REVIEWING THE IMAGE OF THE PHOTOJOURNALIST IN FILM: HOW ETHICAL DILEMMAS SHAPE STEREOTYPES OF THE ON-SCREEN PRESS PHOTOGRAPHER IN MOTION PICTURES FROM 1954 TO 2006

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by
KYLE ROSS MCDANIEL

Dr. C. Zoe Smith, Thesis Supervisor

AUGUST 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

REVIEWING THE IMAGE OF THE PHOTOJOURNALIST IN FILM:
HOW ETHICAL DILEMMAS SHAPE STEREOTYPES OF THE ON-SCREEN PRESS PHOTOGRAPHER IN MOTION PICTURES FROM 1954 TO 2006

Presented by Kyle McDaniel

A candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor C. Zoe Smith

Professor Earnest Perry

Professor Yong Volz

Professor Roger Cook

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to those who assisted to the research portion of this academic study. Most notably, I would like to thank Dr. C. Zoe Smith for guiding me through this process, and answering my seemingly countless questions on topics ranging from formatting style to previous research on the image of the photojournalist in popular culture. Furthermore, this work would not have been possible without help from the members of my thesis committee, including Dr. Earnest Perry, Dr. Yong Volz and Dr. Roger Cook. Their professional counseling, support and assistance during the fall and winter semesters of 2006 and 2007 helped motivate me into carrying out this research study as well. Finally, I would like to thank Professor Joe Saltzman of the University of Southern California-Annenberg for the creation, development and maintenance of the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database, which aided in providing the names of text sources used for analysis during this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEWING THE IMAGE OF THE PHOTOJOURNALIST IN FILM:
HOW ETHICAL DILEMMAS SHAPE STEREOTYPES OF THE ON-SCREEN PRESS PHOTOGRAPHER IN MOTION PICTURES FROM 1954 TO 2006

Kyle R. McDaniel

Dr. C. Zoe Smith, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Since the 1930s, photojournalists in motion pictures have been portrayed as everything from screwball and comic relief characters to stubborn and ruthless sidekicks. With the exception of James Cagney's tabloid photographer in *Picture Snatcher* (1933), the early on-screen photojournalists were largely supporting characters who displayed absurd, unethical behaviors.

However, the 1930s and 1940s image of the photojournalist changed with James Stewart's portrayal of a lonely and voyeuristic magazine photographer in *Rear Window* (1954). Stewart's cynical and detached L. B. Jeffries established a stereotype that would persist through the 1970s. By the 1980s, the heroic but ethically challenged war photojournalist stereotype evolved. *Under Fire* (1983), *The Killing Fields* (1984) and *Salvador* (1986) were a few of the films that perpetuated this recurring leading character. Varied and alternative characterizations of photojournalists were found in the films from the final decade of the 20th Century, and into the mid-2000s. Although the number of appearances of on-screen cameramen in motion pictures has increased in recent decades, their role-related responsibilities and ethical dilemmas have changed alongside trends and technological advances within the field.

Preface

Why research the image of the photojournalist in films from the past 50 years? What does this add to the existing body of communications research? Why am I qualified to perform this study? These were the questions I asked myself when I began this study in August 2006. In order to properly address these issues, I had to look at my background, both as an individual and as a budding scholar.

I took a serious interest in film at a time when most pre-adolescent males my age were more intrigued with sports. While others were playing touch football or riding bicycles, I was tuned in to the television set in my family's living room. On most days, I rifled through my collection of action-adventure and comedy films, searching for the perfect movie for that particular day and time. Whether I knew it or not, I became infatuated with the ways in which motion pictures had the ability to hold my attention, entertain me, and influence my thinking.

By my mid-teens, I was viewing more serious work, and soon began watching the films of Hitchcock, Scorsese and Spielberg. Through these auteurs and others, I noticed that cinematic magic was something that happened only when all of the elements were in place. A good film contained a solid storyline, interesting characters who related to the audience, and intriguing dialogue that helped reveal the characters' feelings and motives.

Shortly thereafter, I began developing my own short films, along with the help of my brother and another close friend. Usually, the setting for the feature was our backyard or a nearby patch of woods, and our dialogue was always improvised. But as we morphed into early adulthood, we began taking our work and ourselves more seriously. By the time I was 19, our trio had developed over 10 short films, primarily for

church groups and the like, and we even created several sketches just for the fun of moviemaking. Additionally, we started basing our material from other, more notable work, such as acclaimed films and novels. As our final project for College English, we created a loose adaptation of Faulkner's "As I Lay Dying," a thirty-minute opus that won raves from our high school peers. However, by the time I entered college, my filmmaking had become a thing of the past.

In the fall of 2000, I entered the biology program at Arkansas State University with aspirations to become a dentist. Needless to say, I never managed to immerse myself in the medical field. By the time I was classified as a junior, I found myself enrolled in the film studies program at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington. During my brief stay in Wilmington, I was able to take classes on both film history and film narrative, both of which, furthered my education and interest in the cinematic arts. It was also during this time that my mother mailed me an aging, 35-millimeter SLR camera that she found while cleaning the basement of our home in Arkansas. At first, I was dumbfounded by the technicalities of still photography and was certain that I would do little more with the camera than make photographs of family, friends and nature.

Due to my increasing interest in still photography, I enrolled in an introductory course upon returning to my former university and was soon able to grasp the basics of lighting, exposure and film speed. Frustrated with the idea of returning to the biology program, I decided to change my academic major to photojournalism in hopes of becoming a successful magazine photographer. Initially, I entered the program with the premise that still photography contained elements that paralleled my first love, cinematography. But I realized that the professional world of photojournalism required

much more training than I could obtain through several university lectures. Photojournalism, as I have came to understand, is about people and their lives.

Since entering the photojournalism graduate program at the Missouri School of Journalism in Columbia, I have become increasingly aware of the similarities between still photography and motion pictures. Although both mediums are a team effort, each is more prominently an interpretation of an artist's point of view of the world. Just as film has the potential to change and empower lives, so does the still photograph.

Because of the motion picture's inherent power to impact audiences, the portrayals presented in even the most critically acclaimed Hollywood productions are nothing more than representations of a society and culture's way of thinking. Undoubtedly, filmmakers have characterized many professions in a variety of fashions, but the vast number of portrayals of journalists in motion pictures far outweighs the characterizations of other, more prominent professions. Throughout the 20th Century, filmmakers also included photojournalists into both mainstream and independent productions, often portraying the press photographer as a less-than-gratifying, second-class citizen.

This study sets out to answer "how" and "why" photojournalists have been portrayed in films from the past 50 years. It also attempts to answer "how" those characterizations have continued and changed as the role of photojournalism developed from a trade to a profession. Because of the power of the press, its influence upon audiences, and its ability to coerce social change, Hollywood's decision to incorporate photojournalists as key players in films must be acknowledged and analyzed. This study

attempts to do so in order to understand the ways in which those outside the realm of journalism view the profession.

Chapter 1

Introduction and questions for research

The purpose of this research study is to analyze the ways in which films from the mid-1950s to the present have portrayed photojournalists. Because a free press is an integral part of a democratic government and thus, an important component of the historical and political atmosphere of the United States, Hollywood and other motion picture outlets have traditionally used a variety of newsmen in both lead and supporting roles. Although many of the films featuring journalists use reporters and their editors in the starring roles, some of these films as well as additional, smaller films have incorporated photographers and photojournalists into the storyline. Many of the films from the "journalism genre" were produced in the 1930s and 1940s, during Hollywood's Golden Age. Thus, many of the photojournalists portrayed in these films were often used as comic-relief figures or supporting characters. As author Matthew Ehrlich said, "The movies have portrayed journalists both as upstanding citizens and heroes and as scruffy outsiders and villains."[1] But many of the more recent Hollywood depictions of photojournalists have transcended these traditional boundaries.

Beginning in the mid-1950s, photographers in films such as *Rear Window* became a symbol for aggression and isolation. In analyzing *Blowup*, a film in which a "Swinging London" fashion photographer believes he witnessed a murder, author Bill Jay describes one example of this characterization of the on-screen photojournalist:

> The film sequence in which the photographer shoots a writhing model, while constantly driving them both to a visual climax, has become an archetype for the sexually aggressive act of photography. Its potency is attested to by the fact that if there were not many photographers behaving in this manner prior to the movie, there were thousands imitating the photographer in subsequent years.[2]

From this point in time forward, Hollywood began using a variety of depictions of photojournalists in leading roles. Following the critical and commercial success of *Blowup,* journalists and photo-reporters were portrayed as low-level pawns that were subject to powerful systems or regimes. For example, the disillusioned television cameraman in *Medium Cool* is forced to confront the fact that he is being used by a large and seemingly evil corporate organization. And Michael Douglas's compassionate photographer in the Academy Award-winning *The China Syndrome* realizes that bureaucratic entanglements at his network continue to refuse to report on a potential nuclear fallout. Douglas's photojournalist foreshadowed other portrayals that came in the 1970s and 1980s, when motion picture outlets used cameramen as symbols of protest and angst. Beginning with *Under Fire* and *Salvador*, the photojournalist was characterized as a heroic underdog who was determined to remain an objective reporter but who sometimes did so in spite of unethical behavior. These types of portrayals can also be seen in the films of the 1990s and 2000s as well, although other, more varied characterizations have also developed, such as that of the pedophilic fashion photographer in 2006's *Hard Candy*.

Along with Jay, researchers such as Bonnie Brennen and Earle Bridger have noticed these varied portrayals of the press photographer and have analyzed the various stereotypes present in a variety of films from the 20th Century. Joe Saltzman, a professor of journalism at the University of California at Annenberg, has also researched the image of the journalist in film and has created an extensive database with over 44,000 items pertaining to this topic. Saltzman's database will also serve as the primary means for retrieving texts for this study.[3]

But why is this study relevant and important to journalists and the existing body of journalism research? Scholars Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel view the press as an important component of America's crusade for freedom and independence. The duty of the press is to provide, "independent, reliable, accurate, and comprehensive information that citizens require to be free," the authors stated in *The Elements of Journalism*.[4] Therefore, the press can be seen as an institution that serves the general public by informing its citizens of the events of the day. However, Hollywood's goal is to provide entertainment to audiences; a goal that additionally brings about over-the-top or larger-than-life, fictional characterizations. As Christopher Hanson said, "Hollywood is less concerned with the accuracy of a characterization than with its fidelity to the mood of the times and its box-office potential."[5] Similarly, Graeme Turner has stated the purpose of motion pictures and their impact on the viewer:

> film does not reflect or even record reality; like any other medium of representation it constructs and 're-presents' its pictures of reality by way of the codes, conventions, myths, and ideologies of culture…[6]

Undoubtedly, research suggests that the repeated, multi-characterizations of the press photographer presented by filmmakers have led to stereotyping of the on-screen cameraman.

While previous research, most notably that conducted by Bridger, has reviewed and analyzed the characterizations of photojournalists in film from the 20th Century, this research study will differentiate from other studies in a variety of ways. For one, this study's definition of "photojournalists" includes those cameramen that produce images outside of the realm of traditional news photography. Additionally, the focus of this research study is the image of the photojournalist in films from the 1950s to the present,

whereas others, primarily Bridger and Brennen, have been predominantly concerned with the portrayals and ethical nature of the press photographer from the films of the 1930s and 1940s. This study will also include a variety of smaller, more independent works as well, an area other research studies have chosen to exclude.

Through a textual analysis of selected films from the afore-mentioned time period, two interrelated research questions will be examined. How are fictional photojournalists presented in these films and do these depictions create stereotypes of the press photographer? Also, how does the filmmaker present the ethical work habits of these photojournalists and do ethics play a role in developing the stereotype(s)?

From the general theory for this study, drawn from Alan McKee's definition of the structuralist theoretical approach, the concepts will be outlined in reference to their context for this research study. The methodological framework will then be introduced, including a definition of textual analysis and its applicability to this research study, in order to develop the research design. Following this section, the outline for conducting this study will be explained, as will a detailed review of Saltzman's Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database. In addition, the findings and conclusions will be explained in-depth in the "Analysis" portion of this study. Finally, the ways in which future research can use textual analysis and the structuralist theoretical framework to analyze the image of the journalist in film over a given time period will be examined as well.

[1] Matthew C. Ehrlich, *Journalism in the Movies* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 1.

[2] Bill Jay, "The Photographer as Aggressor," in *Observations: Essays on Documentary Photography*, ed. David Featherstone (San Francisco: The Friends of Photography, 1984), 21.

[3] Joe Saltzman, *The Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture (IJPC) Database* (Annenberg: The Norman Lear Center at the University of Southern California - Annenberg, 2006) [Microsoft Access database]; available from [http://www.ijpc.org/].

[4] Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, *The Elements of Journalism* (New York: Crown, 2001), 11.

[5] Christopher Hanson, "Where Have All the Heroes Gone?" *Columbia Journalism Review* (March/April 1996): 45.

[6] Graeme Turner, *Film as Social Practice* (London: Routledge, 1993), 131.

Chapter 2

Concept Explication through Literature Review

Structuralism

Structuralist theory derives from the broader model of structuralism. As David Silverman explains this model:

> Structuralism is a model used in anthropology which aims to show how single cases relate to general social forms. Structural anthropologists view behavior as the expression of a 'society', which works as a 'hidden hand' constraining and forming human action.[1]

Although structuralism is not limited to qualitative research studies, studies that rely on drawing conclusions from more elusive subject matter, such as texts or oral histories, have more prominently employed this methodology.

Structuralism is also connected to semiology. For example, McKee says that the structuralist framework derives from the broader model of semiotics.[2] Denis McQuail notes that semiology, the practice of conducting semiotics research, was based on the study of general linguistics and was developed in order for textual interpretation. "A key element of semiology is the idea that any (meaningful) sign (of any kind) has a conceptual element that carries meaning as well as a physical manifestation."[3]

Scholars using the structuralist approach argue that even though cultures use different approaches in making sense of the world, all cultures use similar foundations or social structures. "From a 'structuralist' perspective," McKee has said, "you look for the deep structures that aren't actually apparent in the text, but that you can find by specialized training."[4] Other researchers have defined structuralist theory as it relates to humanistic scholarship in a similar fashion as McKee. For example, Klaus Bruhn Jensen and Nicholas W. Jankowski defined the historical roots of structuralist theory and also

elaborated on its relationship with the model of semiology. The authors say that the structuralist perspective is concerned with "interpreting societies and cultures as discourses" as well as using a "range of textual forms" in order to interpret meaning. More importantly, Jensen and Jankowski have noted that much of the more recent research employing the structuralist theoretical framework has dealt with popular culture as the primary area of inquiry.[5]

In the case of this research study, the structures are those symbols or tools hidden within a particular film or group of films, and made apparent through textual analysis. Turner states that a researcher performing this type of study should "focus on the relations between film's representational 'languages' and ideology."[6] The primary means for interpreting these structures, which include interaction between characters, body language, work and social habits, and most importantly, dialogue, is through means of interpretation. By analyzing these aspects of film through means of textual analysis, it is possible to note the ethical dilemmas and repetitive characterizations that may appear from film to film and decade to decade.

From Jensen and Jankowski's definition of the structuralist theoretical perspective, pop culture texts may be considered valuable research tools for determining changes in the image of photojournalists from one time period to the next. Additionally, the variety of films under observation will aid in determining if certain characterizations and ethical dilemmas have remained a staple of films from the past 50 years that incorporate fictional photojournalists in leading or supporting roles. Finally, the structuralist theoretical framework also allows for exploration into the variety (or lack

thereof) of other, more integrated labels that Hollywood has impressed upon the fictional press photographer.

Introduction to the Concepts

In order to carry out this study properly, the concepts outlined in the research questions must first be defined and analyzed. These concepts are "photojournalist," "stereotype" as it relates to photojournalists, and "photojournalism ethics."

Again, this research study is primarily interested in identifying the ethical habits and work practices incorporated by the on-screen press photographer in pre-selected films from the mid-1950s to the present, and analyzing if certain characterizations result in stereotyping from these situations, as well as other determining factors. Additionally, the historical time period in which the films are depicting and the characterization of the photojournalist within the context of the film may also play a role in shaping the stereotypes. But determining which factors play a role in shaping the image of the fictional photojournalist can only be interpreted after the primary concepts for this study have been defined.

What is a "Photojournalist?"

"Photojournalism" has loosely been defined as everything from freelance fashion photography to daily newspaper press photography. "Journalists," according to author Patricia Dooley, are "those who enter newspaper work from the ranks of the broader printing and publishing establishment."[7] Dooley's definition, largely drawn from a historical standpoint, lies in apparent contrast with many of those currently at work in the profession. Modern journalists are both well-educated and trained primarily for their chosen occupation. Additionally, the job of a journalist is to record and present news to

the general public. Although their overall goal is to educate and inform the masses, today's journalists take on a variety of roles and job-related functions.

"Photojournalist" has traditionally been defined as a working member of the visual communications staff of a news organization. Like the modern reporter, today's photojournalists work for a variety of media outlets that require them to perform numerous role-related tasks. One photojournalist, working as a freelance photographer through an agency, may be responsible for covering the death and destruction in a war-torn country while another may predominantly work as a portrait artist for a monthly city magazine. In any case, the jobs of most photojournalists are largely dependent upon the nature of the individual task and the style of the publication. The majority of today's press photographers are trained as both technicians and artists, responsible for producing visual material on newsworthy topics for publications worldwide.

Research shows that two theories exist regarding the creation of the term "photojournalist," although both agree that the title was developed in the middle of the 20th Century. Several authors, including researcher Paul Lester, believe that Frank Mott, former dean of the Journalism School at the University of Missouri-Columbia, coined the term after establishing an academic sequence for photojournalism instruction in 1942.[8] However, others believe that Wilson Hicks, longtime picture editor at *LIFE* magazine during its heyday, made the term "photojournalist" mainstream in his 1952 book, *Words and Pictures.* "This particular coming together of the verbal and visual mediums of communication is, in a word photojournalism," Hicks wrote.[9] From these definitions, the term has traditionally come to apply to both still and video photographers, all of whom generate and present visual material for publication.

Regardless of the oral and written origin of the term, photojournalism historians such as Brennen, Hanno Hardt and Marianne Fulton trace the roots of the practice to the 1920s and 1930s with the inception of the German picture magazines. Simultaneously, American photographers like Walker Evans and Dorothea Lange were using documentary photography for the purpose of social change. The combination of documentary, socially conscious photography with cheaper and faster technology as well as larger outlets for public viewing led to the rise in popularity of modern-day photojournalism.

Other texts, research oriented or otherwise, dealing with the creation of photojournalism, use the term in association with a member of the visual department of the mass media. Much of this literature uses the term interchangeably to describe both still photographers and television cameramen.

For this study, films from the past 50 years depicting both still and video photographers will be used in order to broaden the scope of the research as well as to provide more in-depth examples of the characterizations of the on-screen press photographer. However, some of the films to be used as primary source material for this study include depictions of "photojournalists" whose occupational definition lies outside the realm of traditional news coverage. These films are useful because they include characterizations of photojournalists who produce fashion and studio-generated material for publication. Although these photojournalists are sometimes classified separately from those that cover news, these types of photographers will be viewed as "photojournalists" for this research study, and will be included in both primary and secondary source films. However, advertising photographers and fine art photographers, along with other types of

cameramen who create images for purposes other than reportage, will not be considered for this study.

Do films "stereotype" photojournalists?

Mass communications scholars have been studying "stereotypes" since researcher Walter Lippmann first introduced the term to the field in *Public Opinion* in the 1920s. Lippmann said that the term applied to a "picture in our heads" which caused the shaping of the imagination in extraordinary ways. "We do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see," he said.[10] From Lippmann's original definition, the term took on a negative connotation and came to refer to ideas or prejudices toward certain members of particular groups. University of Liverpool professor D. B. Bromley has written extensively on the topic of stereotyping:

> Stereotypes provide us with simple cognitive frameworks that are fast and require little mental effort. We rely on these conceptual routines in organizing our behavior when dealing with objects, people and events.[11]

Author Howard Good, who has also performed extensive research on stereotypes in film, said that, "there is the danger that stereotypes overgeneralize and prevent us from recognizing reality."[12] Most mass communications scholars have emphasized the importance of stereotype developments and audience perception of the mass media. However, a number of researchers, like Good, have more recently found evidence for stereotyping as it relates to the image of the on-screen journalist.

