

**THE EFFECT OF CENSORSHIP ON AMERICAN FILM ADAPTATIONS OF
SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS**

A Thesis

by

RUTH ANN ALFRED

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2008

Major Subject: English

**THE EFFECT OF CENSORSHIP ON AMERICAN FILM ADAPTATIONS OF
SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS**

A Thesis

by

RUTH ANN ALFRED

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Douglas Brooks
Committee Members,	Anne Morey Arnold Krammer
Head of Department,	M. Jimmie Killingsworth

May 2008

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

The Effect of Censorship on American Film Adaptations of
Shakespearean Plays. (May 2008)

Ruth Ann Alfred, B.A., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Douglas Brooks

From July 1, 1934, to November 1, 1968, the Production Code Administration (PCA) oversaw the creation of American motion pictures, in order to improve Hollywood's moral standing. To assist in this endeavor, the studios produced film adaptations of classic literature, such as the plays of William Shakespeare. In the first two years of the Code's inception, two Shakespearean films were produced by major studios: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1935) and *Romeo and Juliet* (1936). But were these classic adaptations able to avoid the censorship that other films endured? With the use of archived collections, film viewings, and an in-depth analysis of the plays, multiple versions of the scripts, and other available surviving documents, I was able to see how these productions were affected by the enforcement of film censorship and what it said about the position of Shakespeare's work in society.

A Midsummer Night's Dream tended to use self-regulation, so as to avoid the censorship of the PCA. However, the film did not escape without some required changes. In spite of the filmmakers' efforts, there were a few textual changes and the fairy costumes required revisions to meet the PCA's standards.

In the case of *Romeo and Juliet*, the PCA was far more involved in all stages of the film's production. There were many documented text changes and even a case in which the censors objected to how the actors and director executed a scene on film. The motion picture was created as if it were of the greatest importance by all involved. And, as it were, the existing archives paint a picture of a production that was a sort of battleground in a sociopolitical war between the censors and the filmmakers.

As both films arrived on the international stage, this sociopolitical campaigning did not end. During international distribution, the films were each accepted, rejected, and forced to endure further censorship, in order to become acceptable for public screening. This censorship often relayed a message about the location's societal views and its contrast to American society.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother, Dorothy, who has always encouraged me in my endeavors and kept my supply of smiles well-stocked.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis represents a great many (too many) months of research, writing, and rewriting, as I pursued the elusive Master's degree. Having finally reached my goal, it is now appropriate to acknowledge those who helped to make this possible. First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Douglas Brooks, and my committee members, Dr. Anne Morey and Dr. Arnold Krammer, for their guidance, patience, and support throughout the course of this research.

Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the faculty and staff of the English department for making my time at Texas A&M University a wonderful experience. I also wish to extend my gratitude to the staff of the Margaret Herrick Library. Their immeasurable assistance was greatly appreciated. Special thanks go to my two dear friends Lubecca Long, who listened to me talk about my frustrations until I was practically blue in the face, and Maya Scott, who spent many nights walking with me on the track while I reasoned through my research (and yet, magically, never lost a pound).

Finally, thanks to my family for their love and encouragement. James, Elizabeth, Randy, Joe, Brian, Joshua, Carrie, Little James, Kathy, Mary, and Nanny, you are what kept me going when I started to lose hope. And Mom, words can't describe what your love and support mean to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
II THE PRODUCTION CODE	6
III <i>A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM</i> AND SELF-REGULATION.....	11
IV <i>ROMEO AND JULIET</i> AND ORGANIZATIONAL CENSORSHIP.	19
V CONCLUSION	31
NOTES	36
WORKS CITED.....	39
VITA	45

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		Page
1	Production Code Seal of Approval.....	4
2	Fairy Costumes.....	13
3	Bedroom Scene	29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of nickelodeons, working-class citizens were entertained for five cents a show. Similar to the peep shows of the early twentieth century, the nickelodeons provided visual entertainment for the masses. The content of these films consisted mainly of parades, carnival acts, dances, and so forth. But it was the addition of storylines to films that brought so-called indecent material, such as violence and sexuality, to the motion pictures and attracted a more diverse audience. D.W. Griffith's *The Birth of a Nation* (1915), for instance, appealed to the middle and upper class. However, the religious conservatives, also members of the middle class, objected to the violence incited by the film.

When sound was added to films in the late 1920s, the film industry became increasingly pressured by religious groups to censor the content of motion pictures. Movies, such as *The Jazz Singer* (1927), directed by Alan Crosland, used the intonations of actors to incorporate sexuality into its songs (Walsh 47). And the persuasive and indiscriminately seductive nature of these films appealed to audiences. At the end of the First World War, society, especially its younger members, began to revolt against social standards of behavior and taste. Women cut their hair, smoked in public, went joy riding, and wore clothes that were much shorter and tended to expose their legs and knees. It was a time when jazz music gained popularity, which led to new dances, such

This thesis follows the style of *Film Criticism*.

as the Charleston. Prohibition was in effect but alcohol was produced and made available in major cities by the local gangsters, who also gained popularity and sometimes achieved stardom during this age. Hollywood also gained tremendous popularity during this period and knew how to keep its audience. Stars, such as Mary Pickford, Charlie Chaplin, and sexy Clara Bow, became world famous and, in many cases, were considered more important than their films. The majority of American society had embraced a new sense of “freedom,” where sexuality was openly displayed and the people were enthralled by criminal behavior. And the film industry capitalized on these public interests by including them within multiple films, which were well-received by most audiences. It was this wide appeal that raised concerns for the Catholic moralists.

In 1934, Father Daniel A. Lord, a Professor of Dramatics at the University of St. Louis and editor of *The Queen's Work*, a religious magazine that focused significant attention on motion pictures, examined 133 films released by the leading producers. Lord objected to several counts of indecent material. Citing premarital sex, seduction, rape, attempted incest, and adultery on his list, Lord believed that audience members would be corrupted by the immorality. The gangster films of the early 1930s, for example, glamorized the criminal lifestyle and showed the methods for crime and murder in detail. This led Lord to create a Catholic movie code. Incorporating his Catholic beliefs and conservative political views, the movie code specifically stated that “crime need not always be punished, as long as the audience is made to know that it is wrong” (Black 13). The Catholic movie codes shaped twentieth-century films into

morality plays, clearly distinguishing good from bad for the masses.

The idea that films should not reinforce deviant behavior was emphasized by the Legion of Decency. Formed in 1934, the National Legion of Decency consisted of conservative Catholics who boycotted films believed to be morally objectionable. The legion wanted the church, government, and family represented in the best light possible. Conservative Catholic, Martin Quigley, agreed with this philosophy and formed the *Motion Picture Herald*, a journal that promoted film morality. Quigley argued that the film industry, not the government, needed to regulate itself. Self-regulation would eliminate the censurable material during production, so that the final film contained no immorality.

The Supreme Court's unanimous ruling, regarding the 1915 case of *Mutual Film Corporation v. Industrial Commission of Ohio*, that films were not protected by freedom of speech, struck fear into the film industry. The message was clear: if Hollywood did not take steps to tame the subject matter included in their films, the government would do it for them. Hoping to avoid the alternative, the industry chose to adopt Quigley's approach of self-regulation and, in 1922, appointed William Harrison Hays to clean up the content of Hollywood films, as the first President of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association of America, which became the Motion Picture Association of America in 1945. Hays' position as Postmaster General in President Harding's cabinet and his affiliation with the Republican National Committee made him the most qualified candidate. Hays was a Presbyterian and quickly embraced Father Lord's Catholic movie codes, creating the Production Code, which was adopted on March 31,

1930. However, the code was not effectively enforced until an amendment to the code was adopted on June 13, 1934, establishing the Production Code Administration (PCA), which was headed by Joseph I. Breen until his retirement in 1954. This amendment required all films to obtain a certificate of approval from the PCA before being released (see fig. 1).



