Movie Magazines: Digitization, Periodicals and Cinema History*, edited by Daniel Biltereyst and Lies Van de Vijver.¹³ *Mapping Movie Magazines* is an important, agenda-setting collection that demonstrates the diversity in format and function of film publications while foregrounding their “intermediality”—that is, their connections between the worlds of film and print media, literature, photography, radio, television, and fashion. We, too, are keen to show that film magazines engage with multiple cultural realms and speak to a diverse readership. Like the research in *Mapping Movie Magazines*, our volume revels in the eclectic array of source material film periodicals offer, including editorials, fan letters, advice columns, film criticism, accounts of film society activities, and film trade statistics. A diverse set of publications and the rubrics contained within them allow scholars to create new knowledge about film industries, the discursive construction of directors and stars, fandom and cinephilia, and, more broadly, the relationships between film magazines and their political and social contexts.

Another collection of essays that has influenced our work is *Star Attractions: Twentieth-Century Movie Magazines and Global Fandom* (2019), a study of fan magazines edited by Tamar Jeffers McDonald and Lies Lanckman.¹⁴ Presenting well-researched analyses of the editorial and aesthetic strategies of fan magazines from their emergence in the 1910s to the 1960s, the volume focuses on Hollywood fan magazines, but includes analyses of French, Malay, and Romanian periodicals as well. The authors reveal a wide array of discursive strategies in the advice columns, fan letters, articles, and ads, while challenging our assumptions about the homogeneity of fan magazines, gendered readership, and cinephilic hierarchies.

The scholarship in both *Mapping Movie Magazines* and *Star Attractions* makes substantial use of the MHDL and other digital tools, using new methods for accessing material held in far-flung physical archives. With the use of digital tools, these volumes introduce exciting new methodologies for film periodical research, from the consultation of digitized fan letters to the study of circulation patterns via the use of online census records. Our volume is similarly invested in the use of digital tools to access and analyze film periodicals. Indeed, a major part of our project has been to work with libraries and archives to identify, scan, and render searchable new material for the MHDL. In addition to generating deeply researched case studies on exemplary yet often under-researched periodicals, we have sought to make possible a dramatic expansion of resources for future scholarship on global networks in film culture (a process described below, and in greater detail in our essay in the journal *NECSUS*).¹⁵

One of the most important characteristics of both *Mapping Movie Magazines* and *Star Attractions* is the effort to stretch beyond the handful of anglophone US magazines typically researched by film and media scholars. Both volumes contain important essays about non-US magazines, yet their overwhelming focus remains on North American and Western European publications. Indeed, the current scholarly map of movie magazines is incomplete and uneven. Although no single book can exhaustively cover all movie magazines across all times and places, we are pleased that the chapters that follow offer considerable attention to the film industries and cultures of Asia, Africa, and South America—as well as their connections with one another and the rest of the world. The result of our global ambition is an implicit decentering of anglophone film publications, but also a conception of global film culture as networked. Scholars in the humanities use the term *network* in a variety of ways. In our use, the term connotes both the broad community of researchers at work on the diffuse and diverse phenomenon of film periodicals and a body of scholarship on film magazines that reveals connections, relays, and echoes among publications from many different geographical contexts.

Given our volume's emphasis on the myriad ways in which periodicals traverse national borders, it is worth explaining in some detail our commitment to both national and transnational conceptions of film culture. In analyzing global movie magazines, we seek to bring a nuanced approach to questions related to the national, transnational, and global character of cinema. Many film scholars have argued persuasively in favor of a decisive move away from an old-fashioned "national" paradigm of film history in which ossified notions of national identity persist alongside a limited canon of allegedly representative films. Theoretical interventions on transnational historiography and case studies of transnational exchange can be found in *Cinema and Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, and *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, edited by Nataša Đurovičová and Kathleen Newman.¹⁶ Another branch of productive work in

transnational film studies consists of rethinking film movements. In *Global Art Cinema: New Theories and Histories*, editors Rosalind Galt and Karl Schoonover chart the “geopolitical intersections” of art cinema, demonstrating its centrality to global cinema since the 1970s.¹⁷ Along these same lines, *Global Neorealism: The Transnational History of a Film Style*, edited by Saverio Giovacchini and Robert Sklar, examines the contours of neorealism beyond the borders of Italy, while James Tweedie considers the global reach of the French New Wave in *The Age of New Waves: Art Cinema and the Staging of Globalization*.¹⁸ Mette Hjort, for her part, demonstrates the ongoing necessity of refining our concepts of national belonging in the context of globalization in *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*.¹⁹ *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*, edited by Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden, demonstrates the diversity of traditions within nations and argues that the advent of digital technology and the forces of advanced capitalism have accelerated the flow of films across borders, resulting in a transnational and global cinema.²⁰ We share this impulse to retain, yet transform, the “national” lens in the investigation of transnational cinema.