In *Outcasts: The Image of Journalists in Contemporary Film*, Good states that the often contradictory, reporter-as-hero genre first developed in the 1890s through mainstream literature. But by the time motion pictures began sweeping the nation in the 1930s, this characterization had changed dramatically, primarily through films that

incorporated journalists as leading characters. Good said that the journalist depicted in most motion pictures from the 1930s and 1940s "wore a hat indoors, had a bottle of booze stashed in his bottom desk drawer, and insulted everyone he met."[13] Ehrlich found that the journalism film genre began in the 1930s with the popularity of *The Front Page*. The film, like other motion pictures from the time period, portrayed journalists as "gossips," "scoundrels" and "drunks."[14] However, Ehrlich also noted that the genre continued to develop into the middle and latter portions of the 20th Century. By the 1970s, films such as *All the President's Men* and *Network* were embodying journalists as defenders of democracy and simultaneously, as lower-level players, continually pressured by corporate America, such as the Robert Forster's cameraman in *Medium Cool*.[15]

Undoubtedly, much of the previous research regarding the image of the journalist in popular culture has more narrowly focused on the stereotypes of newspaper reporters in motion pictures. For example, researcher Paul Steinle, whose study reviewed journalism portrayals in films of the 1990s, found that print journalists were largely portrayed as "idiosyncratic and driven" while broadcast journalists were seen as "indifferent to society," "self-centered" and "sensationalistic."[16] Additionally, Saltzman found that film director Frank Capra created a somewhat iconic archetype of the American reporter in his collection of journalism films from 1926 to 1961.[17] But even a large portion of this body of research has included at least one example of stereotypes of the on-screen photojournalist.

Undoubtedly, the journalism film genre progressed from its initial roots in the 1920s and 1930s to include other films in which photojournalists were portrayed as leading characters, rather than as sidekicks or in supporting roles. However, research

shows that many of these films stereotype the press photographer negatively, unlike the larger number of films that feature the heroic and crusading reporter as lead protagonist. Many researchers, including Bridger, Brennen and Saltzman, have taken the initiative to review the growing number of characterizations of fictionalized photojournalists in film.

Much of the research in this area has found that the characterizations pertaining to the fictional cameraman have shifted from decade to decade. For example, Brennen's research, which dealt largely with the portrayals of photojournalists in films from the 1920s and 1930s, showed that photojournalists were often showcased negatively, as either comic relief characters, drunkards, hoodlums or a combination of the three.[18] Similarly, Bridger performed a textual analysis of 16 fictional films, primarily from the early part of the 20th Century, which showcased photojournalists in leading roles. The author also found evidence for negative stereotyping of the press photographer, primarily through their work habits, mannerisms and in relationships with others. Bridger wrote that many of these perceptions were developed through the fictional photographer's intrusive nature as well as their lack of professional respect for their subjects.[19] Author Cathy Newman, one of only a handful researchers who have analyzed the characterizations of photojournalists in film from the latter half of the 20th Century, suggested that Clint Eastwood's portrayal in the 1995 film *The Bridges of Madison County* - a rugged and poetic 1960s-era *National Geographic* photographer - made the profession seem unfairly "easy, simple and relaxed."[20] And Stephen Badsey's research showed that film narrative has helped create an idealistic image of war photographers. The author cites Dennis Hopper's over-the-top portrayal of a drug-abusing Vietnam

correspondent in *Apocalypse Now* and Barry Pepper's detached loner photographer in *We Were Soldiers* as examples.[21]

In sum, much of the previous research on the image of photojournalists in film has found that negative stereotyping does exist and is developed through the character's work habits, professional status within a given culture or society, and in relation to other characters on-screen. However, very little of the research on the image of the journalist in popular culture actually pertains to the characterizations related to fictional photojournalists. And the few studies that have reviewed the role of the photojournalist in film have rarely analyzed the films from the latter half of the 20th Century to the present. However, this study will focus on the image of the photojournalist in film from the latter half of the 20th Century. Characterizations that may lead to stereotyping that have developed since press photographers were first characterized on-screen, as well as those that have remained a Hollywood staple since the 1930s, will be of particular interest to this research study.

What are "photojournalism ethics?"

"Photojournalism ethics," a type of ethics that developed from the broader study of communication ethics, has been studied by a select body of scholars as well as a number of those outside the field of communications research. According to McQuail, journalism ethics developed from a "response to the perceived failings of the mass newspaper press, especially its commercialism" and "lack of political independence."[22] By the middle of the 20th Century, professional organizations such as the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the Society of Professional Journalists had adopted written codes of ethics for journalists in the United States. Press photographers,

pressured by the general public due to their appearance and behavior while in the work field, were among the first of these groups to adopt a written set of bylaws. McQuail states that these codes of ethics "reveal the values that the media publicly proclaim as guidelines for their work."[23] Truthfulness, fairness, accuracy and respecting the integrity of sources are just a few of the more common principles outlined in many journalistic codes of ethics.

Mass communications scholar Deni Elliott defines photojournalism ethics as, "Any situation, including the publication of visual messages, [that] becomes morally questionable (worthy of concern and analysis) when an individual perceives himself or herself as likely to suffer harm."[24] Elliott's discussion of photojournalism ethics has prompted other scholars to review the various definitions of the term. "Ethics is concerned with a person's duty toward moral obligations to humankind," Fulton wrote in the final chapter of her book, *Eyes of Time: Photojournalism in America*. "In photography, the issue covers fairness, truthfulness, privacy, decency, and responsibility-all broad terms defined only when thought to have been abused."[25] Fulton also stated the ways in which photojournalists can protect themselves from ethical pitfalls. The author includes maintaining credibility while working within the field as well as increased educational training as key examples.[26]

The written guideline that today's still and video photographers adhere to is the National Press Photographers Association's code of ethics for photojournalists. Founding member Joe Costa developed this code shortly after the National Press Photographers Association's inception in 1946. While much of the code has remained unchanged since its development, the majority of the text deals with the ideas of subject

misrepresentation and photo manipulation. Authors such as Elliott and Lester have reviewed this code and applied it to the image of the photojournalist in popular culture. In a study published in February 2001's *News Photographer*, the authors listed over 20 films that included photojournalists as main characters. The article also included the thoughts and feelings of real-life photojournalists who surveyed a selection of these films, and who looked for examples in which the ethics of the on-screen photojournalist was compromised. The bulk of the authors' findings revealed that staging photographs, photo manipulation and the photographer-subject relationship were the main ethical concerns noted by the respondents.[27]

In reality, many of these ethical issues depend upon the circumstances in which the photojournalist is working. For example, author Ken Kobre has said that, "the ethics of staging a photograph often turns on which role the photojournalist is playing on any given assignment – reporter or artist with a camera."[28] In other words, what may be ethical for a photojournalist one situation may be highly questionable in another situation. As Good and Michael J. Dillon pointed out in *Media Ethics Goes to the Movies*, "It isn't always easy to determine which value should take precedence when; there is no one-size-fits-all standard for ethical choices. Nonetheless, we still have to somehow choose."[29]

Additional literature confirms that the ethical dilemmas faced by working photojournalists, and as outlined through research such as that conducted by Elliott and Lester, make up the majority of ethical debate in the larger arena of photojournalism. This research study will review and take note of the various ethical dilemmas that may appear throughout an analysis of the films of the past 50 years that feature photojournalists in leading or prominent roles. Also, the ethical debates encountered by

the photojournalists from these films will be examined through textual analysis. These ethical situations will be noted primarily for their impact in creating or reinforcing certain stereotypes of the fictional press photographer.

[1] David Silverman, *Doing Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005), 380.

[2] Alan McKee, *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide* (London: Sage Publications, 2003), 130 -131.

[3] Denis McQuail, *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 2005), 567.

[4] McKee, *Textual Analysis*, 12 - 13.

[5] Klaus B. Jensen and Nicholas W. Jankowski, *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research* (London: Routledge, 1991), 26.

[6] Turner, *Film as Social Practice*, 131.

[7] Patricia Dooley, *Taking Their Political Place: Journalists and the Making of an Occupation* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 1997), 2.

[8] Paul Lester, *Photojournalism: An Ethical Approach* (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1991), 4.

[9] Wilson Hicks, *Words and Pictures* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), 3.

[10] Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Free Press, 1922), 55.

[11] D. B. Bromley, *Reputation, Image and Impression Management* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), 71.

[12] Howard Good, *Outcasts: The Image of Journalists in Contemporary Film* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1989), 7.

[13] Good, *Outcasts*, 13.

[14] Ehrlich, *Journalism in the Movies*, 20 - 45.

[15] Ibid., 106 - 128.

[16] Paul Steinle, *Print (and Video) to Screen: Journalism in Motion Pictures of the 1990s*, paper presented at the Popular Culture/American Culture Conference, New Orleans, La., 22 April 2000, available from <http://www.ijpc.org/>, 2.

[17] Joe Saltzman, *Frank Capra and the Image of the Journalist in American Film* (Annenberg: The Norman Lear Center, 2002), 2 - 6.

[18] Bonnie Brennen, "From headline shooter to picture snatcher," *Journalism* 5, no. 4 (2004): 423 – 439.

[19] Earle Bridger, "From the ridiculous to the sublime; stereotypes of photojournalists in the movies," *Visual Communications Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1997): 4 – 11.

[20] Cathy Newman, "Reel to real," *National Geographic* 188, no. 2 (August 1995): 58.

[21] Stephen Badsey, "The depiction of war reporters in Hollywood feature films from the Vietnam War to the present," *Film History* 14 (2002): 243 – 260.

[22] Denis McQuail, *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 2005), 173.

[23] Ibid., 174.

[24] Paul Martin Lester, ed., *Images That Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media, Ethical and Moral Responsibilities of the Media*, by Deni Elliott (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1996), 4.

[25] Marianne Fulton, *Eyes of Time: Photojournalism in America* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1988), 244.

[26] Ibid., 246.

[27] Deni Elliott and Paul Martin Lester, "Media Ethics Goes to the Movies: What Photojournalism Films Can Teach Us About Our Profession," *News Photographer* (February 2001): 1 – 6.

[28] Kenneth Kobre, *Photojournalism: The Professionals' Approach* (Boston: Focal, 1996), 131.

[29] Michael J. Dillon and Howard Good, *Media Ethics Goes to the Movies* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002), 64.

Chapter 3

Methodology and Research Design

The purpose of this study is to analyze the ways in which photojournalists have been portrayed in films from the mid-1950s to the present. Through a textual analysis of selected films from the time period, two interrelated research questions will be examined for this study. How are the fictional photojournalists presented in these films and do these depictions create stereotypes of the press photographer? Additionally, how do filmmakers present the ethical work habits of the photojournalists portrayed in these films and do ethics play a role in developing stereotype(s)? The methodology for this study, including the method of textual analysis, must first be explained and the research design analyzed as well.

Textual Analysis as Working Methodology

In *Doing Qualitative Research*, Silverman describes the practical uses of examining texts for research studies. "Small numbers of texts and documents may be analysed [in order to] understand the participants' categories and to see how these are used in concrete activities like telling stories, assembling files or describing 'family life.'" The author also says that these types of studies are more concerned with using texts to deduct "social facts" or to depict a certain reality, rather than analyzing them for the sake of developing true or false statements about a selected phenomenon.[1] In other words, Silverman believes that textual analysis works well in qualitative research studies that are primarily concerned with organizing and categorizing large amounts of information. Additionally, the author says that studies performed under the method of textual analysis should not conclude with statements of fact; rather, they should look for bits and pieces of information inlaid within

the texts, which then allows the researcher to make generalizations about a group, culture or society.[2]

McKee also agrees that textual analysis is a strong research method that allows for "likely interpretations" to be made of a particular text or group of texts. The author says that scholars use their interpretations in order to "obtain a sense of the ways in which, in particular cultures at particular times, people make sense of the world around them." Additionally, McKee says that "texts" are any item that researchers use to "make meaning from" and that most researchers use textual analysis to determine differences in value judgments or relationships among items with a fundamental similarity.[3] From McKee's view of textual analysis as a research technique, the observer should be able to review a body of work and note similar patterns or characteristics that continually arise from each individual text. Additionally, these texts could also be observed as an entire body of work or as individual works within a larger whole. However, the texts should have a recurring theme or symbol that is present throughout their entirety.

Jensen and Jankowski have also studied the importance and usage of textual analysis in qualitative research studies. These scholars have noted that textual analysis can be useful if the author employs the correct language usage from the texts. "The language of textual sources…offers cues to how, for example, political and cultural rights have been conceived in different social and historical settings."[4] But Jensen and Jankowski are also aware of the primary drawbacks for using this type of methodology. "The primary tool of research is the interpretive capacity of the scholar," the authors stated. Therefore, the researcher must be well versed in the language of the texts in order to derive accurate and legitimate findings from employing a textual analysis.[5]

Textual Analysis in Previous Studies

Scholars from various fields have recently generated a large body of research pertaining to the image of the journalist in film. Most of these studies incorporated textual

analysis of pre-selected films as means for interpreting "how" and "why" the image of on-screen journalists changed from one decade to the next. For example, Ehrlich, Dillon and Good all examined the stereotypes of journalists in film from the 20th Century and found that a variety of labels were attached to each portrayal. "Scoundrel," "drunk" and "sidekick" are just a few of the stereotypes that these authors and others found through textual analyses of journalism films from the 1920s and 1930s. Textual analysis also allowed these authors to analyze each film independently, and as a single, larger entity. Doing so gave the researchers the flexibility to show the progression of the image of the newsman from one decade to the next. Ehrlich, Dillon, Good and others have also found that these labels were brought about partly through the ethical dilemmas that the fictional journalists faced while interacting with colleagues, in romantic endeavors and while working in the field. More importantly, however, this extensive body of research has paved the way for others to use the method of textual analysis in analyzing the image of photojournalists in film.

As previously stated, many of the research studies in which the image of the photojournalist in film is analyzed through means of textual analysis have shown that fictional press photographers from the early 20th Century were often portrayed as intrusive hooligans or thugs, who were willing to do anything to get the picture. Textual analyses of these films by Brennen, Bridger and others have shown that these portrayals were largely concurrent with the work habits and attitudes of early 20th Century photojournalists. These authors used effective scene recreations, dialogue, and the physical appearance and attitudes of fictional photojournalists from these films in order to research "how" and "why" stereotypes of press photographers in motion pictures came about.

Through a review of films from the past 40 years that feature press photographers in leading or prominent roles, this study will search for similar types of ethical dilemmas that other researchers have found that led to stereotyping of the on-screen photojournalist. For example, prior research incorporating textual analysis found evidence for stereotyping the

on-screen cameraman in both *Picture Snatcher* (1933) and Alfred Hitchcock's *Rear Window* (1954). In *Picture Snatcher*, the characterization of the aggressive, intrusive photojournalist of the 1920s and 1930s was perpetuated by Jimmy Cagney's tabloid photographer's obnoxious behavior. According to Brennen, Cagney's character in the film steals a photograph from a mentally unstable fireman and in another scene, uses a hidden camera to photograph an execution.[6] In *Rear Window*, Bridger found that director Alfred Hitchcock created the stereotype of the modern, adventurous photojournalist - a wheelchair-ridden magazine photographer played by Jimmy Stewart - by using subtle techniques in the setting of the film as well as crafty dialogue. "Jeffries's apartment carries all the expected trappings of a world-roving photographer," Bridger said. "A slow 'pan' of his apartment reveals a gallery of action photographs, passes his smashed camera on the table, and lingers past a stack of magazines adorned with his photograph."[7] Bridger noted that the characterization was perpetuated in another scene in which Stewart's character discusses an upcoming assignment with his editor. In the conversation, Stewart, despite a broken leg and pleas from his boss, refuses to take a break from his work. The dramatic dialogue incorporated into this scene gives the viewer the idea that Stewart's character is not only heroic and adventurous, but a workaholic as well.

Undoubtedly, textual analysis is a powerful research tool that can be used to extract meaning through interpretation of one or more texts. It can also reveal a plethora of information about a culture or group who are represented within the work(s). However, as Jensen and Jankowski note, the researcher must be careful when employing the method of textual analysis and must also be well versed in the "language" of the texts.[8] In other words, this research study must employ terms that are associated with "photojournalism" as well as "film" properly, so that the findings from this study are not skewed. Furthermore, the only generalizations necessary are those that are relative to the body of work under study; conclusions can not be drawn from the films under study about aspects

of real-life photojournalists, nor can the results of this study be applied to every film that features a photojournalist.

However, a study that employs the appropriate language of the selected films will allow for a more accurate and detailed textual analysis. Through a thorough review of selected films from the mid-1950s to the present in which photojournalists are portrayed in leading or prominent roles, the interaction between characters, dialogue, body language and action will reveal if certain characterizations lead to the creation and evolution of stereotypes. Undoubtedly, employing a textual analysis of these films will also allow for certain ethical dilemmas to come to the forefront, many of which may aid in shaping the personality and character of the on-screen press photographer.

Undoubtedly, previous studies in which textual analysis has been employed have used the method in order to generate a variety of rich and detailed information. As previously stated and shown through the above examples, textual analysis is useful when examining the impressions or themes of a certain character or type of character that may be critical to the structure of the film. Additionally, research employing textual analysis views the selected texts as historical or cultural artifacts which have the ability to reveal pertinent and important information about a group or society over a given period of time.

The Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database

Films to be examined in this study were selected from Saltzman's Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database. Saltzman, a professor of journalism at the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communication, founded the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture project of The Norman Lear Center in 2000. The Center's website states the project's mission:

> To investigate and analyze, through research and publication, the conflicting images of the journalist in film, television, radio, commercials, cartoons, and fiction, demonstrating their impact on the American public's perception of newsgatherers.[9]

The project's database, updated annually and available as a Microsoft Access CD through paid membership, includes more than 44,000 items relating to journalists, public relations practitioners and other media and media personnel. Included in this database are 14,200 films, television movies and series, compiled by Saltzman and others, in which print and broadcast journalists are portrayed in both lead and supporting roles. Additionally, many researchers who have analyzed the image of the journalist in popular culture have used Saltzman's database in order to gather a body of selected texts.[10]

Although the database offers additional material that features other media personnel, this study is primarily concerned with only those films in which photojournalists, as defined by this research study, are featured in lead and supporting roles. Secondary source films featured in this study, including those in which non-visual journalists are portrayed, will be used only as means for supporting evidence.

An ordered set of steps will be followed for running each query of the database. Each decade will be queried independently of the others and will be sorted by year. Each query will also include the "Journalists Movie-TV 1997" database, provided by the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture database, as means for retrieving the texts. Additionally, each query will also include a search for all movies, television movies and foreign films, designated in the database as "M" and "MF" respectively, where the occupation field also includes the words "photo" or "camera." Using these search terms allows for all of the films featuring photojournalists and cameramen to appear in the "Comments-Occupation" field of Saltzman's database (See Appendix A).

Because Saltzman's Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database offers the largest and most comprehensive collection of films featuring photojournalists in leading and supporting roles, it will serve as the primary means for gathering texts for this study. A query of the database for films from each decade will be performed, and then other criteria will be used in determining the most pertinent texts for this research study. Films in which

photojournalists are portrayed in leading or supporting roles will be the first and most prominent criteria for selection. Secondary criteria will include films that were critically acclaimed or award-winning at the time of their release, which also feature photojournalists in prominent roles. Alongside Saltzman's database, other sources will be used in order to determine the final selection of films. These sources include the Internet Movie Database, film critic Roger Ebert's website, *Leonard Maltin's 2007 Movie Guide*, the Academy Awards Database, Richard Ness's *From Headline Hunter to Superman: A Journalism Filmography* and the researcher's prior knowledge of films featuring photojournalists in leading or prominent roles.

The list of selected films that appears from these queries will then be reviewed and, based on prior research and the afore-mentioned research criteria, primary source material will be selected accordingly. Again, all films from Saltzman's database and otherwise that feature news, fashion or studio cameramen who generate documentary-type, storytelling images for publication will be considered as primary source material for this study.

After the selection process is complete, up to six to ten films from each decade that best fit the afore-mentioned criteria will be selected for analysis. The number of films per decade selected as primary source material may vary, depending on the number that are found that feature photojournalists in prominent roles. The final selection of primary source films will be purchased or gathered through inter-library loan and will be viewed individually.