Fig. 1. Production Code Seal of Approval. When Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was released in 1935, this image of accreditation was included in the opening credits of the film, as verification of its compliance with the Production Code. By the following year, the seal, along with a motion picture's assigned certificate number, was reduced in size and appeared at the bottom of the screen within the opening credits.

The Motion Picture Production Code era, which regulated Hollywood film

productions from July 1, 1934, to November 1, 1968, can be separated into two segments of time: the 1930s and 1940s stage and the 1950s and 1960s stage. Although the Code allowed more freedom for filmmakers in the 50s and 60s, during the 30s and 40s, the Code was strictly enforced by the Hays office. The Code didn't simply suggest the use of moral discretion when including possibly controversial subject matter in a film, as "The Don'ts and Be Carefuls" did upon their creation in 1927. Instead, they laid out exactly what was considered permissible behavior and the topics that were looked down upon. Although the elements of the 1927 restrictions were enforced more loosely than those of the 1930s, most of the old rules from the original regulations were included in the new version. There were also additional rules incorporated in the Code.

Hays, at every chance he could, sought to protect the film industry's integrity and block the approval of proposals desiring governmental control. One way Hays protected the industry was by submitting an annual report entitled *Plans and Programs of Motion Picture Production* to the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc. (MPPDA).¹ The purpose of the report was to announce the upcoming productions and inform the industry of the progress made towards raising its morality status. The alliance between Hollywood and religious organizations thus prevented government regulation of indecent behavior and maintained audience appeal, resulting in Hollywood's economic gain. The content of films, however, suffered enormously, presenting a warped or sometimes "sugar coated" version of reality to the audience.

CHAPTER II

THE PRODUCTION CODE

While the Production Code and the Hays office were eventually embraced as the saving graces of the film industry, they were not originally so well received. As a result of the vast changes that took place in the American societal landscape of the 1920s, Hollywood began mass-producing films that included subject matter which was currently of interest to the viewing public. Many of these films included supposed immoral themes at their core, such as criminal activity, religious contempt, and sexuality. And while some members of the public cried out for an improvement in the moral tone of motion pictures, many of these so-called immoral films were box office darlings. Thus, due to their success, it was permissible to produce similar films that barely toed the line of current societal moral standards.

It is important to note that these complaints about immorality were not merely disregarded by the film industry. In fact, a few attempts were made to develop a censorship process before one was successfully created. The first endeavor to regulate the content of films occurred in June of 1924 with the implementation of an official declaration known as the "Formula." This statement dealt solely with the issue of adaptation and discouraged any efforts to create films from books or plays of a scandalous nature. In 1927, a code was compiled, based on the results of a study of the state and foreign censor boards' activities over many years. This code, known as the "Don'ts and Be Carefuls," was assembled to assist in the production of films by plainly

stating which items were not permissible elements of a motion picture and which subjects should be treated with great care. Finally, in 1930, Hays presented the more elaborate Production Code that included elements from both the “Formula” and the “Don’ts and Be Carefuls” while also adding more specific restriction to the Code and a section that addresses particular applications of these policies. It was this Code, along with a few added amendments over the years, which determined the content of American films from 1934 to 1968.

The censorship of motion pictures occurred during all stages of the filmmaking process and included both formal and informal elements, such as self-censorship. A film production always starts with the development of a story. Thus, censorship also began with the story and had the greatest impact on the script, as the plot regulations were quite rigid. Under the confines of the Production Code, a plot was not allowed to indisputably side with evil over good or even present evil in an appealing or sympathetic manner (Martin 276). Comedies were not allowed to mock purity, morality, or anything considered good. And the plot had to be constructed so the difference between right and wrong was unquestionable.

These general restrictions alone eliminated many possible stories. However, the Code continued on to address the issue of films that fit within the genre of “serious film drama.” Within this section, it is acknowledged that sin fits within two categories: sin that “repels,” such as lying, hypocrisy, and most legal crimes, and sin that “attracts,” such as daring thefts, revenge, and sins of a sexual nature (276). And if these films were presented to an “adult only” audience, then the themes were deemed appropriate (277).

But the Code emphasized the need to carefully handle the attractive type of sin, since these sins can easily elicit a positive response (276).

The Code then shifts to a rather lengthy and detailed section on sexually related issues. Under the previously stated stipulations that such a film would be a “serious drama” for “adults only”, a love triangle, where one of the individuals is married, was deemed permissible as long as it was handled with care and did not endanger the sanctity of the home or sexual morals (277). Adultery was not considered a permissible subject for a comedy, however it was allowed within a “serious drama” as long as it did not appear justified, weaken respect for marriage, or was presented in an appealing manner (277).

Another sensitive subject that was addressed was the issue of rape and seduction. They were generally regarded as bad subject matter for a film but were permitted if they were absolutely necessary. However, they should never be included as a means of comedy and never more than suggested within the story (277-278). In fact, it is specifically stated that the preceding struggle was never to be shown (278). And the methods of seduction were never to be shown in detail for fear that it might wrongfully arouse the emotions of the audience (278). As far as scenes of passion are concerned, the Code acknowledged that sometimes these scenes were important to the plot but they should appear only when vital and not merely as an “added stimulus” (278).

The Production Code then delves further into the issue of sexuality by addressing the issue of sexual immorality. Again it admits that such subject matter is sometimes essential to the plot but expresses the moral reasons behind this minimalist preference by

stating that the “presentation of scenes, episodes, plots, etc., which are deliberately meant to excite these manifestations on the part of the audience is always wrong, is subversive to the interest of society, and a peril to the human race” (278). Then it concludes the explicitly sexually themed section of the Code by referring to the spiritual aspect of sex and passion by discussing the differences between pure and impure love and how they should be presented in kind, emphasizing that as far as pure love is concerned, “the passion arising from this love is not the subject for plots,” preferring instead for such stories to focus on the couple’s love (279). In contrast, the Code asserts that impure love, as it is forbidden by divine law, is not permitted to be presented as material for laughter or in any way beautiful.

The general plot themes section of the Code concludes with a segment on criminal behavior. In regard to the issue of murder, it states that while such events are often needed to further the plot, “frequent presentation of murder tends to lessen regard for the sacredness of life” (280). It then continues by stating that brutal killings are not to be presented in detail and that dueling should never be presented in a positive light (280). And, as an example of attractive sin, the Code then clarifies that killings for revenge should not be presented in detail, which might, for example, allow the hero’s killings to appear justified, but this does not apply to killings in self-defense (280). Finally, the methods of committing crime are not to be shown in detail, so as not to provide members of the audience with the needed knowledge to replicate the crime (280).

By including such specific guidelines as to what is considered appropriate

material for a film plot, many scripts were successfully written using self-censorship to create a general plot that then only needed specific details censored on a case by case basis. For example, the use of vulgarity was strictly prohibited by the Production Code. However, what qualifies as vulgarity? A writer's measuring stick as to what is vulgar might vary greatly from that of a censorship committee.