To our minds, film scholarship benefits from an awareness of the transnational circulation of films and film periodicals as well as an awareness that the “national” as an historical category retains relevance. As a result, some essays in this volume argue for the specificity of film culture in particular national contexts, while others show how movie magazines participate in the transnational circulation of ideas, building hybrid film cultures. Maria Belodubrovskaya’s essay on *Kino* and Vincent Fröhlich’s essay on *Neue Filmwelt* reveal the complexity and specificity of film culture under Stalin in the Soviet Union and East Germany, respectively. Rielle Navitski’s expansive analysis of Latin American cine club magazines finds a desire to strengthen local and regional film cultures, as well as an interest in the films and film theory emerging from other nations, reflected in the frequent publication of translations of articles from European and US journals.

Film magazines reflect the conditions of their national film industries and cultures, but they also cross national borders, circulating information about films and filmmakers, the challenges faced by film industries, and the sheer richness of film culture, inviting emulation and/or differentiation. In some cases, the magazines even entered into formal arrangements for sharing information. One example is P. S. Harrison’s reviews and editorials that appeared in *filmindia*. Another example took place a decade earlier, and on a grander scale. In the late 1920s, the New York-based trade paper *The Film Daily* entered into a cooperative news-sharing agreement with three of its international peers: *The Daily Film Renter* (London), *Die Lichtbild-Bühne* (Berlin), and *La Cinématographie française* (Paris).²¹ This international cooperative fell apart in the 1930s amid the pressures of the global financial depression and the growing nationalism, hostility, and anti-Semitism within Germany that led to World War II. But it is worth remembering that, roughly a century ago, film industry periodicals imagined and enacted a global network.

What is required, and what does it mean, to excavate these and other publications and create new networks for the digital age?

APPLIED RESEARCH: GLOBALIZING THE MEDIA HISTORY DIGITAL LIBRARY

Our digitization and network-building efforts emerged as extensions of our work on the MHDL (<https://mediahist.org>). As such, any discussion of our applied research efforts requires starting with the MHDL. Housed within the Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research, the MHDL is a collaborative initiative dedicated to digitizing books and magazines from the histories of film, broadcasting, and recorded sound for broad public access. The project depends upon the affordances of the internet—the great network of networks—and the digital preservation infrastructure of the Internet Archive. Since the launch of its first website in 2011 and search engine Lantern in 2013, the MHDL has transformed the study of film and broadcasting history, now offering broad public access to over three million pages of out-of-copyright books and magazines.²²

Despite making a positive impact on the field, though, the MHDL was suffering in the late 2010s from gaps and weaknesses. Some shortcomings were technical in nature. One tradeoff of the MHDL's low overhead had been a data model that was decentralized and messy—a limitation that resulted in an inefficient workflow and, more problematically, broken links and missing thumbnails for our users. We needed to do the hard work of developing and implementing a new data model and user interface. Another area of weakness was the limited amount of digitized content published outside the United States and in languages other than English. We needed to build new partnerships that would enable us to digitize more international and non-English-language film magazines and better represent film history's global reach.

To address these shortcomings and enhance the MHDL, we applied to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Digital Extension Grant program, which was ideally suited for our project and needs. Supported by the Mellon Foundation, this ACLS program sought to take projects that were already doing good work and make them stronger, more effective, and more available to a broader public. After obtaining the grant in 2020, we were able to significantly improve our database and user interface—achieving a far more integrated, efficient, and sustainable data model, as well as a more stable and user-friendly public-facing design. The most ambitious component of our grant proposal, however, was to globalize the MHDL's collections. To achieve that goal, we assembled a Global Cinema History Task Force—a group of a dozen scholars who could identify important non-US film publications, investigate their locations and copyright statuses, and analyze the magazines for their historical significance (see the chapters that follow). The Task Force members possessed expertise in Portuguese, Spanish,

Mandarin, Japanese, Russian, French, Italian, German, and Hindi languages, cultures, and cinemas. Although we recognized that not all the works identified by Task Force members would be able to be scanned (for reasons of availability and copyright), we were confident that we would be able to add at least several international film magazines to the collection.