During the viewing of each film, a textual analysis of each film will be performed in order to determine if ethics plays a role in shaping the photojournalist's character, and/or leads to additional qualities of stereotyping. Examinations of the press photographer will be analyzed in the context of each individual film as well as in the context of the historical time period in which the film was released. Finally, behavioral patterns, dialogue and work habits of the on-screen photojournalist will be the basis for determining if stereotypes exist, and the ethical dilemmas that may arise through the characters in each individual film.

Querying the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database

Multiple queries of the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database produced a variety of films from 1960 to 2006 in which photojournalists, both still and motion picture, were featured in leading and supporting roles. As previously stated, each of the five queries generated was performed on a decade-by-decade basis, with the entries "photojournalist" and "camera" placed in the "Comments – Occupation" field. Results indicated that the database contained 107 entries from 1960 to 1969 in which the term "photojournalist" or "camera" or both were recorded in the "Comments – Occupation" field, 110 entries from 1970 to 1979, 140 entries from 1980 to 1989, 236 entries from 1990 to 1999 and 112 entries from 2000 to 2005. One primary source film that was released prior to 1960 and another that was released after the time periods queried for this study were selected as well. Both of these texts were deemed instrumental to the reliability of this study, because they provided either historical context or further research possibilities on the image of the photojournalist in film.

Films retrieved from each database query were analyzed and reviewed as possibilities for both primary and secondary source texts. Again, sources such as Roger Ebert's website, *Leonard Maltin's 2007 Movie Guide*, the Internet Movie Database and Richard Ness's *From Headline Hunter to Superman: A Journalism Filmography* were critical texts used in order to determine if the film in question was of award-winning caliber or was critically acclaimed at the time of its release. Additional criteria for selection also included films in which photojournalists played leading or supporting roles, and were integral components of the film's narrative. Films that contained all or most of the afore-mentioned selection criteria were chosen as primary source texts for this study.

The 23 primary source texts for this study were *Rear Window* (1954), *Blowup* (1966), *Medium Cool* (1969), *Z* (1969), *Eyes of Laura Mars* (1978), *Pretty Baby* (1978),

Apocalypse Now (1979), *The China Syndrome* (1979), *The Year of Living Dangerously* (1983), *Under Fire* (1983), *The Killing Fields* (1984), *Salvador* (1986), *Somebody Has to Shoot the Picture* (1990), *The Public Eye* (1992), *Before the Rain* (1994), *The Bridges of Madison County* (1995), *Pecker* (1998), *High Art* (1998), *Harrison's Flowers* (2000), *We Were Soldiers* (2002), *City of God* (2003), *Paparazzi* (2004) and *Hard Candy* (2006).

Films retrieved from Saltzman's database or otherwise that also contained portions of the selection criteria, but were not selected as primary source texts, were then considered as secondary source material for this study. Due to the large number of these possibilities, extensive critical background research was performed on each of these films. After inquiries were made into the historical importance of these films as well as the relevance of the photojournalists in these motion pictures, those films that contained most of the necessary research criteria were chosen as secondary source material. In other words, if a photojournalist was portrayed in a film under observation, and also made a contribution to either the storyline or was relevant to this study in any additional way, then the film was selected as a secondary source text. Secondary sources included those texts in which either the photojournalist made a minor contribution to the narrative, the photographer was not a photojournalist as defined by this study but was present in the storyline, or the photojournalist was featured and the film was of historical importance, but the character played a minor role in the development of the film. The 17 secondary source films chosen for this study were *La Dolce Vita* (1960), *Peeping Tom* (1960), *Live a Little, Love a Little* (1968), *Friday Foster* (1975), *Mahogany* (1975), *The Omen* (1976), *Gandhi* (1982), *Violets Are Blue* (1986), *84 Charlie MoPic* (1989), *Kalifornia* (1993), *Road to Perdition* (2002), *Spider-Man* (2002), *The Weight of Water* (2002), *Closer* (2003), *November* (2005), *Flags of Our Fathers* (2006) and *Blood Diamond* (2006).

For the most part, equal time was allotted for both primary and secondary source texts during the analysis portion of this research study. All films were viewed

independently, and each film was screened in its entirety as well. However, because the photojournalists in the primary source texts were on-screen for longer periods of time, and the dialogue, behavioral patterns and ethical considerations of these characters were more integral to the storyline, more detailed information was accumulated from the on-screen cameramen showcased in these texts. Additionally, the more detailed information accumulated from each primary source film also resulted in a deeper, more thorough analysis of these films as well. In sum, both primary and secondary source texts were screened for analysis, but due to the larger importance of the photojournalists in the primary sources, more thorough information was obtained on the characters in these films.

[1] Silverman, *Doing Qualitative Research*, 160.

[2] Ibid., 160 - 168.

[3] McKee, *Textual Analysis*, 1 – 8.

[4] Jensen and Jankowski, *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies*, 33.

[5] Ibid., 31, 32.

[6] Brennen, "From headline shooter," 432.

[7] Bridger, "From the ridiculous to the sublime," 8.

[8] Jensen and Jankowski, *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies*, 31, 32.

[9] Joe Saltzman, *The Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture* (Annenberg: University of Southern California School for Communication, 2005) [online]; available from <http://ijpc.org/>.

[10] Saltzman, *IJPC Database*, Microsoft Access CD.

Chapter 4

Analysis

Textual Analysis in Practice for this Study

After both the primary and secondary source texts were chosen for this study, a textual analysis of each film was performed independently. Situations or dialogue within the film that shaped the image of the on-screen photojournalist was taken into special consideration. The photojournalist's physical appearance, as well as behavioral patterns and communication skills, were noted during each phase of the textual analysis. The character's interaction with his or her coworkers and their environment were factors that were also taken into consideration during this portion of the study. In sum, the on-screen photojournalist's physical presence as well as their influence on the film's other characters and storyline were noted during the textual analysis, in order to determine that character's overall projected image on screen. As previously stated, those situations or instances within the film in which the on-screen photojournalist was placed in an ethical dilemma or debate, were taken into special consideration.

The design for carrying out this portion of the study included viewing all of the films from a particular decade independently. An analysis of the notes from all of the films from a particular decade was conducted, and ethical dilemmas and situations that may have reappeared from film to film and decade to decade were researched. The afore-mentioned qualities of the on-screen photojournalist were primarily analyzed for the sake of discovering if such behavioral patterns and ethical dilemmas resulted in the creation of certain repeated characterizations from one film to the next or from decade to decade.

The findings from this research study suggest that the ethical patterns of many of the photojournalists in the primary source films, as well as those displayed by the characters from many of the secondary source films, were reproduced from film to film and decade to decade. These reproduced ethical dilemmas helped shape the characterizations of the photojournalists in the films reviewed for this study from one decade to the next. However, other factors, including physical appearance, behavior and simple dialogue, were also responsible for shaping the image of the photojournalist in film, and thus, were aided in creating and developing certain stereotypes.

1954 to 1979: The Photojournalist as Young, Caucasian, Male, Loner

The findings from this study suggest that the majority of photojournalists portrayed in films from 1954 to 1979 exhibited unique behavioral patterns and ethical dilemmas that helped shape the stereotype of the cameraman as youthful, Caucasian male, who is obsessed with both his work, as well as detached from the events he is covering. Saltzman has written about the image of the photojournalist in film and has reflected on the behavioral and ethical patterns of these characters:

> Some photographers, especially newsreel shooters, are among the most courageous and corrupt journalists in film. These newshawks use a camera instead of a pad and pencil, and they frequently will do anything to get an exclusive picture of a hot news story.[1]

Saltzman's observation, in reference to many of the films from 1954 to 1979 used in this study, suggests that the characterizations of the on-screen cameraman were similar to those found by researchers such as Jay and Bridger in their analyses. Other researchers, including Zynda, Ehrlich and Good, have placed these characterizations within a historical context and found other reoccurring themes associated with portrayals of journalists in motion pictures. In relation to this study, Zynda found that journalism-

genre films from the 1960s examined the nature of truth as a media problem while journalism-genre films from the following decade were primarily concerned with examining the press as an organization.[2]

Additionally, this stereotype coincides with the historical nature and events of the time period as well. For one, most of the photojournalists in films from 1954 to 1979 use smaller, lightweight and more unobtrusive camera equipment in the field. The rise in popularity of the 35-millimeter camera, which initially began in the 1930s and became commonplace by the 1960s, was undoubtedly influential in shaping the voyeuristic tendencies of these characters. Furthermore, photojournalists working for both newsmagazines and television were predominantly Caucasian males who were viewed as outsiders by both their professional peers as well as the general public. With the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s shaping and developing in the United States – most notably the women's movement and the civil rights struggle as well as Vietnam - the modern photojournalist, working for a largely critical and increasingly corporate news organization, was propelled to the forefront in both reality as well as cinema.

The findings from this study, concurrent with those of Bridger, suggest that the evolving image of the on-screen photojournalist in films from the latter-half of the 20th Century began with James Stewart's characterization of L. B. Jeffries in Alfred Hitchcock's suspense-thriller, *Rear Window*. When Hitchcock's film debuted in 1954, it set the precedent for the image of the on-screen photojournalist for the next 25 years. Hitchcock's protagonist, the roving, wheelchair-bound magazine photographer Jeffries, was a stark departure from the on-screen photojournalists of the previous two decades. The Jeffries character was a handsome, intelligent, world traveler with a beautiful

girlfriend and a high-profile job, while the photojournalists in films of the 1930s and 1940s, as suggested by Brennen, were often portrayed as bumbling, aggressive alcoholics, trained as second-rate professionals when weighed against their counterparts, the adventurous reporter.[3]

The traits and behaviors exemplified by Jeffries would be seen in a variety of other films from the 1960s and 1970s in which photojournalists were portrayed in leading or supporting roles. Jeffries is a Caucasian male loner, isolated from his neighbors by both the confines of his wheelchair as well as his upper-level apartment. From this vantage point, he keenly observes the lifestyles, behaviors and routines of his neighbors from the temporary confines of wheelchair. "He would rather look at the lives of others than live inside his own skin," Roger Ebert observed in a review of the film.[4] In an early scene, a pan of his apartment reveals a battered camera, several framed sports and news photographs, some camera equipment and stacks of photo-heavy magazines. Jeffries's occupation is his life. His girlfriend, the radiant society girl Lisa Fremont (Grace Kelly), is second to his work-obsessed lifestyle and his voyeurism.

JEFFRIES (to his editor): Can't ya just see me…rushing home to a hot apartment to listen to the automatic laundry and the electric dishwasher and the garbage disposal? The nagging wife…

Jeffries's confusion, regarding his insecurities and relationships, is largely shown through the character's dialogue and facial expressions. He is clearly a lonely protagonist, isolated from those around him by his obsession with his occupation and desire to observe the world through his viewfinder. In order to spy on one of his neighbors – the mysterious Lars Thorwald (Raymond Burr), a salesman who may or may not have murdered his wife – Jeffries uses a 35-millimeter camera with a telephoto lens

to peek into Thorwald's apartment complex. "…He is in love with the occupation of photography, and becomes completely absorbed in reconstructing the images he has seen through his lens," Ebert said.[5] What Jeffries observes, the viewer observes, and through this technique, Hitchcock allows the audience to understand the personality and mannerisms of his lonely, obsessed and detached protagonist.

The film's two supporting characters, Fremont and Jeffries's nurse, Stella (Thelma Ritter), are both aware of the photojournalist's growing obsession with voyeurism as well as his love for his occupation. Jeffries treats Fremont and their relationship with a certain sarcastic arrogance, believing that his profession trumps any possibility of a growing relationship or marriage.

JEFFRIES (to Stella): Can you imagine her trampling around the world with a camera bum who never has more than a week's salary in the bank…if she was only ordinary.

While Jeffries is responsible for making observations about his personal relationship with Fremont, the Stella character is vocal about Jeffries's obsessive nature and mannerisms.

STELLA (to Jeffries): We've become a whole race of peeping Toms.

Hitchcock uses his characters to emphasize the theme of the compulsive, Caucasian male photojournalist, struggling between his career and his relationship. The characterization created in *Rear Window* would be seen in a variety of other films from the 1960s and 1970s, in which press photographers were featured in leading or supporting roles. In *Rear Window*, this characterization was initially projected through the film's setting as well as dialogue, and the photojournalist's behavior. But Hitchcock perpetuated it even further throughout the film by reemphasizing Jeffries's unethical

decision to spy on his neighbors through his viewfinder. "His [Jeffries] voyeuristic habits enable him to observe people but not to know them well," Bridger said.[6] Because of Jeffries, other on-screen photojournalists in films from this time period would be stereotyped by their ethical choices as well as their behavioral peculiarities and egocentric mannerisms.

The cameramen featured in two European films from the time period, *La Dolce Vita* and *Peeping Tom,* are also characters with stereotyping elements similar to those of the Jeffries's character. Although the photojournalists in these films are depicted in different ways, both films portray the cameraman as a youthful, Caucasian male, who seeks thrills through the voyeuristic nature of photography.

In Michael Powell's *Peeping Tom*, dismissed as a gore-fest at the time of its release, the leading character, although not a photojournalist by trade, is obsessed with photographing the deaths of his victims. According to Ebert, "He (Mark) identifies with his camera so much that when Helen kisses him, he responds by kissing the lens of his camera...Mark's body yearns for the camera and is governed by it."[7] The film's title character, Mark Lewis (Carl Boehm), is portrayed as a quiet and mysterious a man who works as a focus puller and portraitist by day, but as a disturbed and lonely voyeur by night.

HELEN (to Mark): You're a puzzle and a half.

Mark's obsessive and disturbed condition is revealed in one scene in which the photographer shows his newly adopted girlfriend, Helen (Anna Massey), a home movie created by his scientist-father, in which Mark acts as his father's laboratory rat. Furthermore, the photographer's method for killing involves a knife attached to the end

of his portable film camera, which allows him to photograph his victims at the moment of death. Powell's characterization of the lonely, insular male photographer is further perpetuated through several scenes revealing a vast amount of camera equipment and chemicals stringing from end to end in Mark's hidden darkroom, located in the back of his apartment. Mark's psychological troubles along with his induced voyeurism lead to various ethical dilemmas that, by the film's end, result in the photographer's suicide.

Federico Fellini's *La Dolce Vita* toys with the idea of the detached, camera-obsessed, early adulthood Caucasian male, through yet another photojournalistic outlet. In Fellini's film, the tabloid photojournalists, largely characterized through two characters aptly named Paparazzo (Walter Santesso) and Newspaper Photographer (Enzo Cerusico), are portrayed as young, ruthless males, always on the lookout for the next celebrity or notoriety. Like Jeffries in *Rear Window*, their ethical choices are closely related to their youthful idealism and persona, traits that aid in shaping the afore-mentioned stereotype.

The tabloid photojournalists in *La Dolce Vita* are almost always shown traveling in a pack, waiting outside an exotic café or nightclub, or stuffing themselves into an undersized vehicle in pursuit of the perfect photograph. The director showcases the group's lack of ethical considerations for their subjects in several key scenes. In one, the flirtatious blonde Paparazzo (Santesso), traveling alongside the film's protagonist Marcello (Marcello Mastroianni), snaps a picture of a prince and his date at a local nightclub without the duo's consent. When he is asked to leave the venue for intruding on the couple, the photojournalist gives a sarcastic response.

PAPARAZZO: It's [the camera] not loaded!

In another scene, a famous American actress named Sylvia (Anita Ekberg) arrives at the airport in Rome. Her exit from the plane to the tarmac is interrupted by a large group of tabloid cameramen who swarm upon her in hopes of obtaining her photograph. Armed with a slew of 35-millimeter cameras, Speed Graphics and flashbulbs, and newsreel cameras, the photojournalists are then forced to fight off the actress's police protection. After a portion of the group succeeds, they unethically beg Sylvia to repeat her exiting performance from the aircraft, while continually snapping away images of the actress.

Fellini also includes another powerful scene in the film that showcases the unethical behavior of the tabloid photographers. One of the cameramen follows Sylvia and Marcello as they are exiting a nightclub and proceeds to hound the actress with his camera. Sylvia is clearly put off by the photojournalist's intrusive nature but he is clearly unfazed by her feelings toward him.

SYLVIA: Paparazzo! Scram…

PAPARAZZO: [But] I'll give you 50% of my sales!

The type of unethical behaviors highlighted in *La Dolce Vita*, coupled with a detached aggression and obsession with the power of the photograph, would be repeated in a host of films from the 1960s and 1970s that featured photojournalists in leading and supporting roles. By the mid-1960s, these characteristics were practically imbedded into almost every photojournalist that appeared on-screen. Even Elvis Presley's failed semi-musical, *Live a Little, Love a Little,* portrayed a heartless, sarcastic magazine photographer, Greg Nolan (Presley), who has little to offer in the way of care and concern for both himself as well as his subjects. This character's behavior and persona

are best summarized through one scene in which the photojournalist interviews for a job at *Classic Cat* magazine.

EDITOR: Are you any good?

NOLAN: As a lover?

EDITOR: As a photographer!

Due to the large number of photojournalist-driven vehicles that were released during this period, audiences and critics soon ignored the troubled behavior and lack of ethics exhibited by the these characters, and instead, spent time dissecting the films' larger messages on violence and the state of the mass media.

The cocky, high-profile, fashion photojournalist featured in Michelangelo Antonioni's *Blowup* is a sexually charged Caucasian male whose obsession with photographic truth-telling leads him into uncovering a possible murder. As *New York Times* critic Bosley Howard observed in a review of the film:

> He can spend a night dressed up like a hobo shooting a layout of stark photographs of derelicts in a flophouse, then jump into his Rolls-Royce open-top and race back to his studio to shoot a layout of fashion models in shiny mod costumes – and do it without changing expression or his filthy, tattered clothes.[8]

Like Mark in *Peeping Tom* and others from the time period, the voyeuristic photojournalist Thomas (David Hemmings) in *Blowup* is completely overtaken by the power of his occupation. Furthermore, Thomas's obsession leads him into a slew of unethical behaviors, including sexually abusing his photographic subjects and spying on others. As Jay and Sontag observed, this fascination with the camera as a tool of sexual voyeurism violates those standing in front of the photographer's lens. In the *Blowup*'s now-classic, pseudo-rape scene, the photojournalist, working in his home studio, takes a swig of wine and then coolly approaches a scantily dressed model (Verushka) stationed

in front of a white backdrop. "It is the classical scene of photography as a sexual act," Jay said.[9] As the model begins assuming sexually suggestive positions, Thomas retrieves his camera and begins firing the shutter. By the scene's end, Thomas is positioned on top of the model, kissing her neck and demanding that she fight off his advances with the camera.

THOMAS: That's good, that's good. Hold that...Give it to me! Give it to me! Hold that! Yes…yes…yes!

The scene, which climaxes in post-orgasmic fashion with both Thomas and the model lying side-by-side on the floor, is merely one example of the photographer using his tool for personal pleasure. In his review of the film, Ebert called Thomas, "a character mired in ennui and distaste, who is roused by his photographs into something approaching passion."[10]

Thomas becomes only moderately conscious of his detached behavior and personality defects after he previews a series of blown-up prints, whose content reveals that the cameraman may have photographed a murder. As Ebert observed:

> [As] Thomas moves between his darkroom and the blowups, we recognize the bliss of an artists lost in what behaviorists call the Process; he is not thinking now about money, ambition or his own nasty personality defects, but is lost in his craft.[11]

During this sequence, the viewer observes what Thomas observes and reaches the same conclusions as the protagonist. But the photojournalist's ethics leading up to the scene are so abhorrent that they leave the viewer feeling unsympathetic for both Thomas and his plight.

THOMAS: You know most girls would pay me to photograph them?

JANE: I'll pay you.

THOMAS: I overcharge. There's other things I want on the reel.

Thomas's aggressive, near-abusive behavior in *Blowup* would be replicated and exacerbated in the attitudes and personalities of the photojournalists portrayed in both *Medium Cool* (1969) and *Z* (1969). The former is director Haskell Wexler's powerful, pseudo-fictional examination on the effects of television violence. Simultaneously, the film was released at a time in American history in which the Civil Rights struggle as well as the Vietnam conflict were the most covered news topics.