While much of the content within a film was able to be self-censored and merely seek final approval, especially in regards to the script, some elements of motion pictures, such as the costumes or specific dance moves, needed the censorship office to determine if they met the morality standards. The Hays office often received film footage of costume tests or individual scenes to determine if they met with the standards of the Code, since each film was required to have the Production Code Administration seal of approval before it could be shown publicly. In addition, some film content sought approval as an attempt to slide slightly risqué material by the administration, instead of immediately removing the content by self-censoring. And this need for approval did not solely relate to the film itself.

Sensational or shocking advertisements were often used to draw viewers to the box office. However, as the Great Depression deepened, the viewing public diminished, due to financial difficulties, causing a need for more scandalous advertising to catch the interest of the audience. Therefore, in an attempt to restrain the sensationalism, the advertisements were also forced to seek censor approval. In the end, though sometimes deemed chaotic and unnecessary, this partnership between the censors and the filmmakers eventually led to the legitimization of the film industry.

CHAPTER III

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM AND SELF-REGULATION

In the world of film adaptation scholarship, an on-going debate exists as to the importance of fidelity to the original material of a film. Should a film be an exact replica of its source or is the source simply an inspirational jumping-off point? Some scholars holdfast to the argument that a film adaptation has a responsibility to remain faithful to the original work. At the same time, their extreme opposition contends that a film adaptation is an independent creation that should hold little responsibility to its inspiration. However, this discussion is, to a degree, hindered by external forces that tend to interrupt the creative process. In a perfect world, filmmakers could freely express their opinion within this dispute by creating an adaptation that represents their individual creative point of view. But ours is not a perfect world. Instead, film artists have been forced to endure the influence of many individual governing bodies, such as the Production Code Administration (PCA), which inevitably affect the production. Such manipulations beg the question: what effect does censorship have on the resulting film adaptation? In the case of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1935), directed by Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle, censorship certainly played a role in the decisions made by the collaborative artists who created the film.

Some of this film censorship is well documented within the Production Code Administration's surviving archives, located in the Special Collections department of the Margaret Herrick Library, which includes an individual file for *A Midsummer Night's*

Dream. One such instance is presented in an interoffice memorandum, written December 4, 1934, by Islin Auster, a member of Breen's staff, about the PCA's disapproval of the production's costumes for the elves and fairies:

Messrs. Shurlock and Auster conferred Friday, November 30, 1934 with Max Reinhardt and Mr. Dieterle about the costumes for the elves and fairies in *Midsummer Night's Dream*. They showed us a sketch in which an apparently nude figure was covered solely with revealing strips of cellophane. We indicated that this would be unsatisfactory, and explained that nudity in fact or silhouette was expressly prohibited under the Production Code.

We realized that in this instance a certain amount of leeway was permissible. We saw a test of one costume which was definitely bad, and gave our opinion to that effect. We suggested that tests be made and shown to us before costumes are actually okayed for the picture. It is our understanding that this will be done.²

The costumes were eventually approved, after making some alterations to their design (see fig. 2). But even this slight form of censorship most likely affected future creative decisions made for the production, due to fear of additional censorship.

And what is this "leeway" to which Auster refers? The Production Code does make reference to allowing a certain amount of freedom when adapting an established work, such as a Shakespearean play. But does this flexibility extend to all aspects of the creative filmmaking process? For instance, the Production Code acknowledges the fact that, when creating a film adaptation, certain literary material, which might otherwise be objectionable, should be deemed acceptable, for the purpose of remaining faithful to the original work. However, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* did not escape entirely from the censorship of the Code. In a letter from Joseph I. Breen to Jack L. Warner, the film's executive producer and co-founder of Warner Brothers Pictures, written December 11, 1934, Breen informs Warner of two script changes that were negotiated between himself



Fig. 2. Fairy Costumes. The prohibited design of the fairy costumes for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, was eventually revised to include more strips of cellophane, allowing the performers' form to appear less exposed and, thus, gaining the approval of the Production Code Administration.

and Henry Blanke, one of the film's producers, during a meeting that occurred earlier that same day:

This is to confirm the conference we had this morning with Mr. Blanke, with regard to your script *A Midsummer Night's Dream*:

Page 45: Mr. Blanke agreed to shoot this scene two ways, one of the versions to include the cuts in dialogue which we discussed.

Page 93: The expression "eunuch" will be deleted, and the word "minstral" [*sic*] substituted. We believe this is advisable, inasmuch as it has been our experience that political censor boards almost universally delete the first word.³

This letter is proof that the PCA was, in fact, attempting to strip the film of Shakespeare's sexual references, which occur throughout his work. The changes or alternate version Breen refers to, beginning on page 45 of the shooting script, is a scene between Lysander, played by Dick Powell, and Hermia, played by Olivia de Havilland, from act 2, scene 2, of the play.⁴ In the scene, Lysander attempts to convince Hermia that he should lie beside her as they sleep in the forest:

LYSANDER: Fair love, you faint with wand'ring in the wood,
And, to speak truth, I have forgot our way.
We'll rest us, Hermia, if you think it good,
And tarry for the comfort of the day.

HERMIA: Be it so, Lysander. Find you out a bed;
For I upon this bank will rest my head.

LYSANDER: One turf shall serve as pillow for us both;
One heart, one bed; two bosoms and one troth.

HERMIA: Nay, good Lysander; for my sake, my dear,
Lie further off yet; do not lie so near.

LYSANDER: O, take the sense, sweet, of my innocence!
Love takes the meaning in love's conference -
I mean that my heart unto yours is knit,
So that but one heart we can make of it.
Two bosoms interchained with an oath;
So, then, two bosoms and a single troth.
Then by your side no bed-room me deny;
For lying so, Hermia, I do not lie.

HERMIA: Lysander riddles very prettily.
Now much beshrew my manners and my pride
If Hermia meant to say Lysander lied.
But, gentle friend, for love and courtesy,
Lie further off, in human modesty.
Such separation as may well be said
Becomes a virtuous bachelor and a maid,
So far be distant; and good night, sweet friend.
Thy love ne'er alter till thy sweet life end.

LYSANDER: Amen, amen, to that fair prayer say I;
And then end life when I end loyalty.
Here is my bed; sleep give thee all his rest.

HERMIA: With half that wish the wisher's eyes be pressed (41-71).⁵

Two versions of this scene were filmed, one of which eliminates all but four lines. Moreover, this idea of alternate versions is further complicated by the existence of an additional edited version of the film. The film-cut created for general release, a 117-minute version, which was meticulously edited by the studio, changed the order of some sequences and eliminated others. The four-line version of this scene exists within the general release film. However, the original 132-minute roadshow version of the film includes most of the scene as written, excluding three missing lines, a few word changes, and the conversion of half a stanza of Lysander's spoken dialogue into a song that he sings to Hermia as they ramble through the woods.

As for the change Breen suggested, on page 93 of the shooting script, it is unknown if the change was ever made or filmed. The word "eunuch" appears in act 5, scene 1, of the play and is spoken by Lysander, who is reading the entertainment options for the evening to Theseus, played by Cavanaugh Ross:

LYSANDER: [Reads] 'The battle with the Centaurs, to be sung
By an Athenian eunuch to the harp' (44-45).

Breen suggested that the word be changed to "minstral" [sic] to avoid possible censorship. Instead, the entire line was cut from both versions of the film, evading any sexual undertones that the word might suggest.