Within our research network, the Task Force members came to serve as crucial bridge nodes—connecting the MHDL to archives and libraries around the world. The Task Force mobilized their decades of pursuing basic research, and the relationships they had developed with librarians and archivists, toward helping the MHDL team achieve our applied research goals. Several Task Force members helped us obtain permission from libraries to obtain digital files of magazines that had already been scanned, and then put these digital copies through our post-production and indexing systems, making them accessible within the MHDL while including attribution to the original source. For example, Italian cinema scholar and Task Force member Daniela Treveri Gennari facilitated a productive collaboration between the MHDL and the Biblioteca Luigi Chiarini del Centro Sperimentale di Cinematografia. As a result, we were able to add six Italian film periodicals to the MHDL: *Lo schermo*, *Film d'oggi*, *Cinema illustrazione*, *Bianco e Nero*, *Star*, and *La critica cinematografica*. Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh, Belinda Qian He, and Darrell Davis all generously shared scanned Chinese movie magazine files with us. And Michael Cowan helped us add the German film industry's first two trade papers, *Der Kinematograph* and *Die Lichtbild-Bühne*, to the collections with the permission of the Mikrofilmarchiv der deutschsprachigen Presse. All in all, by utilizing the model of consent, file sharing, and post-production, we added hundreds of thousands of pages of non-English-language movie magazines to the MHDL.

Alongside the post-production and indexing of previously scanned magazines, we sought out new collaborative digitization arrangements with libraries and archives. Three of our Task Force members—Rielle Navitski, Laura Isabel Serna, and Nicolas Poppe—are experts in Latin American film history. They knew from their research that the New York Public Library (NYPL) held an impressive physical collection of Spanish-language movie magazines. We began talking with the staff in 2020 about ways we could work together to scan them once the library fully reopened after the COVID-19 shutdown. We identified three Spanish-language film magazines, all published within the US, as being out-of-copyright and excellent candidates for digitization: *Cinelandia* (1924–47), *Teatro al día* (1936–39), and *Empresario Internacional* (1940–41) (see figure 0.3). We made arrangements with the NYPL to scan all three magazines. We were also pleased to collaborate with the Cinémathèque française on the scanning of *Le Courrier cinématographique* (1911–37), an early and important French film industry trade paper.

By the end of the ACLS grant funding period, we had tripled the number of non-English-language digitized magazines within the MHDL's collections. This milestone was achieved through collaborations and the blend of basic research



FIGURE 0.3. On the front cover of this 1941 issue of *Empresario Internacional*, scanned in cooperation with the New York Public Library, Olivia de Havilland poses with an earlier issue of the magazine featuring fellow Warner Bros. star Ida Lupino.

and applied research discussed earlier. In their chapters in this book, Daniela Treveri Gennari, Darrell Davis, and Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh share their work locating and scanning important publications from Italy, China, and Taiwan. Their experiences show the value of collaborative and hybrid research models. But they also serve as reminders of the uneven landscape of digital collections. Despite our best efforts, some nations and regions remain much better represented within the MHDL than others, and, even when they are represented, it's not always by the most influential or potentially revealing publications. This book, then, attempts to level the field by shedding light on magazines that are now freely available online, alongside magazines that are undigitized and difficult to access within the US. Whether utilizing digitized or paper-based sources, however, the book's authors always place the magazines they discuss within broader historical contexts and debates. In doing so, they generate new knowledge about dozens of significant movie magazines and model the possibilities for future research in this field.

BOOK STRUCTURE AND CHAPTER DESCRIPTIONS

The twenty chapters that follow offer a guide to significant global movie magazines, the process for researching them, and the histories they reveal. This book is not a complete and exhaustive catalog of every movie magazine ever published across world history. Such a project would require thousands of chapters given the sheer number of publications, many short lived (indeed, we could fill a multivolume anthology with film zines that published only a handful of issues). And, even if it were possible to generate a comprehensive encyclopedia of all international movie magazines, the end result would miss much of what the authors in this book show to be most fascinating and significant: the way the publications function as nodes—connecting industries, cinephilic communities, fans—and necessarily direct our attention to institutions and events that play out far beyond their pages. Thus, we have organized the chapters that follow into four sections, thematically grouped to highlight continuities and differences among the magazines and the communities to which they spoke, across time and space.