Coincidentally, the film's protagonist, a disillusioned, overzealous cameraman named John Cassellis (Robert Forster), is on-hand to capture many of these events for a local Chicago television station. The filmmaker combines actual footage of events such as the riots at the 1968 Democratic Convention with a fictional storyline, in which Cassellis becomes increasingly aware of his journalistic ethics as well as the power of the moving image on the viewing audience. Zynda observed the following about the photojournalist's changing personal ethics:

> He [Cassellis] discovers that he is little more than a functionary with a camera, in the service of unreachable owners and controllers of a medium which delivers as 'news' a manufactured product that only the naïve accept as documentary.[12]

Cassellis's weapon of choice is a lightweight television camera that, like the smaller, 35-millimeter still cameras, allows him to work speedily and unobtrusively. Ness notes that, "the new lightweight equipment was enabling television to become omnipresent."[13] Wexler's protagonist was merely one example of the new generation of photojournalists who adapted to smaller-format cameras in order to appear less obtrusive at the scene of a news event. From *Rear Window* to the journalism-genre films of today, both still and motion picture cameramen accept and benefit from the technological

advances in photography equipment. And in *Medium Cool*, John Cassellis, like many other on-screen photojournalists, uses and abuses these technological advances for both persona and professional gain. As Vincent Canby stated in a review of the film, "[the] television news camera [is] an instrument that observes, selects, isolates and photographs the reflection of a visible world."[14]

Like Jeffries in *Rear Window* and Thomas in *Blowup*, Casellis's personality and behavior towards his profession are suggested at the beginning of the film and then reinforced and redeveloped as the film progresses. Cassellis is portrayed as a Caucasian male loner, detached from both the events he is covering as well as the people directly involved in those events. His off-putting, unfeeling personality is first revealed while covering a car accident in the film's opening scene. While the victim's body hangs in between the automobile's passenger-side door and the shoulder of the road, Cassellis and his soundman, Gus (Peter Bonerz), move quickly and quietly around the accident site, recording close-up footage of the event. The two journalists decide on a course of action only after Cassellis has finished recording the event on film.

GUS: Better call an ambulance.

"[They] are more interested in shooting dramatic news footage than in helping an injured driver…" Good said.[15]

Another example of Cassellis's quiet and mysterious detachment occurs in a scene in which the National Guard gasses an angry mob of student demonstrators. The photojournalist moves patiently throughout the mob and points his lens close to the action. Much of this scene in the film is shown from Cassellis's point of view, allowing the viewer to partake in the cameraman's voyeurism.

The Cassellis character also fits the photojournalist-as-womanizer stereotype that emerged in both *Rear Window* and *Blowup*. Throughout *Medium Cool*, Cassellis is shown romancing several women and, by the film's end, has given up his profession for the love of a female. However, the photojournalist's sexual aggression is shown as an unfavorable characteristic during a conversation involving both Cassellis and his nurse-friend, Ruth (Marianna Hill), who doubles as his sexual play-toy.

RUTH: Admit it to me! You're a rotten, egotistical, selfish, punchy cameraman!

More importantly, Cassellis becomes enraged and completely disenchanted with his occupation after finding out that the FBI has been reviewing his news station's footage for more than a year. Additionally, when a young African-American male is interrogated by the Chicago Police Department for returning a missing amount of money, and the television network refuses to run the man's side of the story, the photojournalist is fired for "canning" the fabricated story, then becomes infuriated with his superiors. While Cassellis and his newfound love interest, a Vietnam War widow named Eileen (Verna Bloom), are watching Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. on television, the character's rage acclimates through a monologue.

CASSELLIS: Jesus I love to shoot film. Can you feel the violence?

EILEEN: I don't know what to think anymore.

CASSELLIS: See, the media has a script now. By the numbers. Flags at half-mast. Trips cancelled. Ballgames called off. Schools closed. Memorial meetings, memorial marches. Moments of silence. The widow cries and then she says great words. More moments of silence. Then the funeral procession. A lot of experts saying how sick our society is, how sick we all are. See, the script is a national drain-off. People say, 'yeah, yeah, we're guilty, we're bad.' Cuz a lot of people are afraid; they're afraid the Negroes are going to tear up their stores, burn neighborhoods. So they have this nationwide, coast-to-coast, network special called, 'More the Martyr.' Nobody's really on the hook, you see?

Cassellis's disenchantment with the news business, and his network in particular, lead to his and Eileen's inevitable deaths in a car accident in the film's final scene. Wexler uses this scene to promote the film's message on society's obsession with television news; "The Whole World is Watching" is both the filmmaker's statement to his viewing audience and also a slogan that is bellowed by the rioters at the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention. In the symbolic final shot in the film, a television cameraman captures the dramatic car accident on film.

As in *Medium Cool* and the subsequent journalism films of the 1970s, the photojournalist portrayed in *Z* (Jacques Perrin) would also incorporate personal ethics in order to defeat The System. Despite the photojournalist's occasional ethical considerations and passion for his profession, the character is primarily yet another example of the young, male voyeur stereotype, who believes in the inherent truth-telling power of photography.

Set in France in the early 1960s, *Z* is a film about an assassination attempt and the following cover-up that ensues. "The film suggests an uneasy alliance between the press and the police," Ness stated.[16] The photojournalist in the film, who works as both reporter and photographer for a local newspaper, is first shown as fashionably dressed in a white retro suit and black tie, and acts confident about his professional occupation and duties. In an opening scene, he covers a large demonstration in the city streets alongside a coworker. Through his opening dialogue, he reveals his professional feelings about the event to his fellow news photographer.

PHOTOJOURNALIST: You could sell them [photographs] to the Daily Worker!

The photojournalist exhibits countless unethical behaviors throughout the film, which aid in developing his character. His overt flirtatiousness leads him to interrogating an attractive, female hospital operator about a victim's state while simultaneously snapping images of the young woman with his partially hidden camera. He also obtrusively injects his Nikon 35-millimeter into the action whenever the opportunity arises. In several scenes, he snaps away frames while the subject is unaware of his presence. One scene shows the character forcing himself into the hotel room of the victim's wife, and then photographing her grieving state.

WIDOW: No pictures please.

PHOTOJOURNALIST: No photos. Only a few questions…the public has a right to know!

Like the afore-mentioned cameramen in films such as *Rear Window* and *Medium Cool*, the photojournalist in *Z* is portrayed as driven, ambitious and willing to go to great lengths to get both the picture and the story. When one of the victim's supporters is attacked and hospitalized by a group of government interrogators, the photojournalist has the man place a hot-water bottle on his head for a propaganda-like portrait.

PHOTOJOURNALIST: [Now] People will see that you were clubbed.

VICTIM: But they'll beat me again.

PHOTOJOURNALIST: They won't dare. You're famous now.

The character also offers to pay off a mole in exchange for the names and faces of those responsible for covering up the murder. Instead of using ethical means to gain access to the secret society, he photographs the members from the confines of a speeding automobile. This sequence shows the photojournalist's face concealed by his camera, snapping away frames of the conspirators from behind the car's window panes.

The photojournalist in *Z* is responsible for bribing sources, concealing his camera and photographing subjects without consent. Like Thomas in *Blowup*, he is also flirtatious to the point of sexual harassment and injects himself personally into the events and situations he is covering. Conspiracy thrillers in the vein of *Z* would be the prototype for the journalism-genre film of the 1970s. In describing this transformation of the genre, Ness observed that, "the depiction of dedicated journalists who, by working slowly and methodically and refusing to give up, were able to bring down the highest officials in the country, created a new, if short-lived image of the press as a positive force."[17] Although many of the more popular journalism-genre films from the 1970s such as *All the President's Men* and *Network* did not feature news cameramen in leading or supporting roles, many of the ones that did showcased the characters as irrational and crazed member of a larger news corporation. Furthermore, these characters' personal and professional ethics would dictate the recreation and development of the stereotype.

Mahogany and *The Omen*, although not critically favored, were two of the conspiracy-fueled, journalism-genre films of the mid-1970s that portrayed photojournalists in key supporting roles. Both films projected the afore-mentioned stereotype of the cameraman that was also presented in a selection of motion pictures in the 1960s. Like the stereotypes associated with the on-screen photojournalists from the previous decade, the stereotypes presented in both *Mahogany* and *The Omen* were perpetuated through the photojournalists' ethical behaviors, mannerisms, dialogue and nuanced characteristics.

Ebert called *Mahogany*, "a big, lush, messy soap opera, so ambivalent about its heroine that we can't even be sure the ending's supposed to be happy."[18] The film,

starring Diana Ross of the ever-popular musical act The Supremes as the title character, was one of many "blaxploitation" motion pictures from the decade that showcased an African-American celebrity in a romantic leading role. It was also one of the first big-budget blockbusters of the 1970s to feature a high-profile fashion photojournalist in a supporting role.

Sean McAvoy (Anthony Perkins) is an arrogant magazine photographer whose mere presence is praised by his coworkers and others in the fashion industry.

MAHOGANY (to her boss): Sean McAvoy! You got Sean McAvoy? I didn't think we could afford his lens cap?

Like Thomas in *Blowup*, McAvoy coerces his subjects into seductive poses for the camera, and simultaneously, interrogates them with sexually suggestive prose.

MCAVOY (to Mahogany): Ok…ok. This is more like it! Come here darling and let me look at you before we put you in some clothes.

McAvoy is young and dashing, and appears stylishly outfitted in dark sunglasses, a tan overcoat and blue jeans. He is also characterized as loud and obnoxious, and willing to go to great lengths in order to craft the perfect image.

In one of the film's most revealing scenes, the photojournalist directs a large group of models at a fashion shoot outside a large, urban apartment complex. McAvoy is shown shuffling quickly throughout the scene, scattering models to different locations and barking instructions.

MAHOGANY: Watch him move. He's like a dancer or something. He used to be a combat photographer.

During the peak moment in this scene, the photojournalist begins snapping away frames of an elderly man experiencing a coughing fit. Rather than tend to the subject's needs,

McAvoy points his lens at the man's face and coldly records the event with his 35-millimeter camera.

McAvoy's unethical nature helps shape the character. For example, he coerces Mahogany into sleeping with him, and then attempts to murder her political activist boyfriend (Billy Dee Williams). Undoubtedly, the character is a far-fetched version of the celebrity-like, obsessively driven cameraman with a penchant for voyeurism.

MCAVOY: My saints are a camera and a gun. They are both fiercely truthful.

Mahogany would be the first in a series of 1970s journalism-genre films in which the photojournalist is primarily used as a plot device. In the case of McAvoy, his personality and persona are played out as antagonist characteristics. His erratic behavior and mannerisms are primarily tools incorporated by the filmmaker that set up the audience for a climactic moment. This moment occurs in one of the film's final scenes in which McAvoy takes Mahogany hostage, and then photographs her shrieking and wailing, as he drives recklessly down a busy interstate. The scene ends in a car accident, causing his foreshadowed death.

Keith Jennings (David Warner) in *The Omen* is a toned-down version of McAvoy in *Mahogany*. Despite the fact that the photojournalist in this film is primarily incorporated as a plot device, Jennings, like Jeffries in *Rear Window* and Thomas in *Blowup*, acts as a sleuth rather than as a news photographer.

Jennings is portrayed as a young, quietly mysterious voyeur, outfitted with long, shaggy hair, and a single-lens reflex camera strapped around his shoulder. Like Mark in *Peeping Tom* and others, Jennings's home doubles as a darkroom and his printed work and negatives dangle from one end of his disheveled apartment to the other. His

obsessive nature regarding his profession is primarily revealed through one of the film's opening scenes, in which a possessed nanny hangs herself from the balcony of a colonial mansion. While others in view of the deceased turn their heads in disbelief, Jennings points his camera toward the hanging victim and snaps away several frames of the scene.

The character becomes a prominent device within the film after several of his prints foreshadow a series of murders. Here, the character shifts from photojournalist to detective; he teams up with the film's leading protagonist, a confused American ambassador (Gregory Peck) who believes his son is responsible for the gruesome killings, and sets off to solve the case.

AMBASSADOR THORN: I don't know whose son I'm raising.

JENNINGS: If you don't mind, Mr. Thorn, I'd like to try and help you find out.

Jennings believes in the all-encompassing, truth-telling power of the photograph. Like Thomas in *Blowup*, his prints are his primary source for revelation, and his camera serves as a window to a different and exciting world. Additionally, his ethics and decision-making skills play second to these beliefs and altered mindset.

Bellocq (Keith Carradine) in the controversial *Pretty Baby* (1978) also showcases many of the same characteristics as the Jennings character and other freewheeling photojournalists in the films of the 1960s and 1970s. Bellocq, while not portrayed as a sleuth, is, indeed, a wild-eyed, incompetent portrait photographer whose feelings and emotions override his ethical responsibilities. Canby noted that the Bellocq character is an obsessed photographer loosely based on the physically misshapen, hydrocephalic New Orleans photographer Ernest J. Bellocq, who specialized in portraiture in the city's Storyville section in the early 20th Century.[19] In *Pretty Baby*, Bellocq is portrayed as a

quiet and mysterious Caucasian male, whose personality and feelings come to life while photographing scantily clad or nude models. While the photographer is shown as taking his work quite seriously, other characters in the film fail to see his occupation as professional.

MADAME LIVINGSTON: Photographs? What the hell kind of thing is that?

HATTIE'S SUITOR: Why would anyone want to take a picture of a piece of ass?

The character becomes increasingly unethical as the film develops, which aids in the development of his on-screen persona. "He seems at first to feel no passion at all," Ebert said. "There is, we feel, the possibility that he's asexual."[20] Bellocq, usually dressed in a top hat, necktie, and primarily shown in conjunction with large, cumbersome camera equipment, remains emotionally detached from his subjects and their plight. When Violet (Brooke Shields), the film's young protagonist, breaks one of the photographer's wet-plate negatives, the cameraman slaps the young girl across the face. After the two develop a friendship in the second half of the film, Bellocq inappropriately kisses the child and proceeds to marry her, leading to the character's eventual downfall.

VIOLET: You hate me.

BELLOCQ: I have no time for either hate or love.

The character's inappropriate sexual behavior and violent temperament coincide with his obsessive nature toward his profession. His work is performed with rapid precision and he is always conscious of the direction of the light. He purchases a baby doll for his young wife and patiently waits for her to assume the perfect position in order to capture the image. Additionally, he lives alone in a dingy apartment with no electricity. The photographer's home doubles as his workspace, and his prints are

developed in the kitchen sink. His eccentricities become too much for many of the other characters in the film, and by the movie's end, Bellocq is stranded alone, with only his work and self-centeredness to accompany him.

Both *The China Syndrome* and *Apocalypse Now* portray important examples of the photojournalist as young, male loner. Coincidentally, both films would also foreshadow several of the new characterizations of photojournalists that would litter many of the journalism-genre films of the 1980s. The ethical dilemmas encountered by the photojournalists characterized in these two award-winning films would also help shape their stereotype, as would their behavioral patterns and work habits.

While *Apocalypse Now* is a big-budget war picture, *The China Syndrome* is a classic example of the ever-popular journalism-based conspiracy thrillers of the 1970s. In the film, Richard Adams (Michael Douglas) is a wild-eyed, longhaired, radical television cameraman, and leftover hippie from the anti-war movement of the late 1960s. His character plays second to reporter Kimberly Wells (Jane Fonda), who describes the photographer as "an award-winning cameraman" and "one of the best I've worked with." But Adams's buoyant personality and over-the-top demeanor override Wells's calm, reserved attitude and professionalism. "Richard is the reporter's virtuous alter ego…His constant criticism of Kimberly's go-along-to-get-along attitude, eventually [helps] push her into taking a moral stand."[21]

Unlike John Cassellis in *Medium Cool*, Adams is not detached from the events he photographs but rather completely obsessed by the story. But like the character in Wexler's film, Adams works mercilessly and methodically when on the job.

ADAMS: Okay that's a cut…that was great! Let's get a reaction shot of Kimberly from over here.

Adams is so enthralled with his work that when asked not to photograph a possible accident in the control room at a nuclear power plant, he ignores the order from a plant supervisor and proceeds to capture the panic and fear.

SUPERVISOR: Oh, I'm sorry, you can't film in that direction.

ADAMS: Not even one shot?

SUPERVISOR: No. It's for security reasons.

[Moments Later]

WELLS (to Adams): Are you filming this?

ADAMS NODS "YES"

Adams exhibits this same type of unethical behavior at other moments in *The China Syndrome*. Shortly after his news network decides to not run the controversial footage, Adams's explosive temper is unleashed upon the organization's producer, Don Jacovich (Peter Donat).

ADAMS: What do you mean you are not going to put it on the air? I photographed an accident. An accident at a nuclear power plant! And accident is the right word…this is all a Goddamn cover-up!

When the station finds out that Adams was photographing in an unauthorized zone, the photographer illegally enters the network's film vault and steals the footage. Alongside Wells, Adams begins conducting his own personal investigation regarding the plant accident and abandons his journalistic duties, until the film's final sequence. The character becomes so involved with uncovering the so-called conspiracy that, in the film's final moments, he and others take the plant hostage in order to conduct a private interview with a key official who wants to tell the truth (Jack Lemmon).

Furthermore, the Adams character's obsessive work ethic is clearly identified through his home decor. A sign near the entrance reads "Richard Adams Productions" and his upscale loft is filled with photographic equipment, lights and camera reels. Like Thomas in *Blowup* and Jennings in *The Omen*, Adams believes in the power of the photographic image, and his belief is epitomized through his home environment.

The China Syndrome would not be the last film from the time period to showcase a youthful, Caucasian male photojournalist who has traded his journalistic ethics for personal ego and erratic behavior. *Apocalypse Now*, described by Badsey as, "an overt fantasy rather than a factual portrayal of the Vietnam War," creates a harrowing image of one soldier's journey and struggle to survive in the Cambodian jungle.[22] Canby described the controversial film as "a stunning work" and "technically complex and masterful" and other critics, including Ebert, hailed it as a cinematic masterpiece.[23] But despite the favorable reviews and hype that director Francis Ford Coppola's film attracted, the disheveled, disillusioned war photojournalist (Dennis Hopper) in *Apocalypse Now*, is less than admirable.

The character is a hybridization from two distinct eras; he is both the detached, lonely Caucasian male photojournalist, similar to those featured in films from the previous two decades, and also an early interpretation of the foul-mouthed and ethically challenged war photographer from the journalism-genre motion pictures of the 1980s. Despite the fact that the photojournalist, "functions as a foil and a fool to Brando's king and as comic relief," he is also an essential plot device, and foreshadows the 1980s image of the photojournalist in film.[24]

Photo Journalist is only on-screen during the final half-hour of *Apocalypse Now*, and he is primarily characterized through his ragged appearance and off-the-wall behavior and mannerisms. These tendencies toward mania are revealed shortly after the film's leading protagonist, Captain Willard (Martin Sheen), and his crew arrives at a utopia-like setting where the cameraman and the elusive Colonel Kurtz (Marlon Brando) are stationed.

CAPTAIN WILLARD: Who are you?

PHOTO JOURNALIST: Who are you? [Laughs Hysterically] I'm a photojournalist!

Shortly thereafter, Willard notices that the character, a self-described veteran war photographer, is living like a destitute tribesman with a group of hostile, native Cambodian villagers, whose sole purpose is to protect Kurtz. Bearded and outfitted with a red headband and long, unkempt hair, Photo Journalist, armed with a slew of 35-millimeter cameras and a film vest strung around his neck, appears both disillusioned and drugged to Willard and his men. His ethics comes into question when he introduces himself while lighting a marijuana joint and rambling on to Willard about Kurtz's dictatorial role on the island.

PHOTO JOURNALIST: I can tell you like something the other day; he [Kurtz] wanted to kill me.

CAPTAIN WILLARD: Why did he want to kill you?

PHOTO JOURNALIST: Because I took his picture. He said, 'if you take my picture again, I'm going to kill you…in a minute.'

Photo Journalist's ethics in *Apocalypse Now* are clearly lacking and his incoherent ramblings have progressed since his inhabitance on Kurtz's utopian hideaway. The character begins peppering Willard with questions and describes the AWOL Kurtz as a

"poet" and as a "great human being." In one scene, he organizes a portrait shoot featuring Willard and his men alongside the native villagers. This strange interlude is filmed from Photo Journalist's perspective, and shows the American soldiers standing tall and proud over Kurtz's militia. Coppola uses this scene in order to show how an apparently once-successful photojournalist has mutated into a sympathetic press agent for the diabolical Kurtz and his belief system.