The screenplay is the foundation of a film, especially when adapting a literary work. And, as such, the process of refining the script requires revisions to further the quality of the script and, in the case of an adaptation, possibly increase the fidelity to the original work. In the case of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the script developed over the creation of several drafts. Upon the arrival of the shooting script, over sixty percent of

Shakespeare's play had been incorporated. But the writing process does not end with the shooting script. Often, revisions are made during the filming of the script, while striving to perfect its content and include more of the adapted material. In fact, while filming this script, an additional one percent of the play was included. By doing so, the filmmakers were able to add further textual detail. For example, when adapting a Shakespearean play, it is common to update some of the language for a modern audience, such as the words "thy," "thou," and "thee," which does occur in this motion picture. However, after completing the shooting script, some of the Elizabethan text, such as "methinks," "perchance," and "ere," was returned to the script and exists within both versions of the film. Additionally, E.W. Korngold, the film's composer, integrated text from the play, along with other Shakespearean sources, into the music of the film, by including extra dialogue as lyrics. For instance, as Lysander sings to Hermia while they are lost in the forest, the lyrics he sings are part of his dialogue from act 2, scene 2, of the play:

LYSANDER: I mean, that my heart unto yours is knit,
 So that but one heart we can make of it.
 Two bosoms interchained with an oath;
 So, then, two bosoms and a single troth. (53-56)

The lyrics, however, are not the only significant factor in this musical moment, as they are incorporated into Korngold's adaptation of Felix Mendelssohn's *Midsummer* composition, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* ("Lysander & Hermia"). This inclusion emphasizes the fact that the film is not solely a Shakespearean adaptation. In fact, with the exception of a few of Korngold's original compositions, Mendelssohn's work appears throughout the entire film, especially his *Midsummer Night's Dream* overture.⁶

Not all adaptation attempts lead to literary fidelity. For example, the shooting script originally included a wife for the character Bottom, played by James Cagney, although she does not appear in Shakespeare's play. It was a small role in which she spent most of her time yelling and scowling at him. This character was most likely included to produce sympathy for Bottom, as he is otherwise perceived as rather arrogant. Eventually, the wife was removed from the script and does not appear in either version of the film. In addition, other textual details were changed for unknown reasons, but could be an attempt to adhere to the requirements of the Production Code. At the end of act 2, scene 2, Hermia awakes and yells for Lysander to help her:

HERMIA: [Awaking] Help me, Lysander, help me! Do thy best
 To pluck this crawling serpent from my breast!
 Ay me, for pity. What a dream was here?
 Lysander, look how I do quake with fear.
 Methought a serpent ate my heart away,
 And you sat smiling at his cruel prey.
 Lysander - what, removed? Lysander, lord -
 What, out of hearing, gone? No sound, no word?
 Alack, where are you? Speak an if you hear,
 Speak, of all loves. I swoon almost with fear.
 No? Then I well perceive you are not nigh.
 Either death or you I'll find immediately (151-162).

With the exception of a few word adjustments, to modernize the text, all of this dialogue is included in the shooting script. But the treatment of the word "lord" is noteworthy. In the shooting script the word remains in its given position but has been capitalized and is followed by an exclamation point, similar to a curse. However, in both versions of the film, the word was moved to the beginning of a line that occurs later in the stanza, thus causing the line to read as "Lord. Then I well perceive that you are gone," which aids in the clarification that the word is meant to address Lysander, instead of being used as

profanity and, therefore, does not violate the profanity clause of the Code. Hence, in this case, the Code, however slightly, did impact the adaptation of Shakespeare's play and affected the creative process, due to a desire to avoid censorship.

CHAPTER IV

ROMEO AND JULIET AND ORGANIZATIONAL CENSORSHIP

As the Production Code Administration (PCA) developed into a well-oiled machine of constant involvement in the many stages of a film's making, *Romeo and Juliet* (1936), directed by George Cukor, began production and was maneuvered by the PCA into becoming a Code compliant creation of artistic grandeur, as is evident by the existing archives, which thoroughly documented each stage of the production. In fact, Joseph I. Breen addresses the increase in personnel in his Annual Report, dated February 15, 1935, which covers the previous year, listing the men working under him: James Wingate, Geoffrey Shurlock, Islin Auster, Douglas MacKinnon, Carl Lischka, Arthur Houghton, John Stewart, and Vincent G. Hart. In this report, Breen mentions that the enlargement of his staff allowed him to more efficiently cover the daily activities of the current films in production. In the case of *Romeo and Juliet*, the film industry had high hopes for the film and, as such, Breen and his staff kept a particularly close eye on its progress.

Before a single word of the script was submitted to the PCA, and almost a year prior to the beginning of the film's principal photography, Breen and his staff were already examining the prospect of creating a motion picture version of Shakespeare's play. On December 21, 1934, Vincent G. Hart wrote to Breen after witnessing the play at the Martin Beck Theatre in New York on opening night, December 20, 1934, which included a young Orson Welles, as Tybalt and Basil Rathbone, as Romeo, who later

played Tybalt in the film version.^{7, 8} In the full-page report, Hart reviews the content of the play and concludes with the comment: “Except for some minor bits of profanity this masterpiece is in compliance with the Production Code.”⁹ However, while profanity was an issue, it was not the only censored element within the motion picture.

Romeo and Juliet was promoted as a pure Shakespearean text. But the script did not begin in such a pure form. Before Talbot Jennings became the film’s screenwriter, George Cukor sought the help of other writers, who were less dedicated to the goal of preserving the pure text. In a telegram to George Cukor, dated May 31, 1935, from Hugh Walpole, an English novelist and Cukor’s screenwriter for *David Copperfield* (1935), Walpole reports on receiving a phone call from an agent named Rosalie Stewart:

Rosalie Stewart phoned and said:

Thornton Wilder is sailing for Europe June 28th, and after thinking the matter over wired Miss Stewart as follows:

“Would agree to mail from Europe by August Fifteenth a thirty five or forty page treatment of the first half of *Romeo and Juliet* with samples of dialogue partly by Shakespeare and partly in partial modern adaptation”

Miss Stewart thinks there might be a chance of having Mr. Wilder come out and consult with you and Mr. Thalberg inasmuch as he is not leaving until June 28th.¹⁰

Walpole then sent a second telegram from London on June 6, 1935, telling Cukor that English poet and writer, John Masefield, would also be interested in possibly writing the script if he was approached directly by the proper authorities.¹¹ As the search for a screenwriter continued, Cukor and his staff began collecting research, some of which was gathered by silent film writer, Marion Ainslee, and having meetings about the play, going so far as to even explore the earliest known source of the play’s plot, in an attempt

to better understand and adapt it to film. In the end, the position went to Jennings, who completed the script by November 13, 1935, which was then sent to the PCA for approval. While working on the script, Jennings received considerable assistance from Harvard professor, John Tucker Murray, who is not listed in the film's credits.¹² With his help, Jennings created a script of all-Shakespearean text, even going so far as to include the exact same spelling in the screenplay as that of the Oxford edition, such as the words "mistemper'd," "soften'd," "on't," and "punish'd," which was never to be seen by the audience. However, even though the script includes such an accurate text, it is only a compilation of 45 percent of the play.