Section One: Hybrid Journals

One of the major findings of this book (and the theme of the first section of chapters) is that genre hybridity, in terms of both the content and readership of film magazines, was commonplace rather than exceptional. In earlier US-centered conceptions of film periodicals, scholars—ourselves included—have frequently emphasized distinctions between trade publications and fan magazines. When we explore movie magazines globally, however, those neat divisions fall away.

Eric Smoodin explores a magazine that responded to local, national, and international spheres in his chapter on *Pour Vous* (1928–40). Firmly rooted in Paris—the magazine systematically published a complete listing of films playing in the

city by neighborhood and by theater each week—*Pour Vous* also covered trends in international cinema. The life of the magazine, Smoodin shows, was also intimately linked to the nation's technological and political culture, beginning in 1928 with the fraught shift from silent to sound cinema and ending in 1940 with the fall of the Third Republic and the fascist takeover of the country.

In her analysis of the daily trade paper *filmindia* (1935–85), Darshana Mini shows how editor Baburao Patel cultivated a heterogeneous readership that included exhibitors in search of information about Hollywood releases, fans craving tabloid coverage of their favorite stars, and cinephiles looking for film reviews. The magazine's identity was also "hybrid" in its pan-Indian and transnational readership, as well as in its contradictory discourses on nationalism and anticolonialism.

Other magazines derive their hybrid identity through attention to multiple forms of entertainment and through the need to please fans and government authorities alike. In her essay on the South Korean entertainment monthly *The Delight* (1956–92), Chung-kang Kim emphasizes the role of magazines in that nation's postwar drive for national reconstruction, economic development, and universal education. The magazine's success, she argues, depended heavily on its wide-ranging coverage of film, radio, music, theater, the popular novel, sports, and cartoon strips, as well as its capacity to satisfy the desires of its popular readership while also adhering to repressive government policies of the 1950s and '60s.

The Iranian magazine *Setāreh-ye Sinemā* (*Cinema Star*, 1954–present) is the focus of the essay by Kaveh Askari and Babak Tabarraee. Respected for its film reviews, the magazine was also criticized for its pinups and attention to low-budget genre films known as *filmfārsi*. Askari and Tabarraee describe the magazine's distinctive editorial voice, its collage aesthetic, and its commitment to film criticism and news about technology. Their essay reveals the tensions "between the critical reception of local productions and imports, and between popular fan service and the intellectual commitments of critics and filmmakers whose careers were incubated at the journal."

Paul Moore explores a different kind of hybridity in film journalism in his analysis of syndicated weekly film fan magazines distributed as supplements to Sunday newspapers in the United States. The supplements, which started in the teens and survived downturns in the circulation of freestanding magazines in the post-Depression era, circulated existing gossip columns, gravure portraits, serial stories, and local advertising.

Belinda Qian He sheds light on the intermedial and dynamic play between cinema and print media in her analysis of Chinese film publications.²³ Ranging from film journals, newsletters, and modernist literary magazines to glossy entertainment magazines and fanzines, these periodicals "defy simple differentiation and categorization, do more than cater to industry professionals and communities, and should not be viewed in isolation." Focusing on the use of still images in

film magazines, and on the transformation of news into cinema, He demonstrates the necessity of considering both the material and discursive elements of film periodicals.

Section Two: Film Cultures, Critics, and Circuits

Movie magazines constitute global networks that participate in the construction of film cultures and the exchange of information and ideas about cinema. This section explores the transnational circulation of films and ideas between Latin America and Europe, the links between film culture and science, and the engagement with film history and contemporary film culture in France, Japan, and Taiwan.

Rielle Navitski explores the wave of film society magazines that appeared in Latin America from the late 1940s through the late 1960s. She focuses on publications such as Uruguay's *Cine Club* (1948–52) and Argentina's *Gente de Cine* (1951–57), revealing that they “sought to transcend the novelty-driven coverage of newspapers and fan magazines while serving as a point of contact between like-minded cinephiles at home and abroad.” More broadly, Navitski points to the important role of film magazines in the circulation of global art cinema and the transnational fostering of cinephilia, as well as their transformations in the 1960s due to shifts in leftist political culture.

Michael Cowan invites us to think broadly about the “technologies, practices, and social imaginaries” with which cinema is associated in various eras. In his analysis of the German journal *Film und Lichtbild* (1912–14), Cowan explores the cultural links between cinema and amateur science. The journal rejected an alarmist stance on cinema, positioning film instead as a “new branch of optical technology” with educational, scientific, and amateur uses. *Film und Lichtbild*, he reveals, served as a nodal point within a larger network of readers interested in the scientific applications of cinema and other optical projection media.