The photojournalist disappears from the film after aiding the captured Willard and feeding him countless ramblings on Kurtz's existential plight. But the ethical sensibilities and behavioral patterns of Photo Journalist in *Apocalypse Now* would be repeated to a degree in a variety of films from the 1980s that featured photojournalists in leading and supporting roles. Many of these films, including *The Year of Living Dangerously*, *Under Fire*, *The Killing Fields* and *Salvador*, would also feature war photojournalists disillusioned by the violence and bloodshed surrounding them, and ethically challenged in terms of their given profession. Although these characters would be portrayed in various ways, the majority of them would also be young, Caucasian males, obsessed with their occupation, and overcome by their eccentricities.

1980 to 1989: The Heroic War Photojournalist

The photojournalist in *Apocalypse Now* set the stage for a series of characterizations in the 1980s in which the image of the war photographer would be idolized on-screen. In describing the reoccurring themes of the journalism-genre war pictures from the decade, Badsey observed that, "They are set in a poor country that is disintegrating through civil war, with an emphasis on urban destruction and civilian deaths…"[25] The researcher goes on to identify behavioral patterns and mannerisms

associated with the photojournalists portrayed in these films, an analysis which is concurrent with the findings from this study:

> The journalist figure, although established as an experienced war reporter, is a naïve innocent abroad in his behaviour; he starts detached or indifferent to circumstances…[and] becomes a human being exactly at the point that he stops being a journalist…[26]

With the exception of *Gandhi*, in which the elusive *LIFE* magazine photographer Margret Bourke-White (Candice Bergen) makes a brief appearance, the characters depicted in the foremost journalism-genre films of the decade were stereotyped as heroic but ethically challenged photojournalists, situated in the middle of Third World conflict. As Ness observed, "In films like *The Year of Living Dangerously*, *The Killing Fields* and *Under Fire*, journalists in Third World situations fail to understand the implications of the actions they cover or are seen as easily manipulated by the forces they believe to be right."[27] While the main theme of reporter-driven journalism-genre films from the 1980s focused on the public's mistrust of the press, motion pictures with photojournalists in leading roles were more likely to put the cameraman at the center of attention. Thus, more varied and exotic interpretations of photojournalists in film came about, bringing the cameraman's unethical behaviors and mannerisms to the forefront. As Bridger stated, "In the 1980s and 1990s film producers have shown little interest in portraying traditional press photographers…recent films have concentrated on the exploits of roving photojournalists."[28]

Many of these new characterizations were likely developed due to the United States' increased involvement with Third World conflicts during the 1970s and 1980s. For one, more photojournalists covered the Vietnam War than any other prior conflict, and many of these cameramen became passionate about America's personal involvement

with Southeast Asia. The controversy surrounding Vietnam, as well as the United States' involvements in the Latin American countries of El Salvador and Nicaragua during the following decade, prompted a variety of new ethical considerations for real-life photojournalists. However, a number of now-famous Vietnam-era photojournalists were awarded and recognized for their work during this time period as well, including Dickey Chapelle, Philip Jones Griffiths and Eddie Adams. The popularity and historical significance of each of these characters and events is undoubtedly a contributing factor in the increased number of characterizations of war photojournalists in motion pictures during this time period.

The 1980s stereotype of the photojournalist as exotic, world-roving war photographer began with Billy Kwan (Linda Hunt) in *The Year of Living Dangerously*. Set in Indonesia in 1965, the film tells the story of Australian journalist Guy Hamilton and his restless quest to cover the country's slumping dictator and his shaky regime. Hamilton's counterpart is the half-Chinese, half-Australian photojournalist Kwan, whose poetic prose and pint-size stature make him an obvious outcast in a country littered with high-profile journalists. "…Billy is as much a theatrical device as a character; he's a fascinating, bristly, androgynous figure. The fact that he is played marvelously by a woman only works to the film's advantage," Canby said in his review of the film.[29]

Kwan's feminine characteristics and sympathetic but shifty demeanor partially aid in developing the character. More prominently, Kwan's narration throughout the film reveals that the supposedly objective journalist has ties to underground diplomatic organizations. When Hamilton asks Kwan about one of the cameraman's photographs – a

black and white print of the country's dictator - the photojournalist expresses sympathy for the Indonesian ruler, thus trading his occupational duties for personal preference.

KWAN: I think he's a genius. He's really trying to do something for his people.

In several other scenes, Kwan is shown caring for a native and her grieving child. These scenes are juxtaposed with others in which the photojournalist spies on both Hamilton and his newfound love interest Jill Bryant (Sigourney Weaver), in hopes of obtaining personal information for his secret files. Kwan's vast collection of top-secret records as well as his ties to outsider organizations leads many to believe that he is a spy for an unnamed government.

HAMILTON: He's a strange little guy, you know? I mean, how does he get me an interview with the top Communist in Indonesia?

BRYANT: You think he's an agent?

HAMILTON: Well…maybe. He's a cameraman for Christ-sakes. How does he get such good contacts?

As the film progresses into the third act, Billy Kwan becomes antagonistic and deranged. He breaks off his friendship with Hamilton, then starts a bar fight with an American journalist who has belittled him about his stature. His erratic behavior leads him into further trouble and prompts his mysterious death. In his final scene, Billy Kwan is forced from the window of a high-rise hotel after two hit-men bust into his room and attack the war photographer.

Both Kwan and Russell Price (Nick Nolte) in *Under Fire* are portrayed as courageous war photojournalists conflicted by their lack of occupational ethics. But whereas the Kwan character in *The Year of Living Dangerously* is characterized as an exotic, dwarfish personality, the ruggedly handsome Price is projected as his opposite.

"[*Under Fire*] plainly implies that there comes a time when a correspondent must shed his objectivity and act," Good observed.[30] "[The film] vividly reflects the legacy of shame and guilt growing out of the Vietnam War."[31] Roger Spottiswoode's film is set in Nicaragua in 1979 during the fall of the Somoza regime. A group of journalists from various media organizations, including Price, Alex (Gene Hackman) and Claire (Joanna Cassidy), find themselves covering the brutish civil war, "a war in which morality is hard to define and harder to practice."[32]

The Price character is undoubtedly the film's leading protagonist, and Ebert described him as "the seedy photographer with the beer gut."[33] Ehrlich's description of Price also elaborates on the behavior of the seasoned war photojournalist; "He traipses between war zones with little concern for the people or politics involved…"[34] Like those before him and future characterizations, Price is portrayed as a chain-smoking, womanizing, former Pulitzer Prize-winner, whose ethics are compromised at various points throughout the film.

His adventurous, roving attitude is introduced in the film's opening moments; loaded with a photography vest and multiple 35-millimeter cameras, Price gets caught in a military attack between African rebels and a smaller American patrol unit. The climax of the scene occurs when Price, standing atop an uncovered military convoy, points his camera at an incoming fighter plane, while an ongoing battle between ground troopers swarms below. Thus, the character sacrifices his life for the sake of the photograph, heroically triumphing in his pursuit, as the attack develops around him.

The character's ethics, however, begin to spiral downward after he begins a romance with Claire, a fellow reporter who is already spoken for by their mutual friend

and colleague, Alex. In their opening encounter, Price approaches Claire at a party for Alex, and begins secretly photographing her while guests scurry in between the both of them. This flirtatious behavior on the part of the photojournalist is carried out even further after Alex leaves the war-torn country for the United States. Like Thomas in *Blowup* and others, Price's disregard for his the feelings of his friends is revealed after he has intercourse with Claire and then proceeds to photograph her naked, sleeping body.

The photojournalist's occupational ethics continue to dwindle as the film continues, and even more so as Price's relationship with Claire and the Nicaraguan rebel movement progresses. As Ebert stated in his review of the film, "He [Price] commits the journalistic sin of taking sides, and it leads him, eventually, to a much greater sin: faking a photograph to help the guerilla forces."[35]

PRICE: I'm a journalist. I don't do things like this.

CLAIRE: It sure would be a prize-winner, wouldn't it?

PRICE: I've won enough prizes.

CLAIRE: But you haven't won a war.

The photojournalist, caught up in his obsession to prove that the rebel leader is alive and infuriated by the loss of his friend, agrees to set-up a portrait-like image of the deceased and his supporters.

CLAIRE: Did you know that you didn't shoot any pictures after that whole thing was over?

PRICE: I didn't, did I? Oh Jesus, I picked up the gun…something happened to us.

The act of manipulating a photograph for the rebel cause leads Price into personal misery and an ethical downfall. Simultaneously, his iconic photograph receives praise on both Latin and Northern American fronts.

ALEX (to Price): Congratulations…the news services, the wire, The Washington Post, the Times – everybody's picked it up; it's a famous picture.

Furthermore, when many of the photojournalist's combat prints are stolen from his hotel room, he finds that the images are being used as propaganda by both the American military as well as the Sandinista rebels. After becoming outraged upon realizing the news, he and Alex take off in search of the guilty party, an act that ends in Alex's brutal murder.

By the end of *Under Fire*, Price's crisis of conscience has led to his disillusionment with both his work as well as his profession. Similar cases would be replayed in both *The Killing Fields* and *Salvador*, but the former film's neurotic *New York Times* war photojournalist, Al Rockoff (John Malkovich), would inherit almost none of the guilt that besieged Price. Whereas Price's mistakes caused the photojournalist suffering, Rockoff's unethical behavior is merely instinct, and he has little regard for the consequences of his actions. As Ebert mentioned in his review of *The Killing Fields*, "he [Rockoff] is not stirred to action very easily, and still less easily stirred to caring…"[36]

Essentially, Roland Joffé's film - the story of a friendship between a Cambodian aid and a passionate reporter - portrays at least three photojournalists on-screen. However, only two of these characters are actually developed in the film as independent personalities. Although Canby said that the film's supporting characters "are mostly functions of the plot," the Rockoff character is by and large the more vibrant of the two, featured photojournalists.[37]

The character's behavioral patterns and work ethic are developed through one of the film's opening moments, in which the photojournalist awakens from a bitter

hangover. When his reporter-counterpart, Sydney Schanberg (Sam Waterston), enters the room, the photojournalist immediately projects his noteworthy, aggressive behavior.

ROCKOFF: Shut the fucking blinds, will ya?

In the vein of Hopper's Photo Journalist from *Apocalypse Now*, Rockoff wears discolored army fatigues, a weathered bandana, and relaxes by boozing and partaking in the habitual use of marijuana. His dynamic and off-putting personality is matched by his unaffectionate but crafty work habits; while he and Schanberg are relaxing at an outdoor café, a bomb explodes in a nearby building, prompting the photojournalist to ignore the grieving and tortured bodies lying in the streets, and instead, take up his occupational duties.

ROCKOFF (to Schanberg): Did you see that!

The character's obsessive nature and voyeuristic tendencies lead to his helping Schanberg's liaison, Dith Pran (Haing S. Ngor), attempt an escape from his war-ravaged homeland. Rather than sticking to his professional duties, Rockoff is shown meticulously crafting the perfect image of the Cambodian informant for a phony passport.

ROCKOFF: We've got to get sulfide and some powerful developer; if we can get that, I can make a passport photo.

Rather than aid in the relocation of Pran to safer ground, Rockoff's actions actually hinder the informant's futile escape, thus forcing Pran to flee for his life from the totalitarian regime.

Like Kwan in *The Year of Living Dangerously* and Price in *Under Fire*, Rockoff's sympathies eventually cause him to forgo his photojournalistic responsibilities and become a participant in a Third World social cause. By the film's end, Rockoff has clearly sided with Pran's plight and his disenchantment with Schanberg, who remained a

journalist despite his sympathies, comes to the forefront in the film's climactic showdown. When Schanberg is rewarded for his reporting on the Cambodian conflict, Rockoff's first impulse is to explode on his friend and coworker.

ROCKOFF: You know what bothers me?

SCHANBERG: What?

ROCKOFF: It bothers me that you let Pran stay in Cambodia because you wanted to win that fucking award!

Rockoff's confrontational actions upset Schanberg, and the film showcases the photojournalist's behavior as heroic and noble. The end of *The Killing Fields* showcases Rockoff's behavior as saintly for his reuniting Schanberg with Pran. But many of the character's unethical decisions that led to his aiding in their reunion created prior unnecessary harm to all those involved.

In *Salvador*, director Olive Stone takes the stereotype of the heroic war photojournalist torn between his professional responsibilities and his personal preferences to an altogether more drastic level. In the film, a disillusioned, foul-mouthed and drug-abusing photojournalist teams up with an equally oblivious and obnoxious disc jockey, aptly named Doctor Rock (James Belushi), and heads to El Salvador for both business and pleasure. Richard Boyle (James Woods) is an aggressive and temperamental cameraman and reporter, who is jobless and drinking excessively. When his girlfriend moves out and his unpaid parking tickets draw the attention of the local police, Boyle heads south in hopes of redemption.

DOCTOR ROCK: Where are we going now?

BOYLE: Guatemala.

DOCTOR ROCK: Why?

BOYLE: Why not? No cops, no laws, sun, it's cheap, no yuppies, plenty of dope.

"*Salvador* is a movie about real events as seen through the eyes of characters who have set themselves adrift from reality," Ebert stated in his review of the film.[38] But the film's main story thread is Boyle's experiences in a Latin American country that considers his type of fast-talking, neurotic and vulgar war correspondent intolerable. "[Boyle] manages to be wherever the action is, from military headquarters to right-wing hangouts to guerilla camps to the United States Embassy," Walter Goodman said.[39]

Boyle epitomizes the stereotype of the hard-drinking, foul-mouthed, but ethically challenged on-screen war photojournalist that littered the journalism-genre films of the decade. But Stone contrasts his protagonist with a supporting character whose ethics and professionalism are intact. John Cassady (John Savage) is Boyle's alter ego; a seasoned, Pulitzer Prize-winner, whose name is well-known within the profession, and whose images are plastered across the covers of newsmagazines worldwide. Their relationship and respective character traits are best revealed in a scene in which the two document a dumpsite littered with mutilated bodies.

CASSADY: You know what made photographers like Robert Capa great, Rich? They captured the nobility of human suffering.

BOYLE: It was a great shot in Spain; the one flying through the air.

CASSADY: It was more than a body…what Capa caught….he got *why* they died. That's what Capa caught. He caught that moment in death.

BOYLE: You're right up there with him, John. You're in his league. One of the best.

CASSADY: You gotta get close, Rich. You get the truth. You get too close, you die…

While the Cassady character represents the photojournalist Boyle wants to be, the latter's off-the-wall and reckless behavior forces him into mediocrity. For example, when Boyle shows up to a high-profile party for various members of the United States military wearing a Schlitz Beer t-shirt, with his 35-millimeter camera slung around his shoulder, he immediately begins peppering the attendees with questions, and asks one of the diplomats for a fifty-dollar loan. Furthermore, his repulsive attitude gets him into trouble with both his peers as well as the governing body of El Salvador. On various occasions throughout the film, Boyle slanders both his colleagues as well as the locals, sometimes leading him into trouble.

BOYLE (to colleague): These people [El Salvadorians] would vote for Donald Duck, Genghis Khan or whoever the local cop tells them to because if they don't, {Holds up a photograph of a mutilated child} *this* is what happens!

In one of the film's most revealing scenes, Boyle's Latin American girlfriend, Mariá (Elpidia Carillo), persuades the photojournalist to go before a priest and confess his sins. But the cameraman's matter-of-fact apology sends the clergyman into a state of shock and disbelief.

PRIEST: Are you following the way of Christ?

BOYLE: {Sighs} Not exactly – I mean, in my heart. I have done a lot of, ya know, cardinal sins and I've drank a lot of alcohol and done some drugs…I've kinda weaseled around in my life a lot, ya know, get the edge all the time. But basically, I'm a good-hearted person.

Boyle's lack of professional ethics and self-respect leads him to siding with the rebel cause, while simultaneously, confessing his undying love for Mariá. During the film's second half, he becomes enraged after both his girlfriend's son is murdered and a group of nuns are raped by the powers-that-be. These acts, along with the country's escalating violence, force Boyle into picking up his camera for the sake of documenting

the plight of the military freedom fighters, and those most affected by the escalating conflict. However, the photojournalist's divided sympathies end up affecting his closest allies, and by the film's end, Cassady is killed in battle and Mariá is deported from the United States to El Salvador.

Richard Boyle would represent the most extreme example of the period's stereotype, whereas the photojournalist depicted in a smaller, lesser-known film, *84 Charlie MoPic*, would be a much more moderate characterization. The film is also a key example of how the brazen war photojournalists depicted in the films of the 1980s would take on more complex and varied characterizations as the decade shifted into the 1990s.

MoPic (Byron Thames) in *84 Charlie MoPic* is another, altogether different interpretation of the combat war photojournalist in films from the decade. The film, a fictional, first-person account of one military unit's struggles in the Vietnam War, would create, as Badsey observed, a "reporter who has no need to struggle with assimilation or detachment because he is already a serving soldier."[40]

84 Charlie MoPic is a seminal film in the history of the journalism-genre films from the time period because director Patrick Sheane Duncan's storytelling style is more akin to documentary than fictional narrative. Additionally, the MoPic character is physically shown only twice throughout the film, and has minimal dialogue. Third, much of the character's observations and feelings are projected through interview-like questioning rather than through on-screen movement or action.

The term "MoPic" is slang for "United States Army Motion Picture Division," and the cameraman's devoutness toward his unit is central to the understanding of his character. He is portrayed as a Caucasian male, outfitted with a crew-cut and military

fatigues, who is on his second tour of duty. "What makes his subjective camera convincing is that he is not simply recording the action, but trying to make a documentary that can be used as a training film for other infantrymen," Ebert said in his review of the film.

While MoPic is not a photojournalist in the traditional sense, his behavior and characteristics closely mirror the methodical, observant cameramen in films such as *Medium Cool* and *The Year of Living Dangerously*. And like the afore-mentioned characters, MoPic becomes an integral part of the action, laying his camera down for the lives of others in the film's graphic and bloody conclusion. Similar to Cassellis and Kwan, the MoPic character is forced to place his journalistic duties on hold when his unit is besieged by Vietcong strikers; when one of the men in his unit is shot down while trying to board a rescue helicopter, MoPic releases his camera, picks up the injured soldier, and is killed by crossfire while trying to board the plane. His heroics and feelings come between his occupational duties and, in return, the character pays the ultimate price for his decision.

As the 1980s faded into the 1990s, and then into the 21st Century, the image of the heroic war photojournalist, torn between his professional responsibilities and choosing sides in wartime, would fade into other, increasingly varied interpretations. Whereas films such as *Apocalypse Now*, *The Killing Fields* and *Salvador* glorified the role of the adventurous war correspondent, the motion pictures of the next two decades would take photojournalists primarily out of Third World conflicts, and place them back into the confines of major American metropolises. Additionally, these characters' occupational duties and professional roles would change for the first time since the

journalism-genre films of the 1960s. For example, the battle between photojournalism and art photography would be one of many changes that help to define these characters' role-related image.

Undoubtedly, the ethical dilemmas and behavioral patterns that helped shape the image of the on-screen photojournalists from the previous three and a half decades would also reappear in the films of the next sixteen years. However, the predominant stereotypes associated with the cameramen in the films of the 1990s and 2000s would be altogether more abstract interpretations. Furthermore, a composite of the characterizations that first appeared in *Rear Window* and continued to shape and evolve through the end of the 1980s would be reformed and develop in the next decade and a half.

[1] Joe Saltzman, "Analyzing the Images of the Journalist in Popular Culture: a Unique Method of Studying the Public's Perception of Its Journalists and the News Media," In *Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication*, San Antonio, Texas, 2005.

[2] Thomas Zynda, "The Hollywood Version: Movie Portrayals of the Press," *Journalism History* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 17.

[3] Brennen, "From headline shooter," 427-436.

[4] Roger Ebert, Review of *Rear Window, Chicago Sun-Times,* 20 February 2000.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Bridger, "From the ridiculous to the sublime," 8.

[7] Roger Ebert, Review of *Peeping Tom, Chicago Sun-Times,* 2 May 1999.

[8] Bosley Howard, Review of *Blowup, The New York Times,* 19 December 1966.

[9] Jay, "The Photographer as Aggressor," 21.

[10] Roger Ebert, Review of *Blowup, Chicago Sun-Times,* 8 November 1998.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Zynda, "The Hollywood Version," 21.

[13] Richard R. Ness, *From Headline Hunter to Superman: A Journalism Filmography* (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997).

[14] Vincent Canby, Review of *Medium Cool, The New York Times,* 28 August 1969.

[15] Good, *Outcasts,* 99.