Although the script is quite similar to the play, some changes were made to the text, based on the suggestions of others. The last credit displayed before the film begins is that of the literary consultant, Professor William Strunk, Jr., from Cornell University. And, as the literary consultant, Strunk provided many notes to Jennings about the play and script. For example, on July 9, 1935, one of the notes he provided pertains to Romeo's line "I dreamt a dream tonight," from act 1, scene 4, of the play, just before Mercutio's Queen Mab speech. Strunk suggested that the word "tonight" be changed to "last night," for clarification purposes, which is how it exists in the film.¹³ However, not all of his suggestions were followed. Strunk directed Jennings' attention to Mercutio's dialogue in act 2, scene 1, of the play:

MERCUTIO: I conjure thee by Rosaline's bright eyes,
 By her high forehead and her scarlet lip,
 By her fine foot, straight leg, and quivering thigh,
 And the demesnes that there adjacent lie,
 That in thy likeness thou appear to us (22-26).¹⁴

It was suggested in his notes that this “demesnes” section might be considered too “pointed,” but the lines were not removed and the PCA did not require any actions be taken.¹⁵ Strunk’s notes were also ignored three other times in act 2, scene 4. The first is Mercutio’s line “Without his roe, like a dried herring. O flesh, flesh, how thou art fishified,” which he identified as having a possible censorship issue (21).^{16, 17} The second is Mercutio’s use of the word “bawd” (70), which Strunk called “a challenge to the censors.”^{18, 19} Lastly, the third was a similar concern about Peter’s lines:

PETER: I saw no man use you a pleasure; if I had, my weapon should quickly have been out, I warrant you: I dare draw as soon as another man, if I see occasion in a good quarrel, and the law on my side (79).²⁰

In all three cases the lines remained in the script and were not censored by the PCA. However, Mercutio’s use of the term “bawd” was remarked upon. In a letter to L. B. Mayer, co-founder of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (M-G-M), from Joseph I. Breen, dated December 11, 1935, Breen informs Mayer that the first submitted script for *Romeo and Juliet* has been read and gives his opinion in regards to its content:

We have received and read with great interest the script for your proposed production of *Romeo and Juliet*. It looks to us like the basis of a magnificent film, and one which should contribute immensely to the advancement of the motion picture.

The script which you have prepared seems to us to meet in every respect with the requirements of the Production Code. However, from the standpoint of political censorship, certain aspects suggest the possibility of a minor problem. I refer specifically to the use of a number of expressions which, in a modern picture, would undoubtedly be deleted by certain censor boards. Such expressions are:

All use of the words “God”, “Lord”, etc., as an interjection.

Page 40: The expression “bawd”.

Page 43: The expression “Jesu”.

Page 44: “God’s dear lady”.

Page 50: The action of the crowd crossing themselves.

Page 64: The expression “God’s bread”.

Page 69: The word “harlotry”.

While it would seem to be stretching the point to imagine any censor board being so hide-bound as to make such deletions in a Shakespearean classic, nevertheless it might be well for you to bear this possibility in mind.

We shall look forward with great interest to reviewing the finished picture, and wish you all good luck in this important undertaking.²¹

In many cases, the film was successfully shielded behind the justification that the text was a “Shakespearean classic.” And, as such, interjections like “Lord,” “God,” “Jesu,” and “God’s dear lady” were allowed to remain in the script. But some of the noted changes from this letter were utilized within the script. During the fight scene between Tybalt and Mercutio, played by John Barrymore, members of the on-looking crowd do not cross themselves, as the script originally indicated. Capulet’s previous cry, as played by C. Aubrey Smith, “God’s bread,” from act 3, scene 5, of the play (190), was replaced with the word “frankly.” Also, Capulet’s line from act 4, scene 2, “Well, he may chance to do some good on her. A peevish, self-willed harlotry it is” (13-14) was removed from the film entirely, along with the rest of the scene.

One of the reasons this film was able to escape from heavy-handed censorship, due to its profoundly sexual and violent subject matter, is because much of it was removed in previous versions of the script. Many of the references to sex and death were taken out early in the writing process, or never even made it into a draft of the script. Some of these removals were due to the time constraints of film or because their inclusion was not necessary to furthering the plot. But other omissions were intentional, since, due to the text’s content, the censors would most likely remove them. For

example, Juliet's line "You kiss by the book," from act 1, scene 5, of the play (111), was included in the script draft, dated June 27, 1935, but removed from the following draft, dated September 4, 1935.^{22, 23} The elimination of this line aids in the innocent characterization of Juliet, played by Norma Shearer, as she was not experienced enough to recognize a skilled kiss. In addition, the line itself is unnecessary to the plot and, if the censors were extremely strict, might fall under the category of dialogue that fans the flames of passion. Another line deletion that occurred from the June 27 draft to the September 4 version of the script, involves Friar Laurence's line, "Which craves as desperate an execution as that is desperate which we would prevent," from act 4, scene 1, of the play (73-74).^{24, 25} The Code preferred the inclusion of death within a film to be minimized to that which was absolutely necessary. Thus, since the line was not crucial to the plot, it was removed.

With the exception of Romeo's line, "This shall determine that," from act 3, scene 1, of the play (98), which was spoken in the film by Tybalt before his fight with Romeo, played by Leslie Howard, Friar Laurence, played by Henry Kolker, was the only other character whose lines were given to someone else. In scenes 37 and 38 of the shooting script, Benvolio, played by Reginald Denny, was given some of Friar Laurence's dialogue from act 2, scene 3 of the play.²⁶ The lines, "Our Romeo hath not been in bed tonight" (46), "Jesu Maria, what a deal of brine hath wash'd thy sallow cheeks for Rosaline" (73-74), and "Thou and these woes were all for Rosaline" (82) were all given to Benvolio in the script but were originally spoken by Friar Laurence in the play.²⁷ And much of Friar Laurence's dialogue, including his opening soliloquy, was

not included in the shooting script. In fact, only 35 percent of the character's part from the play was in the script and a mere 26 percent made it into the final film. This could be due to the Code's requirements in regards to the representation of religious figures in a motion picture, since the production took great care in researching other religious aspects of the film. One source for such research was Father John O'Donnell, the pastor of St. Augustine Church in Culver City. O'Donnell was a frequent religious technical advisor for M-G-M, as the studio was across the street from St. Augustine Church. For example, Terry Spencer, from M-G-M's Research Department, reported in a note dated November 21, 1935, on some information from Father O'Donnell, pertaining to the candles in Juliet's tomb.²⁸ In the note there was a description of what the candles should look like and how many should be present.

There were also other members of the film industry who offered advice pertaining to *Romeo and Juliet*. In an inter-office memo from David O. Selznick, who was a producer at M-G-M during the film's production, to producer Irving Thalberg and George Cukor, dated August 6, 1935, Selznick gave suggestions on who might best play the role of Romeo:

I understand you are still more than uncertain about an actor for the role of Romeo and I, therefore, venture this suggestion, which offhand may seem a bad one but which on study I don't think you will regard as any worse than the others you've had - the suggestion is Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., who, I think, has the virtue of youth and charm and who is capable of fine performances with direction. I've seen him very bad at times, but on the other hand, I personally thought he was excellent in "The Dawn Patrol" and other pictures.

Granted - he is not the ideal Romeo - but who is?

[Laurence] Olivier might be better, but I understand he cannot be obtained.

[Franchot] Tone might give a better performance but I personally doubt he has the romantic appeal.

[Brian] Aherne would undoubtedly give a better performance, but isn't he too mature and too English?

[Robert] Donat is perhaps a possibility, but I doubt whether you could get him.