Kelley Conway asserts the vitality and diversity of film culture in post–World War II France, focusing on *Cinéma*, the monthly magazine of the French Federation of Ciné-Clubs. The publication, which existed from 1954 to 1999, had multiple functions and audiences. It was committed to providing information about film history to the *animateurs* and members of its ciné-clubs, while also tracking the vicissitudes of the contemporary French film industry. Focusing on the 1950s, Conway excavates the magazine's month-by-month account of the New Wave as it emerged, as well as its sophisticated contributions to film historiography from figures such as Lotte Eisner and Georges Sadoul.

Rachel Gabara explores the birth of Black African and Black French-authored film history and criticism in her analysis of three publications: *Présence Africaine*, *La Vie Africaine*, and *L'Afrique actuelle*. These African-owned and Paris-based and -edited publications, studied here from 1957 to 1967, bridge the period just prior to and following the independence of France's African colonies. Gabara

excavates the writing and editorial work of D'dée, the Paris-born son of Martinican parents who was a writer, artist, bebop dancer, and collaborator of Boris Vian. She also sheds new light on the early writings of Paulin Soumanou Vieyra, who would later be at the epicenter of Senegalese film and broadcasting. These publications covered the rare African films that already existed and called for the promotion and development of a truly African cinema.

Naoki Yamamoto analyzes the impact of three Japanese film journals—*Kikan firumu*, *Shinema* 69, and *Eiga hihiyō*—during a turbulent period in Japanese politics and cinema in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The journals underwent a discursive shift, focusing on expanded cinema and video art, French post-structuralism, far-left radicalism, Third World politics, and a reconsideration of the auteur theory. Moving beyond the simple geopolitical divide between the West and the rest, Yamamoto shows that Japanese film journals of this period revitalized both film criticism and film theory and had a profound impact on the emergence of alternative cinema.

James Udden's analysis of the quarterly Taiwanese journal *Film Appreciation* (1983–present) reveals the constraints and possibilities experienced by a journal originating from a government-run film archive, the Taiwan Film and Audiovisual Institute (formerly the National Film Archive). While the journal did not participate in the robust debates around Taiwan's New Cinema movement found in other publications, its staying power and in-depth analyses—produced well after fiery debates had cooled—render it essential for scholars of Taiwanese cinema.

Section Three: Intermediaries of State, Region, and Media

This section foregrounds the multiple and occasionally contradictory positions film magazines hold regarding their relationship to state and region. Magazines can serve as the mouthpiece of a political regime, yet also convey concrete information about the workings of a film industry. Movie magazines can promote commercial goods, yet also serve as a vibrant meeting place for diasporic communities. And film magazines can promote national stars and films, yet influence international film culture.

Maria Belodubrovskaya focuses on a publication tightly linked to the state: the weekly Soviet newspaper *Kino* (1923–41). The mouthpiece of Soviet state cinema authorities, *Kino* always devoted at least one page in each issue to accounts of official government business. But its articles on feature-production planning and execution, distribution, and exhibition, and its screenplay drafts and proposals, provide an invaluable portrait of industry concerns and developments. An effort to fully digitize the newspaper for readers outside of Russia is underway. Belodubrovskaya reveals that *Kino* is a “rich and almost entirely unexplored repository of information on discourses, images, personalities, activities, institutions, and issues of the time” and “has the potential to generate many new research questions about both Russian culture and transnational cinema.”

Laura Isabel Serna explores a film magazine's role in fostering mutually beneficial relationships between North and South America in her analysis of *Cine-Mundial* (1916–48), which was published in Spanish by New York's Chalmers Publishing Company. *Cine-Mundial* functioned as a “mouthpiece for a consumer culture based on the consumption of goods produced in the United States” but also intersected in surprising ways with the “transatlantic and hemispheric movement of intellectuals and journalists,” providing a refuge and meeting point for members of the Spanish-language press in New York City.

The influence of movie magazines on the development of local film culture in the face of Hollywood competition is the subject of Nicolas Poppe's contribution. Focusing on *Radiolandia*, one of a constellation of new fan magazines in 1930s Argentina, Poppe explores how local stars of cinema and radio such as Floren Delbene came into focus and helped popularize Argentine cinema in the early sound period.