[16] Ness, *From Headline Hunter,* 496.

[17] Ibid., 497.

[18] Roger Ebert, Review of *Mahogany, Chicago Sun-Times,* 1 January 1975.

[19] Vincent Canby, Review of *Pretty Baby, The New York Times,* 5 April 1978.

[20] Roger Ebert, Review of *Pretty Baby, Chicago Sun-Times,* 1 June 1978.

[21] Good, *Outcasts,* 147.

[22] Badsey, “The depiction of war reporters,” 247.

[23] Vincent Canby, Review of *Apocalypse Now*, *The New York Times*, 15 August 1979.

[24] Badsey, “The depiction of war reporters,” 248.

[25] Badsey, “The depiction of war reporters,” 250.

[26] Ibid., 251.

[27] Ness, *From Headline Hunter*, 557.

[28] Bridger, “From the ridiculous to the sublime,” 9.

[29] Vincent Canby, Review of *The Year of Living Dangerously*, *The New York Times*, 21 January 1983.

[30] Good, *Outcasts*, 57.

[31] Ibid., 56.

[32] Roger Ebert, Review of *Under Fire*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 21 October 1983.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ehrlich, *Journalism in the Movies*, 149.

[35] Ebert, Review of *Under Fire*, 21 October 1983.

[36] Roger Ebert, Review of *The Killing Fields*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 1 January 1984.

[37] Vincent Canby, Review of *The Killing Fields*, *The New York Times*, 2 November 1984.

[38] Roger Ebert, Review of *Salvador*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 25 April 1986.

[39] Walter Goodman, Review of *Salvador*, *The New York Times*, 5 March 1986.

[40] Badsey, “The depiction of war reporters,” 248.

Chapter 5

Analysis Part 2

1990 to 2006: Alternative and Varied Interpretations of the On-Screen Photojournalist

For the most part, the stereotype of the on-screen photojournalist as youthful, Caucasian male, detached from both the events he is covering as well as his personal relationships with others – a characterization that dominated the journalism-genre films from 1954 to 1979 – would be replayed and reformed in the journalism-genre films of the 1990s and up through 2006. However, the stereotype of the heroic but ethically challenged war photojournalist would also reappear in some of the films from the time period. Still other journalism-genre films released since 1990 have been historical but fictitious narratives or biopics, in which the photojournalist is representative of a famous or iconic photographer from the past. Thus, the photojournalists in many of these films take on varied role-related responsibilities, and thus, the line between art photography and photojournalism becomes blurred for many of these characters.

In sum, the image of the on-screen cameraman portrayed in films from 1990 to 2006 would take on a variety of interpretations and oftentimes, would hybridize into multiple characterizations. Ness has observed the lack of definitive characterizations present in these films as well:

> Although the sheer number of films released in recent years indicate the public's fascination with the subject [journalism], few clear trends have emerged in this period. This may reflect the ambiguous attitude of the public toward the press as a whole.[1]

The lack of one dominating stereotype during the more recent decades is partly attributed to the more varied role-related responsibilities of real-life photojournalists. In the mid-1990s, photojournalists began replacing film with digital media, which in turn,

contributed to the increased usage of audio in online presentations as well. Similarly, the rise of corporate ownership also led to newer, more diverse responsibilities for photojournalists working for news organizations. For instance, in the years following the 1980s, cameramen were viewed as multitasking professionals, who were required to photograph news events, as well as fashion, sports and art-related images for publication as well. This trend was also due in part to the cost-cutting methods implemented by owners of media outlets across the globe. More importantly, the alternative and more varied characterizations of on-screen photojournalists from more recent decades have undoubtedly been projected through the characters' intertwining professional duties and diverse responsibilities.

In *Somebody Has to Shoot the Picture*, Paul Marish (Roy Scheider) would represent one of the many hybridized characterizations of photojournalists in the motion pictures of the 1990s. Marish is a lonely, recently divorced, womanizing alcoholic and Pulitzer Prize-winner, whose career is revived after a death row inmate, Raymond Eames (Arliss Howard), requests the cameraman document his execution.

MARISH (to cab driver): Are there any nice cool bars along the way [to the prison]?

The character's varied occupational roles are introduced in an opening conversation with his agent, in which the latter persuades Marish to accept the inmate's offer. During this encounter, the Marish character is shown depressed and intoxicated atop a barstool, staring into his drink, and replying unenthusiastically to his agent's requests.

AGENT: This is why I sent you to Vegas? These are supposed to be glamour shots for a wannabe band.

MARISH: I shoot what I see.

AGENT: [You] can't do this Marish. Photograph concerts and rock parties like Beirut, only you won't go to Beirut…Look, either you're a commercial photographer and you shoot what the client wants or you're a photojournalist and I send you to China to take pictures of students being run over by tanks. There's no middle ground.

When the photojournalist finally accepts the offer, he is antagonized by those closest to the inmate, leading to ethically questionable behavior on the part of the cameraman. In one such scene, man who has been affected by the actions of the accused confronts Marish, and persuades him to turn down the inmate's final request.

MAN: You're making a big mistake coming here. The officer Eames murdered was my buddy. You wanna make a hero out of a cop killer?

MARISH: Yeah, look man, it's just a job. You know, it's nothing personal.

MAN: Don't take the picture. Just let us forget about it.

MARISH: You want to forget about it? Don't buy the magazine when it comes out.

The photojournalist's ethics are again placed into question after he begins romancing the murdered police officer's wife (Bonnie Bedelia). Furthermore, Marish develops an overtly sympathetic relationship with the accused that eventually leads to his conducting a one-man investigation for the inmate's life.

EAMES: How much you gettin' paid for this?

MARISH: Seventy-five.

EAMES: Seventy-five dollars?

MARISH: Seventy-five thousand.

EAMES: What'll you do with all that money?

MARISH: Well, I give some to Amy, I give some to Barbara…all those ladies runnin' around out there with my name.

Paralleling the actions of Thomas in *Blowup* and Price in *Under Fire*, Marish uncovers facts about Eames's case that proves the inmate's innocence. But the photojournalist's findings are too late and in one of the film's final scenes, he is forced to witness the execution. In a fit of rage, the photojournalist throws his camera against a pane of glass and is detained by security. Like the passionate war photojournalists in the films of the 1980s, Marish's sympathies override his professional responsibilities and, in the end, he is left lonely and depressed.

The Public Eye was the first of the period's pseudo-historical biopics and showcases a version of the famous, 1940s New York press photographer Weegee. In the film, Leon Bernstein (Joe Pesci) is known as "The Great Bernzini" by those familiar with his byline. The character is portrayed as a lonely, cigar-chomping press photographer who dreams of becoming an artist, as Canby noted in his review of the film:

> Bernzie has a way of arriving at the scene of a crime before the police. Armed with a Speed Graphic, the pockets of his trench coat bulging with flashbulbs and film, Bernzie roams nighttime Manhattan in search of the right subject.[2]

"Pesci would seem the perfect actor to impersonate Weegee, but he did the movie under some damp cloud of humanitarianism," author James Wolcott said.[3] But the actor's portrayal of an underpaid, disrespected, bottom-feeding news photographer in post-Depression-era New York, is more than just a routine reenactment; Bernstein is an ethically challenged photo-reporter with a penchant for covering the worst of the worst.

In one of the film's opening scenes, the photojournalist asks a police officer to rearrange the arm of a victim for the sake of a better photograph. In another, the photojournalist dresses up as a priest and sneaks into a hearse in order to capture a close-up image of a corpse. He also bribes police officers for information and disregards crime-scene privacy. And the character is also known for his connections, mostly with

the local mob and other, nefarious characters. Needless to say, Bernstein is an unethical interpretation of the early 20th Century newspaper and tabloid photographers that littered the films of the 1930s and 1940s.

KAY LEVITZ: Lou told me you know everybody in New York…all the crooks and the cops. Is that true?

BERNSTEIN: Uh-huh.

LEVITZ: And he says that you never take sides. All you do is take pictures. Taking sides might get in the way.

Bernstein is, at first, portrayed as lonely and detached. But as the film progresses, he is shown aiding nightclub owner Levitz (Barbara Hershey), who hires him to get information on an entrepreneur who wants her dead. Bernstein, who is simultaneously working on a photographic book project, also believes himself to be more of an artist than a journalist. But his would-be publisher believes otherwise, and thus, shatters his dream.

PUBLISHER: Well sir, what I see here is a batch of pictures that are sensational. [But] too vulgar to justify a book of fine photography.

Bernstein seems to care little for anyone or anything outside the realm of his work; his passion is expressed in a scene in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation interrogates him regarding the murder of a mobster.

BERNSTEIN: I'm a freelance photographer. If I'm not on the street by midnight the whole world passes by.

The film's final scene, one in which the character photographs a shootout between competing mafia families, develops Bernzie's personality as a detached and obsessed photojournalist. In between rampant gunfire, Bernstein works quickly from behind a stack of wooden chairs and eventually, is wounded. When his friend and former

colleague Artie (Jerry Adler) arrives on the scene, the photojournalist is clearly more concerned about the photographs than his overall well-being.

ARTIE: Jesus Bernzie you're bleeding!

BERNSTEIN [handing the film to Artie]: Just get that to the Mirror, the Post, the Telegraph and *Life* magazine.

ARTIE: I know the routine.

While *The Public Eye* showcases the period's first example of the historical photojournalist in film, the 1990s' version of the heroic but ethically challenged war cameraman - the ever-popular stereotype developed through the journalism-genre films of the 1980s - would be exploited again in *Before the Rain*. The film is an intertwining mix of multiple story lines that converge, each focused on the events that culminate into the conflict between Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia during the early days of the Clinton administration. The film's leading character, Aleksandar (Rade Serbedzija), is a grizzled, adulterous war photojournalist of Macedonian descent, who returns to his homeland after a sixteen-year hiatus.

Like Price in *Under Fire* or Boyle in *Salvador*, Aleksandar's quiet demeanor and passion for his work are second to his unethical decision-making, both personally and professionally. "…he has a worldly, weary attractiveness," Ebert said of the Aleksandar character. "[His] return [home] is fueled by guilt."[4]

The photojournalist's love affair with a married, London-based picture editor, Anne (Katrin Cartlidge), is fueled by sexual tension and disregard for loyalty. Anne's mother shuns Aleksandar during one scene, and Anne refuses to reveal to her lover that she is pregnant with their child. Their only conversation in the film is an extended battle of sex, wits and ego.

ANNE: So what happened in Bosnia? Why are you back?

ALEKSANDAR: I'm free. I resigned [from the agency] this morning.

ANNE: Oh yeah? So you can just resign from taking photographs, can you?

ALEKSANDAR: Let's fuck.

[Both Laugh]

ANNE: Let's be serious, Aleks. You were born to be a photographer. You can't do anything else. You have a contract with the agency.

ALEKSANDAR: They can suck on my contract!

When the photojournalist decides to flee England for Macedonia, his troubles follow him halfway across the globe. In the film's third half entitled "Pictures," Aleksandar puts his camera away and sides with his family against the rebel forces. He begins drinking heavily to subdue his pain, and in the vain of the Photo Journalist character in *Apocalypse Now* and *Salvador*'s Boyle, smokes marijuana to alleviate tension. Although he dreams of returning to the woman he loved many years beforehand, he cannot shake his demons. While typing a letter to Anne in his dreary room, Aleksandar reveals his personal and professional struggles through narration.

ALEKSANDAR (narration): This place is the same as before, but my eyes have changed, like a new fit on a lens. Last week, I told you I killed. I got friendly with this militiaman and I told him I wasn't getting anything exciting; he said 'no problem,' pulled a prisoner out of the line, and shot him on the spot. Did you get that? I took sides. My camera killed the man.

Eventually, the character's inner turmoil surfaces, and when a member of his family is murdered, he retreats to find the missing daughter of his former lover. His subjectivity and decision to forego his professional duties, leads to his brutal murder at the hands of his cousin.

Undoubtedly, Robert Kincaid (Clint Eastwood) in the 1995 landmark audience-pleaser, *The Bridges of Madison County*, would represent the most unrealistic characterization of the photojournalist in film to date. Both audiences and critics alike praised the film, a passion-drenched love story set in the mid-1960s and based on the novella by Robert James Waller. The film tells the story of an Iowa farm wife who falls for a poetic and romantic *National Geographic* photographer who is developing a story on the state's covered bridges. The film gently moves along, as does its protagonist, quietly, objectively and methodically. As Maslin said in her review of the film, "Mr. Eastwood's 'Bridges of Madison County' has a European flavor. Its pace is unhurried, which is not the same as slow. It respects long silences and pays attention to small details. It sustains an austere tone and staves off weepiness until the last reel."[5]

But others, including many of the staff at *National Geographic* magazine, found the sexually charged, world-weary Kincaid, repulsively inaccurate and misrepresentative of the profession. Staff writer Cathy Newman noted the inconsistencies of the Kincaid character:

> [He] drives a pickup truck. Plays guitar. Doesn't eat meat but smokes Camels. Goes out to Iowa to shoot the covered bridges of Madison County for *National Geographic* magazine. Romances a farmer's wife. Loves her. Leaves her…is that how it is with our photographers on assignment? Hardly.[6]

For the most part, Robert Kincaid is the epitome of the world-roaming, Caucasian male, magazine photojournalist. He is handsome and suntanned, and speaks as though he were reading classical prose. Ebert described Eastwood's performance as, "quiet, gentle and yet very masculine," and many viewers and critics found the change-of-pace role a major turning point in the actor's career.[7]

The romanticized Kincaid is introduced on-screen through a letter that his former lover, Francesca Johnson (Meryl Streep), has left in her will to her two adult children, Caroline (Annie Corley) and Michael (Victor Slezak). At first, Francesca's children are irate at their mother's adulterous endeavors, but they are equally at odds with the charming, adventurous Kincaid.

CAROLINE: He was a photographer…he promises not to write again…all it says is 'I love you, Robert.' He left all his belongings to mom and requested to be cremated and his ashes scattered over the Roseman Bridge.

MICHAEL: Damn him…it was some damn perverted photographic mind that influenced her.

Despite their anger, Caroline and Michael decide to explore their mother's past in hopes of understanding her life. Inside Francesca's dresser, the siblings find three battered Nikon F1 35-millimeter cameras and several old issues of *National Geographic* magazine, which include a portrait of the photojournalist and his series on the state's covered bridges. By this point, the film has well established Robert Kincaid as a world-roving poet, photojournalist and womanizer.

The longhaired, independent character is showcased and developed in a long flashback sequence that recalls his introduction to Francesca Johnson as well as their ensuing affair. The two meet after Kincaid stops at Francesca's home to ask for directions to the covered bridges, then requests that she accompany him in his weather-beaten, aging Ford pickup. When they reach the bridge, Kincaid quickly relinquishes his cherished photographic equipment – a light meter, tripod and camera – then methodically begins framing the image he wishes to create in his mind.

KINCAID: I won't shoot this today. I'll just do a little prep work…the light's no good right now.

Simultaneously, the photojournalist becomes increasingly interested in the farmwife, and her interest in him unfolds after he presents a bushel of handpicked Iowa wildflowers to her.

Kincaid and Francesca's first encounter leads to dinner, and then another in which the two share their past life experiences. During this scene, the photojournalist's semi-drunken ramblings reveal insight into both his past as well as present nature. He tells Francesca a lengthy story about an encounter with a gorilla while on assignment in Africa, a country he describes as a "voyeur's paradise," and she, in turn, is fascinated by his lifestyle and viewpoints.

KINCAID: The trouble with being a journalist too long is that you stop giving yourself a reason to invent. Think I'll just continue making pictures.

FRANCESCA: Making pictures…I like them. You really love what you do, don't you?

KINCAID: Yeah, I'm obsessed by it.

The photojournalist's obsession with his craft is primarily revealed through his methodical speeches and quirky habits while working in the field. But his decision to pursue the married Francesca Johnson is one that leads him away from his chosen profession, and towards a path of adultery and mistrust. Fueled by unethical decisions, the lonely, disheveled photojournalist moves away from his passion and pleasure of life on the road.

KINCAID: I have a little bit of a problem with this American family ethic that seems to have hypnotized the whole country. You [Francesca] probably think of someone like me as a poor, displaced soul who's destined to wander the planet with no TV set or self-cleaning oven.

Kincaid's interest in Francesca is self-centered and isolated; he cares little about the consequences that she and her family will suffer if she were to escape for a new life of travel and leisure.

FRANCESCA: You [Kincaid] don't have to feel anything, period! You have carved out a part for yourself in the world as a voyeur and a hermit and a lover whenever you feel like it!

The photojournalist also decides to forego his career interests in favor of passion, and he admits to Francesca that he will do anything to continue their romance.

KINCAID: The reason I make pictures…it's because I've been making my way here.

In the film's final scene, Francesca chooses her family and life on the farm over the romanticized version offered by Kincaid. Although filmmaker Eastwood reveals that the two possessed an everlasting connection, the photojournalist is left lonely, ashamed and displaced by the film's finale.

The image of the career-obsessed, womanizing photojournalist would be retold in an altogether different genre in John Waters' *Pecker*. The youthful title character (Edward Furlong) is nicknamed so because "he eats like a bird." Maslin said in her review of the film that Pecker is, "the happy, innocent shutterbug at the center of this giddy satire [who] takes pictures just because he loves to, and because, just like Mr. Waters, he thinks art is anywhere and everywhere."[8]

Although not a photojournalist in the traditional sense, the teenage, camera-wielding Pecker, whose works part-time at a Baltimore sandwich shop, is as obsessively career-driven as Bernstein in *The Public Eye* and Kincaid in *The Bridges of Madison County*. He always carries a small Leica strung around his neck, and he is continually looking for the interesting and obscure moments of daily life. The character literally

photographs everything in sight; from hamburgers sizzling on the grill to insects scanting across the floor, Pecker is classically characterized as an on-screen voyeur, similar to Mark in *Peeping Tom*. " 'Pecker's like a humane Diane Arbus,' one critic gushes, when in fact, he's more like just plain Diane Arbus," Ebert stated of the character.[9]

The character's unethical nature is a perfect match for his quirky mischievousness. In one scene, Pecker and his friend, Matt (Brendan Sexton III) - a regular kleptomaniac with an appealing innocence – exchange grocery items in customers' carts at a local supermarket, so that the photojournalist can make reaction-oriented photographs. In another scene, the character is kicked out of a nightclub for spying on strippers, persons he believes to be prime fodder for his photographic body of work. He is also continually late to work until his eventual firing, and has sex with his girlfriend, Shelley (Christina Ricci), in a voting booth. Primarily, he is a constant annoyance to any and all within range of his viewfinder.

SHELLEY: I got fluff-and-fold duties.

PECKER: Ok. Just a few pin-up shots.

[Pecker snaps a few frames of Shelley, then asks that she tilt her head at a certain angle]

SHELLEY: Ok. But I don't have all day for your stupid art.

The character's obsessive work habits eventually land him a small gallery showing at his workplace, where a New York art critic (Lili Taylor) takes a keen interest in his images. Pecker immediately receives a larger gallery showing and becomes an overnight sensation in the world of high-profile, portrait and candid photography.

MATT: You sure got an eye for this stuff.

PECKER: Sometimes I'm amazed they even turn out at all.

Despite the critics' positive comparisons to Weegee and Arbus, Pecker's eventual fall from the limelight is directly related to his lack of personal and professional ethics. A neighbor scolds him for not having her sign a model release and his family's home is broken into because of his carefree behavior during his streak of success. More importantly, the gallery owner who discovers his talent falls in love with him, which causes immediate problems in his relationship with Shelley. But Pecker's believes in the photographic process as well as his artistic merit and achievements.

PECKER: You robbed our house!

THIEF: So? You take my photograph and didn't pay me!

PECKER: C'mon, man. That's not the same thing. These are real-life shots.

The varied characterizations of the photojournalists in the films of the 1990s would carry over into the first half of the next decade. From 2000 to 2006, a variety of different filmmakers working in genres ranging from comic book superhero to elite foreign film would portray on-screen cameramen in both leading and supporting roles. But the films from the first half of the 21st Century would take an even more extensive look into the psyche and mindset of their photojournalists. More importantly, filmmakers would develop these characterizations around the characters' personal and professional relationships, rather than simply through the on-screen presence or work habits of the photojournalists. Additionally, the occupational role of the photojournalists in these films would continue to blur, and their personal and professional ethics would become increasingly distant and surreal.