Accordingly, perhaps the suggestion of Fairbanks, Jr. isn't as bad as it might seem to you if you had a man who looked like Ramon Navarre ten years ago and who had John Barrymore's ability.

Incidentally, Frank Lawton is hoping that you will think him enough of a possibility to test him. I think his reading of the lines in a test would surprise an awful lot of people.

I hope you won't consider this note a presumption but will regard it instead as what it is - a desire to be helpful.²⁹

Heeding Selznick's advice, Laurence Olivier and Robert Donat were each offered the role of Romeo but both turned it down.

Not all of the advice that was given to the production's filmmakers was out of sheer helpfulness. There was a buzz within the industry as to the great importance of the two million dollar production. And many people wanted to be involved in its making. In a handwritten letter from composer Franz Waxman, who was working at Universal Pictures, to George Cukor, dated August 12, 1935, Waxman offers his suggestions, regarding the film's background score:

One might call *Romeo and Juliet* the story of the purest and eternal love and that gave me the idea, that this picture should have a 100% background score of the composer, whose music is also the purest and the most eternal -- MOZART! --

It would take to [*sic*] much time now, to go into details of my ideas, how to use Mozart's compositions, I only want to mention, that there is a man in town - Dr. Richard Lert, conductor of several Mozart festivals abroad - who possesses in his music collection the most wonderful and most charming compositions of Mozart besides those generally known!-

I am sure, that with Dr. Lert's assistance I could give you one of the finest musical scores that ever a picture has had in Hollywood.-

Having no contracts with any agent at the moment I thought, that this is the most agreeable way for me and for you to let you know about it!

I would appreciate very much if you could give me - in case you like my suggestions - an opportunity any time, any where, to explain to you, what I'm not able - to write down in my broken English. - ! Thank you!³⁰

Waxman did not become the production's composer, and Herbert Stothart, who wrote the film's score, did not follow his suggestion of including the work of Mozart. Instead, he chose to honor Shakespeare's text, by including some of the Bard's work as lyrics to Stothart's original music and his musical arrangements of other noted Shakespeare composers' work and by adapting some Shakespeare inspired compositions into the film's background score. Regarding the production's songs, Stothart, along with screenwriter Talbot Jennings, incorporated the lyrics of songs within Shakespeare's plays, which had to be approved by the PCA before their inclusion. For example, in scene 56 of the film, which takes place in the Capulet's ballroom, Juliet makes her entrance to the sounds of music and singing, to which she immediately begins to dance the choreography of the film's dance director, Agnes de Mille. The lyrics of that song were originally sung by the character, Juno, in act 4, scene 1 of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (106-109).³¹ It is followed by the pavane, which formally opened the evening's dancing. For this, Stothart chose Peter Warlock's *Pavane*, as Warlock's work was greatly influenced by the music of the Elizabethan period. Jennings also included the clown's song from act 2, scene 4, of Shakespeare's play, *Twelfth Night* (50-61), which was sung by a shepherd to open scene 37 of the film.^{32,33} The rendition of the song that

was included in the motion picture was created by English composer Thomas Arne, which Stothart arranged to fit the scene. Stothart also selected Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky's *Romeo and Juliet* for the young couple's musical theme within the production. It is understandable as to why Stothart chose to use these classical pieces, instead of composing an original score, since such a vast amount of Shakespeare inspired music already existed. But why was classical music the only division of musical composition deemed worthy of accompanying the Bard's work? Perhaps, these classics were the only pieces capable of reaching high enough to join Shakespeare's work on its lofty pedestal.

The term "classic" was bandied about throughout the production of *Romeo and Juliet* and was sometimes used as justification for the decisions being made, in regards to the film's content. In a letter from Joseph I. Breen to Irving Thalberg, dated December 20, 1935, Breen utilizes the word "classic" while explaining his negative evaluation of a *Romeo and Juliet* test scene:

Yesterday, at the request of Mr. Block, two members of our staff viewed a test scene for your forthcoming production *Romeo and Juliet*, and have discussed the same with me this morning.

It seems to us that the present manner of playing this bedroom scene is highly inadvisable. In the first place, it seems to us that any attempt to inject anything approaching a "hot" bedroom scene into a Shakespearean classic would be a serious mistake. Our Code lays down very specific regulations with regard to the use of bedrooms in pictures, and we feel after viewing this test, that this scene hardly satisfies the spirit of that particular clause in the Code.

Also, as a matter of practical protection against censorship mutilation, we believe the scene to be ill-advised. The British censors in particular are very strict about bedroom scenes, even between married couples, and we have observed it to be their practice to delete such scenes when the couple are shown in or on one bed together.

We therefore earnestly recommend to you that you play this scene so as to omit all action of them lying on the bed, fondling one another in a horizontal position, and pulling one another down, etc.³⁴

The version of this scene that exists in the film was adjusted to accommodate Breen's suggestions and has Romeo awkwardly lean against the bed, rather than lie on it with Juliet (see fig. 3). However, the bedroom scene does still include a short moment in close-up when both characters are shown reclining on the bed together. And, according to the British Board of Film Censors' records, an organization known today as the



Fig. 3. Bedroom Scene. The bedroom scene in George Cukor's *Romeo and Juliet* was filmed to show Romeo, played by Leslie Howard, fully clothed with his feet on the floor, instead of his entire body reclining on the bed. By making such a compromise, the scene remains largely intact within the film.

British Board of Film Classification, the only deletions required by the British censors were dialogue related.³⁵

The word “classic” was a double-edged sword. While, for the studio, the label “classic” was useful in gaining acceptance of some questionable material within the film, the censors also used the “classic” label to remove any unseemly elements of the picture. As a result, the term “classic” became a weapon between the studio and the censors, in an effort to create each organization’s personal vision of the production.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Before establishing the Production Code Administration (PCA), some political leaders and religious groups, such as the Legion of Decency, believed that the American film industry was not living up to the moral standards that they deemed suitable for the current American society. But, in reality, while Hollywood did tend to lean towards sensationalism, they were merely making films that reflected the current interests of society. During the previous decade, society, especially its younger members, embraced liberalism. There was also a rise in organized crime, gangsters were celebrated, and women were more openly sexual. It wasn't until after the economic decline of the 1930s that the public returned to a more conservative attitude. However, Hollywood's response to public trends usually lags behind at least a year, since it takes at the minimum a year from conception to a film's release to produce a picture. Nevertheless, film studios were making movies that were considered inappropriate by the vocal opposition. And, as such, they thought the film industry should be controlled by the government, so that the resulting films would reflect certain views and moral standards. This threat of censorship became the opening blast in a three decade sociopolitical struggle over film censorship in America.

As a response to this condemnation, the film industry implemented a plan to censor itself, in an effort to fend off further action by the government. Politician William Harrison Hays was placed at the helm of this massive endeavor, to oversee the

operation, while Joseph I. Breen physically executed this plan of censorship. But one of the greatest tools in defending against the threat of government control was the decision to produce film adaptations of “classic” literary works, such as Shakespeare’s plays.

The first two American Shakespearean film adaptations of the Production Code era became an important part of the self-censorship shield that the film industry hid behind. These films sought to prove that the film industry was capable of successfully producing motion pictures inspired by highbrow material, which also improved its reputation. But what they really proved was that Hollywood knew when a project was important enough to hire the very best, which was also a way of shielding itself. As a result, it became difficult for the film industry’s opponents to object to the immoral elements of such “classics.” For instance, although the Code dissuades the inclusion of death scenes, the lovers are allowed to commit suicide, since the play’s carnage is such an important component, as it is the domino effect of the play’s deaths that make it a tragedy. However, other countries did not let the sacred “Shakespearean classic” label get in the way of censoring these adaptations to conform to their individual sociopolitical beliefs.