Vincent Fröhlich's analysis of an East German film magazine, the illustrated popular monthly *Neue Filmwelt* (1947–53), reveals the impact of political volatility on the life of a publication. Using quantitative and rhetorical analysis, Fröhlich shows how text and image work together, initially to remind readers of a positive pre-National Socialist German film culture and to celebrate the films of many national cinemas, before shifting decisively to Soviet propaganda, a celebration of Stalin, and an emphasis on films of the Eastern Bloc. Popular illustrated film magazines, Fröhlich argues, have been neglected by scholars but are fascinatingly “multimodal” and “polyphonic” in their discourse. With his mix of methodologies, including quantitative research, qualitative techniques, and data visualizations, Fröhlich's chapter also serves as a bridge to our final set of chapters.

Section Four: Data, Curation, and Historiography

The chapters in this final section reflect on the opportunities and challenges that digitization and digital tools pose for analyzing the magazines as historical sources.

The historically unequal relationship between media industries in adjacent nations can affect the availability of sources, as Paul Moore shows in his study of Canadian film journals. Canada's film trade news was routinely reported in US entertainment trade papers and, for those seeking information today on the history of the Canadian film industry, US sources are more accessible and searchable than Canadian sources. To research his essay for this collection, Moore sought access to *Canadian Film Weekly* at the HathiTrust Digital Library, a resource available to many university researchers in the US but geo-blocked to researchers in Canada. Moore explores the legacy of editor Hye Bossin, a staunch defender of the Canadian film industry, who was also beholden to the goodwill of Hollywood distributors for advertising revenue. As Moore reveals, Bossin was also the architect of an analog database: his *Year Book of the Canadian Motion Picture Industry* (1951–70) helped address the Canadian film industry's information management needs.

Like Moore, Daniela Treveri Gennari explores the data available to researchers within film industry trade publications. She draws our attention to the recent digitization of a wide range of Italian popular movie magazines, as well as the omission of a key Italian trade paper, *Giornale dello Spettacolo*. The journal, a rich source of data on film distribution and exhibition in Italy, is so “granular” that “it has no equal across the rest of Europe.” Treveri Gennari’s essay invites readers to consider the vast number of primary sources, and information within them, that are underutilized even in the era of digitization.

Digitization and optical character recognition also transform magazines into completely different kinds of data that can be computationally analyzed. In “Searching for Similarity,” coauthors Eric Hoyt, Ben Pettis, Lesley Stevenson, and Sam Hansen apply similarity detection algorithms to US film industry papers. During the 1920s, *Exhibitor’s Trade Review*, *Exhibitors Herald*, *Moving Picture World*, and *Motion Picture News* all emphasized their distinctiveness, strenuously denying allegations that they all merely reprinted the same press releases. By applying computational methods to the digitized texts, we can see patterns of language reuse that allow us to read the trade papers—and trends within them—in new ways.

Finally, in their chapter on curating 1920s Chinese film history, Emilie Yuehyu Yeh and Darrell Davis write about the process of choosing and searching key sources in early Chinese-language film history while distinguishing between three distinct sources of film history: periodicals, catalogs, and book-length publications. The result is not a triumphant narrative, but a “partial, accidental, and provisional” account of “setbacks due to bureaucracy, the pandemic, and even avarice.” Yeh and Davis’s chapter is a reminder that many valuable primary sources remain offline to researchers.

To help guide readers toward the historic magazines that they can immediately access online, our book concludes with an appendix, rich in hyperlinks, listing the dozens of global movie magazines currently available within the MHDL. For each magazine, the appendix includes key metadata fields (e.g., title, publisher, nation/location, date span, and more), as well as brief descriptions. Stable hyperlinks associated with each unique magazine point toward the corresponding MHDL catalog records, providing access to all of the digitized issues for a particular publication. The result is that the book ends with what we hope will be the beginning of countless new research projects.

A common thread across many of the chapters is the importance of understanding the magazines’ materiality. Their size, weight, paper quality, and color tones demand our attention, alongside the manifestos, star profiles, and film reviews that more frequently capture the eyes of film historians. If digitization has the unfortunate effect of flattening those material traces, then we must also recognize the rich experiences that it opens up: new possibilities for juxtaposition, search, and access. When approached with curiosity and collaboration, our new network of digital connections draws our attention to figures like “The Brother

Overseas,” aka “Poison Pete” Harrison, revealing the intellectual and cultural networks that were there all along.