Whereas the heroic but ethically challenged war photojournalist from the journalism-genre films of the 1980s was a hard-drinking and rowdy womanizer, the lead

characters in *Harrison's Flowers* and *We Were Soldiers* would alter that stereotype altogether. Although the former portrays a pack of international photojournalists as objectively detached, foul-mouthed alcoholics, the title character, Harrison Lloyd (David Strathairn), is a calm, gentle family man with a passion and knack for war photography.

Unlike the womanizing and troubled Aleksandar in *Before the Rain*, Harrison Lloyd, who is absent from the film's middle half, is portrayed as a quiet romantic, with a loving wife, an upscale home, and two children. He is a passionate *Newsweek* photojournalist who is sent to the Balkans during the early days of the Yugoslavian conflict for a final assignment before retiring. Prior to his exit, he is shown joking with his wife, Sarah (Andie MacDowell), as well as making passionate love to her, hugging his two children, and tending to his garden. He is also sick of his profession, war, and the horrors that go hand-in-hand with his job requirements.

HARRISON (to his editor): Well, Sam, it's like my luck bank is back down to zero. I never used to get clammy hands when guys started going at each other around me. I took my pictures, calm, clear-headed…even when I was up to my neck in shit. And I was proud…I was proud to expose it. And I was conscious of doing my job right…all I can think about now is Sarah and the kids and I'm sick of it.

Although his editor, Sam (Alun Armstrong), agrees to find the photojournalist "something safe, cushy and overpaid," Harrison's final assignment leads to his disappearance and suspected death. His faithful wife heads to Yugoslavia to discover his whereabouts, and encounters a team of wild-eyed, international correspondents who inform her of the area's dangers. Ebert observed the freewheeling nature of these characters in his review of the film:

> They [the photojournalists] commandeer cars and Jeeps and essentially make a tour of the war zone, while bullets whiz past their ears and unspeakable horrors take place on every side. They are protected, allegedly, by white flags and large

> letters proclaiming 'TV' on the sides of their cars…does their status as journalists render them invisible?[10]

Despite the group's careless and reckless antics, they agree to help Sarah in her search for her long-lost husband. In doing so, one of the team members, the drug-abusing, chain-smoking Kyle Morris (Adrien Brody), loses his life. Another, the prize-winning Yeager Pollack (Elias Koteas), helps the grieving Sarah out of respect for her husband and his accomplishments. During his Pulitzer Prize acceptance speech, the photojournalist proves his devotedness to the missing Lloyd.

POLLACK: I've made a lot of mistakes in my life. But I think the biggest was being born in the era of Harrison Lloyd.

Near the end of the film, the trio stumbles upon the shell-shocked Harrison at a war-ravaged hospital in the seemingly dangerous town of Vukovar. Sarah brings him home, and for another year, the photojournalist suffers repercussions. During the film's final sequence, Harrison regains his memory and his honor while toying in his greenhouse. Sarah's ending narration reveals that the photojournalist retires from his passion and relocates to St. Louis, in order to live out a calmer and safer existence near the city's botanical gardens.

While *We Were Soldiers* showcases the brutalities of war, the film's photojournalist, Joe Galloway (Barry Pepper), is portrayed as a virtuous and noble reporter-with-a-camera in the vein of Harrison Lloyd. A far cry from the vulgar and hard-drinking substance-abusing war correspondents in the journalism-genre films of the 1980s, Galloway is a clean-cut "photojournalist and soldier's son, who hitches a ride into battle, and finds himself fighting at the side of the others to save his life."[11] The

character was constructed from the experiences of real-life Joseph L. Galloway who coauthored the book from which the film is based.

Galloway is portrayed as a heroic and noble Texan, and a quiet and mysterious photojournalist for United Press International, whose family has a long history of military and wartime service. Although initially disliked by the rough and rugged Lieutenant Colonel Hal Moore (Mel Gibson), Galloway's sporty behavior with regards to the conflict, and his overt patriotic attitude, aid in winning over the seasoned military veteran.

GALLOWAY (to Moore): Galloways have been in every war that this country's ever fought. But when it came to this one…I didn't think I could stop a war. No, I just thought that maybe I'd try and understand one. Maybe help folks back home understand. I just figure I could do that better shooting a camera than shooting a rifle.

The character is occasionally shown snapping away images during bloody and horrific conflict sequences, and is even rescued by Sergeant Major Plumley (Sam Elliott) after trying to shoot a picture of the soldier in battle. When the gruff Plumley gives Galloway a rifle, the photojournalist is confused and stares at the object, then admits his role-related responsibilities to the Sergeant Major.

GALLOWAY: I'm a noncombatant, sir!

Galloway's professionalism is revealed toward the film's end. When a team of preppy news reporters appear after the fighting has subsided and begin peppering Moore with questions about the conflict, Galloway stands away from the crowd, ashamed, and saddened by the tragedy. With his hand covering his mouth, he moves toward a group of deceased soldiers' bodies and begins crying. Simultaneously, Moore moves away from

the reporters and photographers and kneels solemnly beside the disheveled photojournalist.

GALLOWAY: Sir, I don't know how to tell this story.

MORRIS: Well, you've got to Joe. You tell the American people what my men did here. You tell them my troopers died.

GALLOWAY: Yes sir.

[Both nod in agreement]

Both Harrison Lloyd and Joe Galloway would undoubtedly represent the kindest portrayals of war photojournalists in journalism-genre films since the second-half of the 20th Century. As Badsey observed of the latter character, "this portrayal of a war reporter in *We Were Soldiers* could be described as a return to the certainties of a bygone era."[12] Since the release of *We Were Soldiers* in 2002, only one other mainstream Hollywood motion picture has portrayed a war photojournalist in a leading or supporting role.

But filmmakers in first half of the 2000s continued to use photojournalists in other, more varied, leading and supporting roles. For example, *Road to Perdition* and *Spider-Man* were two motion pictures from the 21st century that portray photojournalists in different and unique ways. While *Road to Perdition* is a gritty crime drama set in the bleak, Depression-era Midwest, *Spider-Man* is a lightweight superhero fantasy based on the Marvel Comics sensation. Additionally, the characterizations of the photojournalists in each of these films are dramatically different from one another.

In *Road to Perdition*, a small-town hitman, Michael Sullivan (Tom Hanks), flees from the mob to Chicago with his 12-year-old son (Tyler Hoechlin), after the latter witnesses a brutal and unnecessary murder. The Irish mafia boss (Paul Newman),

obsessed with finding the duo, hires a morbid bounty hunter, Maguire (Jude Law), whose passion and pleasure is photographing the bodies of his victims.

Maguire, a disheveled, slight and reclusive figure with rotting teeth and a conniving smile, is a voyeur in the sense of the photojournalists in the films of the 1960s and 1970s. His pleasure and his occupation parallel one another, and his unethical nature is revealed throughout the film. A standoff confrontation with Sullivan at a roadside diner reveals the inner turmoil of the murderous photojournalist.

SULLIVAN: Is that your profession or your pleasure?

MAGUIRE: Both. You've got to get paid doing what you love. I'm press –

SULLIVAN: Which paper?

MAGUIRE: All over. I'm something of a rarity. Can you keep a secret?

SULLIVAN: Yes.

MAGUIRE: I shoot dead bodies.

The repulsive character has little if any ethical concern for his subjects or those outside the realm of his profession. During the course of the film, Maguire is shown paying off a police officer for photographic access to a corpse, sleeping with and mistreating a prostitute in a dingy hotel room, and murdering Sullivan in the film's final moments. Like the stereotypical voyeur photojournalists from the films of the 1960s and 1970s, Maguire's home doubles as a darkroom, and his squeamish prints of his victims litter the walls of his dingy apartment.

Peter Parker (Tobey Maguire) in *Spider-Man* would represent a different type of on-screen photojournalist. *New York Times* film critic A. O. Scott described the character as, "an ordinary, disaffected urban adolescent," and the character, who morphs into the

famed superhero after being bitten by a genetically altered spider, is portrayed as awkward, caring and a teenage romantic.[13] "[The] socially retarded Peter Parker…[is] an outcast at school…[and] peddles photos of Spider-Man to cigar-chomping editor J. Jonah Jameson (J. K. Simmons)," Ebert said.[14]

Parker is a quiet and laconic high school newspaper photographer who obtains a job as Spider-Man's personal photographer for the city's fictional *Daily Bugle.* Although the character's occupation is predominantly a plot device, Peter Parker is proud of his profession and takes a decidedly ethical stance toward his journalistic duties. He also uses the occupation to impress his classmate, Mary Jane Watson (Kirsten Dunst). When asked how he knows the superhero personally, Parker uses his profession and all-inclusive access to win the heart of the would-be actress.

PARKER: I know him [Spider-Man] a little bit. I'm sort of his unofficial photographer.

Like *Road to Perdition* and *Spider-Man*, Fernando Meirelles's *City of God* presents another interpretation of the on-screen photojournalist. *New York Times* film critic Stephen Holden hailed the film for its message. "[The film is] one of the most powerful in a recent spate of movies that remind us that the civilized society we take for granted is actually a luxury."[15] *City of God* also became a box-office sensation and was nominated for four Academy Awards in 2003.

The photojournalist in this film, a quiet, passionate newspaper photographer who documents the notorious gang violence in Rio de Janeiro's City of God district, begins as a youth and morphs into adulthood on-screen. Rocket (Alexandre Rodrigues), who also acts as the film's narrator, is viewed as privileged and intelligent, despite his occasional ethical faults, in an area of Rio where gang violence and street wars are commonplace.

Ebert noted the character's development from youth to young adult in his review of the film:

> We watch as Rocket obtains a (stolen) camera that he treasures and takes pictures from his privileged position as a kid on the streets. He gets a job as an assistant on a newspaper delivery truck, asks a photographer to develop his film, and is startled to see his portrait of an armed gang leader on the front page of the paper.[16]

Furthermore, the Rocket character would be the first South American photojournalist portrayed in film and the first teenage cameraman since *Pecker*.

While the majority of the film tells the story of Rocket's coming-of-age, the character's obsession with his craft drives him out of the slums and into the arena of photojournalism during the film's latter half. Prior to his accomplishment, however, the character is shown smoking marijuana and envying the life of his hoodlum older brother. One scene shows Rocket attempting to purchase marijuana for his would-be girlfriend, Angélica (Alice Braga).

ROCKET (narration): I'd have done anything to please her. Buy her pot, coke.

But the character's early personal ethics eventually shift, and soon he becomes a camera-obsessed teen after a news photographer shows up to document a local slaying.

ROCKET (narration): On the day Shaggy died, I remember the crowds and a camera. I'd always wanted to have one.

Rocket eventually obtains a small, store-bought camera that he uses to photograph his friends at the beach, and in particular, his newfound love interest. By his late teens, he picks up a job at a local shopping center in order to buy a better camera. But a more promising opportunity to fulfill his dream arises when the leader of a local gang (Leandro Firmino) asks for a group portrait, and then gives Rocket a newer, 35-millimeter camera in return. Because of Rocket's access to the slums and the gang leader in particular, the

image appears on the following day's front page of the *Journal Do Brasil* and the cameraman is awarded the opportunity to meet his photographer-hero, Rogerio (Gustavo Engracia).

REPORTER: Do you want to be a photographer?

ROCKET: Yes.

ROGERIO: Great start! On the front page.

REPORTER: How'd you get these photos?

ROCKET: I live there.

ROGERIO: Rocket, no photographer has ever been able to go in there.

In the film's final act, Rocket documents a violent outbreak between two local gangs. The character is shown working methodically, stationed in the backdrop, and firing away images of the street war. By the finale, Rocket has obtained an internship with the newspaper and his photograph of a slain gang leader has won him local acclaim.

ROCKET (narration): The picture of the head will guarantee my salary. This one will make me famous. It'll even make the cover of a magazine. I won't have to worry about Li'l Zé anymore. But the cops?

In *Paparazzi*, a team of sleazy and criminal tabloid photojournalists, led by Rex Harper (Tom Sizemore) and Wendell Stokes (Daniel Baldwin), set out to humiliate and eventually harm an upcoming Hollywood megastar, Bo Laramie (Cole Hauser). The film, demeaned by critics and shunned at the box-office, would become notable for its repugnant view of celebrity stalking cameramen.

Harper and Stokes's group of photojournalists are portrayed as overweight, grimy, inconsiderate and most importantly, unethical. "Sizemore's character works for Paparazzi, a magazine that appears to be aimed at professional kidnappers," *New York*

Times film critic Dave Kehr observed in his review of the film.[17] The group continually degrades the celebrities they cover and use improper means of gathering information, including wire-tapping the homes of their victims.

LARAMIE (narration): There are primitive tribes who believe you lose a piece of your soul every time your picture is taken. After last night [at the premiere of the film], it's a wander I have any left.

The group's work is showcased in a scene in which Laramie reviews the cover of *Paparazzi*, only to find his scantily clad body gracing the cover of the magazine. The film star becomes more enraged after Harper photographs his son with a telephoto lens at a soccer game, then coerces the actor into fighting him for the sake of instigating a lawsuit.

HARPER (to himself): Laramie, I'm gonna destroy your life and soul. And I can't wait to do it.

Harper's team of manipulating photojournalists use pressure Laramie into attending group therapy, paying a fine for his outburst, and publicly apologize to the shrewd and abusive Harper. But the stalking photojournalists' unethical decisions extend beyond humiliating megastars. In one scene, the group attends a strip club and proceeds to make degrading comments to females while slandering the public figures that act as their subject matter.

STOKES (to cohort): The public wants raw and real. And that's what we give them. Let me tell you my friend, we are the last of the real hunters.

Additionally, the group's unethical means to obtaining images of celebrities are vocalized in this scene as well.

STOKES (to cohort): I spent three nights hiding in that tree – ants crawling all over my ass. I picked her [subject] out with a thousand mil from one hundred and twenty yards out. It was beautiful.

Meanwhile, Harper flirts with a young female, Marcy (Fay Masterson), at the bar. He appears cocky and self-assured, dressed in a hipster shirt with flared sleeves and sunglasses, and talks professionally about his profession and occupational duties.

HARPER (to Marcy): Look, I'm a photojournalist. I was doing my job. I was assaulted and justice was served…my job is to provide a window of reality for society. It's up to them, whether they want to look through it or not.

The group's antics become increasingly carefree after they chase Laramie and his family down a busy metropolitan road, which causes the film star to wreck his vehicle. After Laramie collides with another driver, the team of paparazzi scramble to the scene and begin photographing without first notifying the police or medical assistance. Furthermore, Marcy witnesses the accident as well and threatens to tell the police of the photojournalists' actions, but Harper, in turn, blackmails the innocent female with a videotape of their sexual endeavors, and harasses her with vicious slander as well.

As the film progresses, Laramie seeks revenge on each member of the unit while the group turns to increasingly criminal means to escape his advances. For instance, one paparazzo sneaks on to Laramie's property and photographs his grieving wife lounging by the pool. In another scene, one of the group photographs Harper embracing a market clerk, and then unethically spins the context of the image, which lands on the cover of Paparazzi magazine. Furthermore, the detective covering the case (Dennis Farina) informs Laramie of the group's criminal record; one of the members was formerly a narcotics dealer-turned-disgruntled attorney while Harper was formally charged with rape.

By the film's finale, Laramie has murdered two members of the group, including Stokes – a character whose high-tech surveillance equipment allows him easy access to

otherwise off-limits celebrities – and has Harper arrested for breaking into his home and attacking his wife.

LARAMIE (to the detective): Get this piece of shit out of my house.

An equally vicious and corrupt on-screen photojournalist is Jeff Kohlver (Patrick Wilson) in the independent thriller, *Hard Candy*. Kohlver is a portrait and fashion photojournalist with a personal studio inside his trendy home, and who has a dark history of sexually assaulting teenage females. Like the tabloid photojournalists in *Paparazzi*, Kohlver is portrayed as a Caucasian male whose slightly cocky attitude, designer close and glamorous occupation leads to his eventual demise at the hands of a 14 year-old female.

Kohlver uses sexually suggestive writing and his appropriate chatroom nickname, Lensman319, to coerce a seemingly innocent female, Hayley Stark (Ellen Page), into meeting him for coffee. The photojournalist takes the teenager home with intent to rape her, but Hayley's plan is to kidnap Kohlver and torment him in a grisly and demented fashion.

HAYLEY (changing clothes): Don't peak.

KOHLVER: I shoot models for a living. I've seen it all before.

In the vein of Mark in *Peeping Tom,* Kohlver is a fatally flawed character whose unethical and voyeuristic nature drives him to photograph his models just before sexually assaulting them. He offers the minor an alcoholic beverage, then lies to her about his occupational duties and his past.

HAYLEY: So what is it like to look through your beautiful lens at some woman who's worked so hard to look beautiful for you?

KOHLVER: [laughs] You know these models; they all have handlers – people who make sure their hair is just right, makeup is okay, they don't get lost on their way to the next gig.

HAYLEY: So you never get to be alone with them?

KOHLVER: Well, rarely. I'm compensated for my troubles. Don't worry about me…you're wandering how many of these models I've been with?

HAYLEY: [laughs] No. How many?

KOHLVER: None of them! They're underage, mostly. I'd be arrested!

HAYLEY: So you're not arrested for photographing them like this?

[Hayley points to the collection of portraits on Kohlver's wall]

Following their flirtatious conversation, Kohlver convinces Hayley to "open up for him." She attempts to model for the photojournalist and jumps on his couch, strips and dances wildly. Like Thomas in *Blowup*, the photojournalist becomes aroused and retrieves his camera, then snaps a few images of the teenage predator.

Hayley unsuspectingly drugs Kohlver, and then attempts to torture him with castration. The two play a game of cat-and-mouse throughout the rest of the film, and along the way, Hayley correctly identifies the cameraman as a voyeuristic photojournalist with pedophilic tendencies.

HAYLEY: You've really got to wander when a grown man goes through all this trouble just to charm a girl. Maybe it's this whole camera thing. Cameras, computers…they let you hide, don't they? I heard how your voice changed when the camera came between us.

Hayley's torture tactics include strangling the photojournalist with cellophane, reading letters aloud from his former lovers, sending slanderous emails to his long-lost love, and rummaging through his safe. By the end of *Hard Candy*, the teenager has forced Kohlver

to confess his deeds and commit suicide for his actions. Like the tabloid paparazzi before him, Kohlver's irresponsible and sick nature leads to his timely death.

Flags of Our Fathers is the most recent film to feature a male photojournalist in a leading or supporting role. Like many of the journalism-genre films from the latter half of the 20th Century and into the next, the cameraman portrayed in this film is a Caucasian male and veteran war photojournalist. Although Joe Rosenthal (Ned Eisenberg) is on-screen for less than two minutes, the film is based on the real-life character's iconic photograph, "Old Glory Goes Up Mount Suribachi."

In *Flags of Our Fathers*, Rosenthal is portrayed as a young and clumsy combat photojournalist who stumbles onto the tiny Pacific island of Iwo Jima, armed with only his professional instinct and Speed Graphic camera. Another actor portraying Rosenthal narrates the film as well, and is also shown giving an interview during the opening moments.

ROSENTHAL (narration): There were plenty of other photos taken that day but none anybody wanted to see. Now the right picture can win or lose a war…I took a lot of pictures that day; none of them made a difference.

The majority of the film deals with the impact the photograph had on two soldiers and one sailor who were subjects in the image. Primarily, Rosenthal's photograph caused negative reactions for most of them and leads to one of the soldier's eventual suicide. But *Flags of Our Fathers* tells the story of these three men from their vantage point, and undoubtedly uses the narrative to make a statement about the power of photography and its ability to shape and impact both the lives of subjects as well as the viewer. And unlike any other motion picture from 1954 to 2006, the focus of the film is not on the

photojournalist, but rather his actions and the effects of his profession on the lives of others.

1954 to 2006: The Female Photojournalist in Film

The latter half of the 20th Century through 2006 produced a variety of films in which female photojournalists were portrayed in leading or supporting roles. Although male photojournalists were undoubtedly portrayed more often, female characterizations became increasingly popular as the 1990s faded into the 2000s, and as newsroom diversity became more globally widespread. For instance, female photojournalists were near-absent in journalism-genre films from 1954 to the mid-1970s.