Although *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1935), directed by Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle, and *Romeo and Juliet* (1936), directed by George Cukor, were censored by the PCA, they still had to endure the censorship of other countries, during international distribution, which occurred more with *Romeo and Juliet* than *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, before becoming available for public consumption. Many countries did not approve of certain American values and feared that, even in an adapted

period piece, these offensive morals might seep onto the screen. In Canada, the censorship of motion pictures is the responsibility of each individual province, so a film can be tailored to a specific community's standards. As such, Alberta required that the actual stabbing of Juliet, in her death scene, be shortened, so that the picture would not linger on her suicide any longer than necessary.³⁶

Unlike Canada, a religiously diverse country, the Indonesian island, Java, is predominantly Muslim, which, when censoring a film, aids in determining what should be removed from a motion picture to comply with the local values. For instance, Islamic beliefs forbid suicide. Therefore, the scene in which Juliet commits suicide was removed from the film before it was allowed to be shown in Java.³⁷

While some censorship was based on local religious beliefs, it was also built on cultural behavior standards. In Japanese culture, kissing is considered a very intimate act. It is not merely a step up from holding hands, as it is in Western society. Instead, it is seen as explicitly sexual and, as such, should not be done in public. Thus, all kissing scenes were removed from *Romeo and Juliet* in Japan.³⁸

One of the best examples of censorship that represented both religious and politically established values occurred in Spain. In April of 1940, a year after the Spanish Civil War ended, *Romeo and Juliet* was accepted, after being censored, for public showing in Spain. In this film, Spain only required one deletion before public screening was allowed, which occurred in the opening lines of act 3, scene 5, of the "morning after" bedroom scene while lying on the bed:

JULIET: Wilt thou be gone? It is not yet near day. It was the nightingale, and not the lark that pierced the fearful hollow of thine ear. Nightly she sings on

yon pomegrante tree. Believe me, love, it was the nightingale.
 ROMEO: It was the lark, the herald of the morn, no nightingale. Look (3-9).³⁹

Francisco Franco imposed a military dictatorship in which the government's pro-fascist political party and the Roman Catholic Church controlled all elements of social and political life, such as morality, ideology, education, and customs, which also influenced the censor's response to American imported films. Hollywood films portrayed women as aggressive and independent, which was far from Franco's desired depiction.

According to the Franco regime, a woman was, above all else, a Catholic, the foundation of family life, and was expected to be submissive to her husband. And, as a chaste and virtuous female, she was devoid of all sensuality and sexuality. Hence, Juliet was not allowed to convince Romeo to stay longer in her bed, since it would exhibit her sexuality.⁴⁰

Although a "Shakespearean classic" was generally given more lenience during the foreign market censorship process than a modern film, this label did not always guarantee that a motion picture would be accepted for public presentation. In Germany, under the watchful eye of the Nazi party, both *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* were rejected from public screenings, which is surprising, since Shakespeare was quite popular in Germany and his works were often exploited by the Nazis for political purposes. Shakespeare was regarded as a German author and his works were accepted as German "classical" canon, since, as an Englishman, he was Germanic. However, both films were rejected for political reasons. At that time in Germany, Jews were openly persecuted, which was part of the Nazi policy. And, in the case of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Max Reinhardt, a former theater director in Berlin, until his

exile in 1933, and composer Felix Mendelssohn were of Jewish descent, which was the ultimate reason for the film's rejection. With regard to *Romeo and Juliet*, a law passed in 1933 entitled the government to prohibit the presentation of foreign films, especially films from certain countries, such as American films, whose exhibition became illegal in 1941. But the film might have been rejected for a number of reasons. The film's director was openly homosexual, which, if he resided in Germany, would have qualified him for elimination. Furthermore, both he and the producer, Irving Thalberg, were Jewish, and the film was set in a heavily Catholic environment. Hitler viewed the Catholic Church as a dangerous opponent, whose influence over the public needed to be eliminated. Therefore, since the production had distasteful elements attached to it, the film was rejected.⁴¹

While Hollywood produced Shakespearean films in an attempt to avoid government controlled censorship and to improve its public status, they did not entirely avoid the censorship utilized to protect the public's moral values. But the censorship of Shakespearean films was about more than morality. Since they were based on "classic" plays, they were mostly forgiven for their controversial subject matter. However, some countries used their censorship as a platform on which to make political statements about America and themselves.

NOTES

1. In the report of Will H. Hays on Plans and Programs of Motion Picture Production for 1934-35, written October 10, 1934, Hays mentions the upcoming production of William Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as one of forty-nine pictures based on stage plays of outstanding merit that will be produced in the coming year.
2. Memorandum by Islin Auster for file, 4 December 1934, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
3. Joseph I. Breen to Jack L. Warner, letter, 11 December 1934, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
4. Charles Kenyon and Mary McCall, *A Midsummer Night's Dream (1935): Shooting script*, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2003, <http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/afso/overview.pl?FS000564>.
5. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 2.2.41-71.
6. *A Midsummer Night's Dream (1935): Film Music Inventory*, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2003, <http://www.alexanderstreet2.com/pdf/FS000564.pdf>.
7. *Romeo and Juliet*, playbill, 20 December 1934, Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
8. Vincent G. Hart to Joseph I. Breen, letter, 21 December 1934, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
9. Ibid.
10. Hugh Walpole to George Cukor, telegram, 31 May 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. George Cukor papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
11. Hugh Walpole to George Cukor, telegram, 6 June 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. George Cukor papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
12. The New Pictures, *TIME Magazine*, 24 August 1936.
13. Professor William Strunk, Jr. to Talbot Jennings, notes on script, 9 July 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
14. W.J. Craig, ed. "Romeo and Juliet." *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press: 1914; Bartleby.com, 2000, <http://www.bartleby.com/70/index38.html>.
15. Professor William Strunk, Jr. to Talbot Jennings, notes on script, 9 July 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

Hills, CA.

16. Ibid.

17. W.J. Craig, ed. "Romeo and Juliet." *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press: 1914; Bartleby.com, 2000, <http://www.bartleby.com/70/index38.html>.

18. Ibid.

19. Professor William Strunk, Jr. to Talbot Jennings, notes on script, 9 July 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

20. W.J. Craig, ed. "Romeo and Juliet." *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press: 1914; Bartleby.com, 2000, <http://www.bartleby.com/70/index38.html>.

21. Joseph I. Breen to L. B. Mayer, letter, 11 December 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

22. Talbot Jennings, script draft, 27 June 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

23. Talbot Jennings, script draft, 4 September 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

24. Talbot Jennings, script draft, 27 June 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

25. Talbot Jennings, script draft, 4 September 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

26. Talbot Jennings, *Romeo and Juliet (1936): Shooting script*, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2004, <http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/afso/overview.pl?FS000789>.

27. Ibid.

28. Terry Spencer, research notes, 21 November 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Turner/MGM scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

29. David O. Selznick to Irving Thalberg and George Cukor, inter-office memorandum, 6 August 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. George Cukor papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

30. Franz Waxman to George Cukor, letter, 12 August 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. George Cukor papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

31. *The Tempest*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 4.1.106-109.