NOTES

1. Baburao Patel, “The Brother Overseas,” *filmindia*, May 1938, 1, https://lantern.mediahist.org/catalog/filmindia193804unse_0013.
2. The first issue of *Harrison’s Reports* was published in the summer of 1919. P. S. Harrison, “To All Exhibitors,” *Harrison’s Reports*, July 5, 1919, 1.
3. Eric Hoyt, *Ink-Stained Hollywood: The Triumph of American Cinema’s Trade Press* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2022), 92–98, <https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.122>.
4. “Poison Pete” referenced in Arthur James, *Exhibitors Daily Review*, December 1, 1928, 1, https://lantern.mediahist.org/catalog/exhibio1exhi_0539.
5. Galo Pando, “Chismes y Cuentos,” *Cinelandia*, September 1934, 55, https://lantern.mediahist.org/catalog/cinelandia-1934-09_0047.
6. “Los Tigres Voladores” [Advertisement], *Cine-Mundial*, March 1943, 92, https://lantern.mediahist.org/catalog/cinemundial28unse_0012.
7. *Harrison’s Reports* published its final issue on September 1, 1962. D. Richard Baer, “Preface,” *Harrison’s Reports and Film Reviews, 1919–1922*, vol. 1 (Hollywood: Hollywood Film Archive, 1991), iv.
8. Daniel Biltereyst and Lies Van de Vijver, “Introduction: Movie Magazines, Digitization and New Cinema History,” in *Mapping Movie Magazines: Digitization, Periodicals and Cinema History*, ed. Lies Van de Vijver and Daniel Biltereyst (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 2.
9. For more on new cinema history, see Daniel Biltereyst, Richard Maltby, and Philippe Meers, eds., *The Routledge Companion to New Cinema History* (New York: Routledge, 2019).
10. Eric Smoodin, “The History of Film History,” in *Looking Past the Screen: Case Studies in American Film History*, ed. Jon Lewis and Eric Smoodin (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 2.
11. Kathryn H. Fuller, *At the Picture Show: Small-Town Audiences and the Creation of Movie Fan Culture* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001); Anthony Slide, *Inside the Hollywood Fan Magazine* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010); Tamar Jeffers McDonald and Lies Lanckman, eds., *Star Attractions: Twentieth-Century Movie Magazines and Global Fandom* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2019).
12. Hoyt, *Ink-Stained Hollywood*; Kathryn Fuller-Seeley, “‘What the Picture Did for Me’: Small Town Exhibitors and the Great Depression,” in *Hollywood in the Neighborhood: Historical Case Studies of Local Moviegoing*, ed. Kathryn Fuller-Seeley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 186–207; Richard L. Stromgren, “The Moving Picture World of W. Stephen Bush,” *Film History* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1988): 13–22; Gregory A. Waller, “Projecting the Promise of 16mm, 1935–1945,” in *Useful Cinema*, ed. Charles R. Acland and Haidee Wasson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2011), 125–48.
13. Biltereyst and Van de Vijver, “Introduction,” 2.
14. Tamar Jeffers McDonald and Lies Lanckman, eds., *Star Attractions: Twentieth-Century Movie Magazines and Global Fandom* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2019).
15. Eric Hoyt and Kelley Conway, “Globalizing and Enhancing an Open Project: The Media History Digital Library in the 2020s,” *NECSUS*, (Spring 2024), <https://necsus-ejms.org/open-scholarship-a-portfolio-on-funding-globalising-and-enhancing/>.
16. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, eds., *Cinema and Nation* (London: Routledge, 2000); Nataša Đurovičová and Kathleen Newman, eds., *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2010).
17. Rosalind Galt and Karl Schoonover, eds., *Global Art Cinema: New Theories and Histories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

18. Saverio Giovacchini and Robert Sklar, eds., *Global Neorealism: The Transnational History of a Film Style* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012); James Tweedie, *The Age of New Waves: Art Cinema and the Staging of Globalization* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
19. Mette Hjort, *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
20. Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden, eds., *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
21. James P. Cunningham, "Foreign Service," *The Film Daily*, April 7, 1929, 12, https://lantern.mediahist.org/catalog/filmdaily4748newy_0874.
22. For more on the development of Lantern and the Media History Digital Library, see Eric Hoyt, "Building a Lantern and Keeping It Burning," in *Applied Media Studies*, ed. Kirsten Osther (New York: Routledge, 2017): 238–50.
23. These periodicals include film trade journals; serial publications from film production companies; *wenyi* (letters and art) periodicals concerning cinema's connection to other arts and media such as drama, literature, opera, photography, broadcasting, and performing arts; and film-specific columns in newspapers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Journal Articles, Dissertations, and Reports