32. *Twelfth Night*. In *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997) 2.4.50-61.

33. Maurice Revnes to Joseph I. Breen, letter and song lyrics, 19 December 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
34. Joseph I. Breen to Irving Thalberg, letter, 20 December 1935, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
35. British Board of Film Classification staff member (London: 13 January 2006), phone interview.
36. Joseph I. Breen to Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., memorandum, 18 February 1937, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
37. Joseph I. Breen to Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., memorandum, 14 April 1937, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
38. Joseph I. Breen to Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., memorandum, 26 March 1937, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
39. W.J. Craig, ed. "Romeo and Juliet." *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press: 1914; Bartleby.com, 2000, <http://www.bartleby.com/70/index38.html>.
40. Joseph I. Breen to Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., memorandum, 26 April 1940, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.
41. Joseph I. Breen to Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., memorandum, 30 November 1936, *Romeo and Juliet*. Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

WORKS CITED

Black, Gregory D. *The Catholic Crusade Against the Movies, 1940-1975*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

George Cukor Papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

Jennings, Talbot. *Romeo and Juliet (1936): Shooting Script*, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2004,
<http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/afso/overview.pl?FS000789>.

Kenyon, Charles, and Mary McCall. *A Midsummer Night's Dream (1935): Shooting Script*, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2003,
<http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/afso/overview.pl?FS000564>.

Martin, Olga Johanna. *Hollywood's Movie Commandments*. The Literature of Cinema. New York: Arno Press, 1970.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, VHS. Directed by Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle. 1935, Burbank, CA: Warner Home Video, 1993.

A Midsummer Night's Dream (1935): Film Music Inventory, American Film Scripts Online, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C., 2003,
<http://www.alexanderstreet2.com/pdf/FS000564.pdf>.

Motion Picture Association of America, Production Code Administration Records, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences,

Beverly Hills, CA.

Motion Picture Association of America, and Will H. Hays. *Report of Will H. Hays, President, on Plans and Programs of Motion Picture Production for 1934-35 Submitted to the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc. October 10, 1934.* New York, 1934.

The New Pictures, *TIME Magazine*, 24 August 1936.

Romeo and Juliet, VHS. Directed by George Cukor. 1936, Culver City, CA: MGM/UA Home Entertainment, 1992.

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: Norton, 1997.

Shakespeare, William, W.J. Craig, ed. *Romeo and Juliet*. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Oxford University Press, 1914, Bartleby.com, 2000, <http://www.bartleby.com/70/index38.html>.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: Norton, 1997.

Shakespeare, William. *Twelfth Night*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: Norton, 1997.

Turner/MGM Scripts, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Beverly Hills, CA.

Walsh, Frank. *Sin and Censorship: The Catholic Church and the Motion Picture Industry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Supplemental Sources Consulted

- Bernstein, Matthew. *Controlling Hollywood Censorship and Regulation in the Studio Era*. Rutgers Depth of Field Series. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.
- Black, Gregory D. *Hollywood Censored: Morality Codes, Catholics, and the Movies*. Cambridge Studies in the History of Mass Communications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Brewster, Ben, and Lea Jacobs. *Theatre to Cinema: Stage Pictorialism and the Early Feature Film*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Couvares, Francis G. *Movie Censorship and American Culture*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996.
- Doherty, Thomas Patrick. *Pre-code Hollywood: Sex, Immorality, and Insurrection in American Cinema, 1930-1934*. Film and Culture. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Facey, Paul W. *The Legion of Decency; a Sociological Analysis of the Emergence and Development of a Social Pressure Group*. The Arno Press Cinema Program. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- Gardner, Gerald C. *The Censorship Papers: Movie Censorship Letters From the Hays Office, 1934-1968*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1987.
- Hoffmann, Hilmar. *The Triumph of Propaganda Film and National Socialism, 1933-1945*. Providence: Berghahn Books, 1996.

- Hortmann, Wilhelm, and Michael Hamburger. *Shakespeare on the German Stage: The Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Jacobs, Lea. "Reformers and Spectators; the Film Education Movement in the Thirties." *Camera Obscura* 22 (1990): 29-49.
- Jacobs, Lea. *The Wages of Sin: Censorship and the Fallen Woman Film, 1928-1942*. Wisconsin Studies in Film. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Kott, Jan. *Shakespeare, Our Contemporary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964.
- Kuhn, Annette. *Cinema, Censorship, and Sexuality, 1909-1925*. Cinema and Society. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Lambert, Gavin, and George Cukor. *On Cukor*. New York: Putnam, 1972.
- Levy, Emanuel. *George Cukor: Master of Elegance: Hollywood's Legendary Director and His Stars*. New York: Morrow, 1994.
- Lewis, Jon. *Hollywood v. Hard Core: How the Struggle Over Censorship Saved the Modern Film Industry*. New York: New York University, 2000.
- MacCabe, Colin. *The Eloquence of the Vulgar: Language, Cinema and the Politics of Culture*. London: BFI Publishing, 1999.
- Maltby, Richard. "'To Prevent the Prevalent Type of Book': Censorship and Adaptation in Hollywood, 1924-1934." *American Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1992): 554-583.
- Martin, Joel W., and Conrad Eugene Ostwalt. *Screening the Sacred: Religion, Myth, and Ideology in Popular American Film*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.
- McGilligan, Patrick. *George Cukor: A Double Life : A Biography of the Gentleman Director*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

- Moley, Raymond. *The Hays Office*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co, 1945.
- Morey, Anne. *Hollywood Outsiders: The Adaptation of the Film Industry, 1913-1934*. Commerce and Mass Culture Series. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Peters, Charles C. *Motion Pictures and Standards of Morality*. New York: Arno Press, 1970.
- Phelps, Guy. *Film Censorship*. London: Gollancz, 1975.
- Phillips, Gene D. *George Cukor*. Twayne's Filmmakers Series. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Prince, Stephen. *Classical Film Violence Designing and Regulating Brutality in Hollywood Cinema, 1930-1968*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2003.
- Richards, Jeffrey. *The Age of the Dream Palace: Cinema and Society in Britain, 1930-1939*. Cinema and Society. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1984.
- Robinson, David. *From Peep Show to Palace: The Birth of American Film*. New York: Columbia University Press in association with the Library of Congress, Washington, DC, 1996.
- Robinson, David. *The History of World Cinema*. New York: Stein and Day, 1973.
- Symington, Rodney. *The Nazi Appropriation of Shakespeare Cultural Politics in the Third Reich*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2005.
- Tollini, Frederick Paul. *The Shakespeare Productions of Max Reinhardt*. Studies in Theatre Arts, v. 31. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.

Turner, Jay Craig. *Public Reaction to the National Legion of Decency as Reflected in the Popular Press, 1934-1952*. Thesis (M.A.)--University of Texas at Austin, 1984.

Vasey, Ruth. *The World According to Hollywood, 1918-1939*. Wisconsin Studies in Film. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

Welch, David. *Propaganda and the German Cinema, 1933-1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Willson, Robert Frank. *Shakespeare in Hollywood, 1929-1956*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000.

VITA

Ruth Ann Alfred received her Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees in English from Texas A&M University in 2002 and 2008. She also minored in Film and History. Her research interest is film adaptation, especially Shakespearean film adaptations and the inclusion of traditional fiction in films.

Miss Alfred may be reached at 502 Ash Lane, Lancaster, TX 75146. Her email address is ralfred@hotmail.com.