- Acland, Charles R., and Eric Hoyt, eds. *The Arclight Guidebook to Media History and the Digital Humanities*. Falmer, UK: REFRAME/Project Arclight, 2016. <http://projectarclight.org/book>.
- Askari, Kaveh. *Relaying Cinema in Midcentury Iran: Material Cultures in Transit*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022.
- Baer, D. Richard. "Preface." In *Harrison's Reports and Film Reviews, 1919–1922, vol. 1*. Hollywood: Hollywood Film Archive, 1991.
- Biltereyst, Daniel, Richard Maltby, and Philippe Meers, eds. *The Routledge Companion to New Cinema History*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Biltereyst, Daniel, and Lies Van de Vijver. "Introduction: Movie Magazines, Digitization and New Cinema History." In *Mapping Movie Magazines: Digitization, Periodicals and Cinema History*, edited by Lies Van de Vijver and Daniel Biltereyst. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Đurovičová, Nataša, and Kathleen Newman, eds. *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Ezra, Elizabeth, and Terry Rowden, eds. *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Fuller, Kathryn H. *At the Picture Show: Small-Town Audiences and the Creation of Movie Fan Culture*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Fuller-Seeley, Kathryn. "Dish Night at the Movies: Exhibitors and Female Audiences during the Great Depression." In *Looking Past the Screen: Case Studies in American Film History and Method*, edited by Jon Lewis and Eric Smoodin, 246–49. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Galt, Rosalind, and Karl Schoonover, eds. *Global Art Cinema: New Theories and Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Giovacchini, Saverio, and Robert Sklar, eds. *Global Neorealism: The Transnational History of a Film Style*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012.
- Hjort, Mette. *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Hjort, Mette, and Scott MacKenzie, eds. *Cinema and Nation*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Hoyt, Eric. "Building a Lantern and Keeping It Burning." In *Applied Media Studies*, edited by Kirsten Osther, 238–50. New York: Routledge, 2017.

- . *Ink-Stained Hollywood: The Triumph of American Cinema's Trade Press*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.122>.
- Hoyt, Eric, and Kelley Conway. "Globalizing and Enhancing an Open Project: The Media History Digital Library in the 2020s." *NECSUS* (Spring 2024). <https://necsus-ejms.org/open-scholarship-a-portfolio-on-funding-globalising-and-enhancing/>.
- McDonald, Tamar Jeffers, and Lies Lackman, eds. *Star Attractions: Twentieth-Century Movie Magazines and Global Fandom*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2019.
- Salazkina, Masha. *World Socialist Cinema: Alliances, Affinities, and Solidarities in the Global Cold War*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.154>.
- Slide, Anthony. *Inside the Hollywood Fan Magazine*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.
- Smoodin, Eric. "The History of Film History." In *Looking Past the Screen: Case Studies in American Film History*, edited by Jon Lewis and Eric Smoodin. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Stromgren, Richard L. "The Moving Picture World of W. Stephen Bush." *Film History* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1988): 13–22.
- Sunya, Samhita. *Sirens of Modernity: World Cinema via Bombay*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.130>.
- Tweedie, James. *The Age of New Waves: Art Cinema and the Staging of Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Waller, Gregory A. "Imagining and Promoting the Small-Town Theater." *Cinema Journal* 44, no. 3 (2005): 3–19.

Film and Entertainment Industry Trade Papers

Bianco e Nero
Boxoffice
Cahiers du cinéma
Canadian Film Weekly
Cine Club
Cinelandia
Cinéma
Cinema illustrazione
Cine-Mundial
The Daily Film Renter
The Delight
Der Kinematograph
Die Lichtbild-Bühne
Eiga hihyō
Empresario Internacional
Exhibitors Herald
Exhibitor's Trade Review
Film Appreciation
The Film Daily
Film d'oggi
Film und Lichtbild
Gente de Cine
Giornale dello spettacolo
Harrison's Reports
Heraldo del cinematografista
Kikan firumu

Kino

La Cinématographie française

La critica cinematografica

La Vie Africaine

Le Courrier cinématographique

Life

Lo schermo

Motion Picture Herald

Motion Picture News

Moving Picture World

Neue Filmwelt

Photoplay

Pour Vous

Présence Africaine

Radiolandia

Screen

Setāreh-ye Sinemā

Shinema 69

Star

Teatro al día

Variety