Even after these portrayals became more commonplace in motion pictures, the characters were oftentimes stereotyped by their femininity and need for relationship and security. Rarely is the female photojournalist in film characterized as detached from the events she is covering or as publicly and professionally unethical as her male counterpart. Simultaneously, she is afforded less screen time than male photojournalists and is oftentimes portrayed as a romantic, whose helplessness and personal insecurities take priority over her professional responsibilities.

Although neither *Friday Foster* nor *Eyes of Laura Mars* were critically acclaimed at the time of their release or generated much box-office revenue, both films featured female photojournalists in leading roles, and thus, represented a new trend in the journalism-genre films of the 20th Century. Additionally, *Friday Foster*'s photojournalist was the first to feature an African-American as a news cameraman. Nonetheless, the characters in both of these films exhibit countless unethical behaviors

while on the job and the filmmakers undoubtedly exploit the characters' feminine characteristics.

Both Friday Foster (Pam Grier) and Laura Mars (Faye Dunaway) are overly flirtatious, shift into detective roles while ignoring their professional obligations, and their occupations are primarily used as formulaic plot devices. Additionally, their male counterparts view them as sexual objects of desire, which leads to both characters having intercourse with their on-screen leading men. These characteristics and others lead the two photojournalists into making various unethical decisions and aid in the creation of a new stereotype for on-screen female photojournalists.

In *Friday Foster*, the title character is an ex-model turned Los Angeles-based tabloid photographer for *Glance* magazine who evolves into a sleuth after her friend is assassinated by a hitman. Foster is portrayed as young and attractive, and has a seemingly carefree attitude toward her job. She talks down to her boss and flirts with an airport security guard, then offers him alcohol – all for the sake of gaining behind-the-scenes access.

FRIDAY FOSTER: First, I'm a woman. Second, I'm a photographer. And third, I'm a little sister…

In turn, Foster's editor treats her as an incompetent female and second-rate employee. When he hears that the "black Howard Hughes" is coming to Los Angeles, he gruffly instructs Foster to cover the event.

EDITOR: I want you to take your little camera and shoot your little pictures and don't get involved!

Later in the film, her boss goes on to further humiliate her by telling her to, "Get your cute little hiney out there and don't get involved!"

Foster's ethics are no worse than those of the male photojournalists portrayed in *Blowup* and *Medium Cool*, but her behavior and decision-making worsen as the film progresses. During her model-friend's funeral, she appears unemotional, and snaps photographs of the suspected murderer (Carl Weathers) as the procession commences. Furthermore, she pursues the criminal in a stolen hearse, and in another sequence, proceeds to use her camera as a physical weapon. However, Foster suffers very few consequences from her lack of personal and professional ethics and instead, is portrayed as the film's heroic heroine by the finale.

In *Eyes of Laura Mars*, the title character is a high-profile fashion photographer working on a book project. Coincidentally, she exhibits many of the same types of stereotyping trademarks as Friday Foster. *New York Times* film critic Janet Maslin described the Mars character in her review of the film:

> Dead men in evening clothes; supine women guarded by sleek, ferocious dogs; upside-down corpses wearing garter-belts, with their hair and makeup in exquisite disarray – these are the tricks of Laura Mars's trade, the hallmarks that have established her as the New York fashion photographer who outkinks them all.[18]

Mars is characterized by her inability to deal with visions that allow her to foresee the gruesome slayings of her friends and coworkers. Despite the fact that the photojournalist sheds tears after several of the murders, she seems more interested in romantically pursuing the detective covering the case, John Neville (Tommy Lee Jones). Maslin observed that, "Laura, being much too self-involved an artiste to worry about the implications of her work, merely thinks of herself as someone who gives 'an account of times in which I'm living,' times rife with 'moral, spiritual and emotional murder."[19]

Furthermore, Mars's professional status and controversial work is praised by many but despised by others. When a reporter outside of Mars's gallery showing

approaches one of the photojournalist's personnel, the journalist proceeds with subjective criticism.

REPORTER: I just wanted to know if she [Mars] realizes that her work is degrading to women?

Another scene shows the photojournalist aiding her makeup artists before a fashion shoot. A team of experts surrounds Mars and she proceeds methodically to go about her work. A slew of cameras, light meters and clothing clog the scene at the following outdoor shoot, and Mars acts as director of the event itself. She is clearly aware of her status and stature within the fashion world and relentlessly pursues the perfect picture in the film's following sequence.

The sulking detective John Neville chooses to pursue the photojournalist as well, and she is thus forced to fend off his vicious advances. By the second half of the film, the photojournalist has shifted from a high-society fashion photographer to a weeping, helpless victim, left to defend herself against the corrupt detective. Simultaneously, she is accused of being a murderer, both literally and photographically.

MARS (to Neville): You think I was in these actual situations, committed the murders, and then recreated them in actual photographs? I don't buy it!

"*Eyes of Laura Mars* tries to say Serious Things about fashion photography, corruption in advertising, and the violence in our society. It does not succeed, but it tries," Ebert said in his review of the film.[20] Other films from the second half of the 20th Century and into the 2000s would portray more varied and multi-dimensional characterizations of the female photojournalist in film, as a larger number of female photojournalists became more prominent figures in the mass media.

In *Violets Are Blue*, Gussie Sawyer (Sissy Spacek) is a small-town Maryland native who returns to her hometown for vacation after years of covering conflicts overseas. The character is the only female war photojournalist depicted in motion pictures during the 20th Century, and her behavior and mannerisms are far more passive and subdued than those of characters such as Price in *Under Fire* or Rockoff in *The Killing Fields.* Her gender also plays a determining factor in how other characters in the film view her profession.

BOY: I heard you've been a lot of places?

SAWYER: Yeah, I guess I have.

BOY: You've been in wars?

SAWYER: A few.

BOY: My mom says that wars are no place for a woman.

Sawyer is featured as a quiet, mysterious and independent flight attendant-turned-photojournalist, who became a notoriety after selling several of her photographs to an in-flight travel magazine. In complete contrast to *Salvador*'s Boyle, the majority of Gussie Sawyer's photojournalistic ethics and professionalism are intact. In an opening scene, she is shown moving quickly and quietly through a war zone, stopping to photograph when something invigorates her. When she encounters two young girls playing with a doll, she kindly asks them questions while shooting several candid portraits of the their interaction. After the girls' mother interrupts the photojournalist and takes her daughters away, Gussie puts her camera away, while tears streak from her cheeks.

Sawyer has more developed feminine characteristics, which in turn, set her apart from other war photojournalists depicted in the journalism-genre films of the 1980s. The

character is shown embracing her family upon her return home, and several scenes show her debating her next career step in long conversations with her friends and family. Additionally, Gussie is portrayed as an expert sailor and recreational jogger who creates time for relationships with long-lost friends and family.

GUSSIE: I don't want my picture taken [for the local newspaper].

MOTHER: Huh?

GUSSIE: I'm on vacation!

MOTHER: Well, most people are just dying to get their picture in the paper.

GUSSIE: Exactly!

Despite these more reputable traits, Sawyer makes several unethical decisions throughout the film and her consequences affect a range of characters. Like the womanizing Price or Boyle, Sawyer's loneliness is essential to the development of her character's ethics; she chooses to have an affair with her former boyfriend Henry Squires (Kevin Kline) and proceeds to coerce him away from his wife and child. Sawyer spends most of the second half of the film convincing Squires into joining her on the road; she argues that he can write the copy to accompany her photographs. Ebert observed the struggle between Sawyer's career and her personal relationships in his review of the film:

> …her father tells Gussie one day, with gruffness and love, that she has no business fooling around with a married man. But Gussie can't help herself. She chose a career instead of a family, but now she has seen the man that could have been her husband, seen the boy who could have been her son, and she wants it both ways.[21]

Like many of the photojournalists portrayed in motion pictures from the latter half of the 20th Century, Gussie Sawyer chooses her occupation over the possibility of true love and family. By the film's end, Squires has left Sawyer alone at the airport, and she

is forced to explain her occupational responsibilities and purpose to her long-estranged but loving father.

GUSSIE (to her father): Do you know how long it took me to get assigned to the Paris bureau, pop? Eight years…eight years of working seven days a week. Did you know I've missed every Christmas for the last 13 years except one? And you know why pop? You want to know why? Because I wanted to be the best and to be the best, you've got to be there, so I'm there.

By the 1990s and through the first half-decade of the 21st Century, the image of the female photojournalist in film would change and develop alongside their male counterparts. *Kalifornia* presents the first of these modern-day interpretations of the female photojournalist in motion pictures. Although the occupation of the Carrie Laughlin character (Michelle Forbes) plays a minor role in the film, the photojournalist's tendency to immerse herself into the lives of her subjects, as well as her behavioral patterns and strong-willed demeanor, represent a trend that carries over to other female photojournalists in films from the 1990s and 2000s.

Laughlin is a married, Caucasian female who is driven to succeed in both her career and her relationship with her husband. Although a minor character in the film, she is showcased as a yuppie, unappreciated art photographer, with a pension for sexually explicit photojournalism and chain-smoking. The character, whose snobbish attitude repulses both her spouse as well as their traveling companions, decides to immerse herself into her work, after her husband convinces her to work with him on a book project. Her independence, as well as her tough attitude and no-nonsense demeanor, would be replayed and exaggerated in a more extreme form five years later.

In *High Art*, Lucy Berliner (Ally Sheedy) is a jaded, lesbian magazine photojournalist who has abandoned her career in favor of aiding her drug-abusing mate.

"Spooked by fame, Lucy long ago retreated from the art world to live a reclusive, druggy life in an apartment that has become a louche mecca for her lesbian friends," Maslin said of the character in her review of the film.[22] Berliner is indifferent about her career, and shows more interest in pursuing possible sexual partners. When Syd (Radha Mitchell), a magazine photo editor who also lives in her apartment complex, approaches the photojournalist about a possible assignment, Berliner's reaction is less-than confident, disenchanted and carefree.

SYD (reviewing Lucy's work): Who's the photographer?

BERLINER: Oh, I took that.

SYD: It's a great picture.

BERLINER: Thanks.

SYD: The composition is skillful but it seems…it seems almost spontaneous. Like a snapshot.

BERLINER: I think it was a snapshot.

Like Carrie Laughlin in *Kalifornia*, Lucy Berliner is secretly enchanted by the power of the sexually perverse photograph. She begins an affair with Syd, and in the film's most intimate sequence, photographs the young picture editor lying in bed, following intercourse.

BERLINER (to Syd): Can I take pictures of you…right now? You look really sexy right now…

But Berliner's off-putting personality and lack of personal respect leads to her eventual downfall. The other editors at Syd's publication believe the photojournalist to be independent and lackadaisical. Additionally, the character's estranged relationship with both her partner as well as that of her mother, adds to her distress and depression. In

the film's final sequence, Lucy has become withdrawn and commits suicide just as her images of Syd's naked body are published in essay form in the magazine.

A much more driven female photojournalist is presented in *The Weight of Water*. Jean Janes (Catherine McCormack) is a newspaper photojournalist investigating parallel murders that occurred more than a century apart from one another. Like Thomas in *Blowup* or Marish in *Somebody Has to Shoot the Picture*, Janes becomes an amateur sleuth who is determined to find the solution to the case. With her husband, Thomas (Sean Penn), involved in an extramarital affair and their relationship dissolving, Janes is forced to turn to voyeurism for personal pleasure and a means of escape.

While investigating the case aboard her brother's yacht, Janes photographs Thomas and his sibling, Rich (Josh Lucas), swimming and toying with one another. She also quietly observes her husband's flirtatious conversations with his mistress, Adeline (Elizabeth Hurley), and she has visions that recreate past sequences from the previous case.

ADELINE: I guess there's a certain poetry in photography, don't you [Jean] think? Putting a frame around the world. I imagine that's part of the attraction between the two of you.

JANES: You think so, Thomas?

THOMAS: Makes sense.

JANES: I've always felt it was more of an animal attraction myself. Two strays sniffing each other in the navel [laughs].

Eventually, Janes's obsession with solving the grisly double-murder affects the attitudes and behaviors of her travel mates.

JANES: Louis Wagner was hanged three weeks after she wrote this letter. Maybe Marin couldn't live with the guilt and she wanted to confess before an innocent man died?

RICH: Confess? I thought you were snapping a few photographs, not reopening the whole case?

Janes is portrayed as fashionably dressed, chain-smokes and is mostly silent throughout the film. The photojournalist is prompted to speak about her personal life and profession only when questioned by others, and usually in association with that of her husband's.

JEAN (to Adeline): I was more of a visual person myself, I suppose. I didn't read poetry…and then Thomas said the most remarkable thing; he said my work and his are almost the same. We're both trying to stop time.

By the film's end, the photojournalist chooses her occupation and a new life over her marriage, believing a revelation will come of the case through the content of her photographs.

Similar characterizations would be replayed in both *Closer* and *November*. In the former, a famous portraitist has an extramarital affair with a would-be author, an act that wrecks her marriage and causes the character a plethora of insecurity. In the film, Anna (Julia Roberts) is portrayed as a married intellectual, and a vulnerable and adulterous female photojournalist. She is introduced in the film while photographing Dan (Jude Law) for his book project, and during their encounter, chooses to kiss him. When he questions her about her work, she is simultaneously withdrawn and flirtatious, and more importantly, intrigued by his advances.

DAN: Portraits?

ANNA: Uh-huh.

DAN: Of who?

ANNA: Strangers.

DAN: How do your strangers feel about you stealing their lives?

ANNA: Borrowing.

DAN: Am I stranger?

ANNA: No, you're a job. And you're a sloucher. Sit up.

Anna is an American photojournalist living in London who becomes involved with two men who are simultaneously infatuated and attracted to her. She is primarily portrayed as vulnerable and unethical, and presents a certain detachment to both her subjects as well as her lovers. Additionally, Alice (Natalie Portman), Dan's live-in girlfriend, demeans the portraitist's work, despite the fact that Anna has also photographed her upon request.

ALICE (to Larry, Anna's husband): It's a lie. It's a bunch of sad strangers, photographed beautifully, and all the said assholes who appreciate art say it's beautiful because that's what they want to see. But the people in the photos are sad…and alone. But the pictures make the world seem beautiful.

A. O. Scott, in his review of the film, described Anna and her cohorts as, "free-floating representatives of the disconnected contemporary tribe of wandering city-dwellers."[23] Similarly, the character is showcased as an upscale yuppie, whose work resembles that of Richard Avedon.

By the film's conclusion, Anna's self-centeredness but desire for attention and male companionship, leave her jaded and attached to a man she does not love.

LARRY: She [Anna] doesn't want to be happy!

DAN: Everybody wants to be happy!

LARRY: Depressives don't…

Sophie Jacobs (Courtney Cox) in *November* is merely another interpretation of the Anna character in *Closer*. Jacobs is a shy and reclusive photojournalist and college

photography professor, whose documentary work hangs from the walls of her small, dimly lit home.

JACOBS (to students): Remember, you decide what goes in the frame but it's also important what stays out. It's a part of your job as an artist. You have to exclude, as well as include. So just think about that for your next assignment.

She is fueled by guilt after her fiancée is murdered during a convenience store robbery, and also because of the affair she is engaged in with a coworker. Throughout *November*, the character is continually plagued by her troubles. "…She visits a psychiatrist (Nora Dunn), complains of headaches, confesses to being unfaithful to Hugh, and in general seems to be gearing up for some heavy-duty soul-searching," Ebert said of the Jacobs character in his review of the film.[24]

Sophie is not only guilty of adulterous behavior but also lies to her shrink and forms personal relationships with her photographic subjects. Additionally, she becomes a sleuth in the vein of Carrie in *Kalifornia* and more recently, Jean in *The Weight of Water*. Jacobs's investigative tendencies appear after one of her student's showcases a photograph during class critique that may provide evidence in the case of her murdered fiancée.

POLICE OFFICER: So one of your students took this [photograph]?

JACOBS: No, I asked them. I found this one in the carousel.

POLICE OFFICER: Just showed up one day?

JACOBS: Yeah, like somebody wanted me to see it.

POLICE OFFICER: And you think if I tried to find out who took it -

JACOBS: That there could be more slides or maybe a shot of the perpetrator.

The film tells several different variations on the events of November 7, the night her fiancée was mysteriously murdered. And throughout each of these variations on the plot, Jacobs is continually showcased as confused, depressed and most notably, suffering from a crisis of conscience. "Sophie is coping with three kinds of guilt: the guilt over her affair, guilt for feeling responsible for the murder by asking Hugh to stop at the store and the guilt of having survived him," Holden said of Jacobs in his review of the film.[25] In the film's final variation on the narrative, Jacobs is shot and killed alongside her fiancée, an act that insinuates that the photojournalist has accepted her lack of control over the events that haunted her.

Blood Diamond is the most recent film to-date to feature a photojournalist in a leading or supporting role. Set against the backdrop of the illegal diamond trading industry in the war-ravaged country of Sierra Leone, the film was praised by critics for its powerful message and socially conscious subject matter. In the film, a diamond trader and soldier-of-fortune, Danny Archer (Leonardo DiCaprio), teams up with a local, Solomon Vandy (Dijmon Hounsou) - whose family has been taken to a refugee camp - in search of a priceless stone that the latter has buried in the jungle for safekeeping.

Maddy Bowen (Jennifer Connelly) is an American journalist who latches onto the duo in hopes of obtaining a story. Bowen is portrayed as a photo-reporter who spends her spare time drinking at a seaside bar while extracting information from second-rate sources. But the character's fatal flaws, similar to those of other female photojournalists, include developing personal relationships with her subjects as well as romancing the criminal Archer. "[Her] preferred method of interviewing involves shimmying up to her

subjects like a pole dancer," Manohla Dargis said of the character in her review of the film.[26]

For most of the film's running time, Bowen tries to extract information from Archer, while simultaneously, getting to know him on a personal level. Her persistence leads to Archer disclosing his connections with the diamond industry, as well as the illegalities of his profession. But Bowen's sarcastic persona and socially conscious outlook initially turns the rebellious Archer away.

BOWEN: You think I haven't met people like you before?

ARCHER: I think you get off on people like me…why don't we go back to your place, see what's in the mini-bar?
BOWEN: I'm a print journalist; I drank it.

The photojournalist unethically and begrudgingly chooses to aid Vandy at Archer's request in exchange for information on the country's illegal happenings. At the expense of losing her job, Bowen tracks Vandy's displaced relatives to a prison camp, disguises the native as a cameraman, and then flies him to the disclosed location where rebel forces have imprisoned his wife and daughter. During this scene, Bowen is shown compassionately photographing the reunion with her lightweight Leica camera, while Vandy and his family discuss the whereabouts of their displaced son between two sides of a chain-linked fence. This tender moment increases the photojournalist's anxieties, and she soon finds herself belittling Archer for the sake of source material.

BOWEN (to Archer, sarcastically): People back home wouldn't buy a ring if they knew it cost someone else their hand. But I can't write that story until I get facts that can be verified, which is to say, until I find someone who will go on-record.

By the conclusion of *Blood Diamond,* Bowen has left Sierra Leone with enough information to faithfully report on the country's illegal diamond trade. She is forced to

leave Archer in a teary-eyed scene near the finale, but reappears in the film's final sequence and photographs Vandy and a diamond trader from afar with a long, telephoto lens. Undoubtedly, the character, like other female photojournalists in film, remains passionate about her professional obligations, in spite of her occasional reckless behavior and lack of personal and professional ethics.

In sum, the image of the female photojournalist in film plays a decisive role in the journalism-genre films from the mid-1970s to the present. Despite occasional differences in personality and professional responsibilities, these characters are primarily showcased based on their gender, as well as their sensitivities, and need for male companionship. Furthermore, as the number of female photojournalists in newsrooms across the globe increased, more interpretations of these types of characters appeared in motion pictures. For the most part, the on-screen female photojournalist has primarily been characterized as a supporting character whose career aspirations play second to those of her personal interests and endeavors.

[1] Ness, *From Headline Hunter*, 557.

[2] Vincent Canby, Review of *The Public Eye*, *The New York Times*, 14 October 1992.

[3] James Wolcott, "Weegee's Naked Style," *Vanity Fair* (October 1997): 371.

[4] Roger Ebert, Review of *Before the Rain*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 10 March 1995.

[5] Janet Maslin, Review of *The Bridges of Madison County*, *The New York Times*, 2 June 1995.

[6] Newman, "Reel to real," 58.

[7] Roger Ebert, Review of *The Bridges of Madison County*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 2 June 1995.

[8] Janet Maslin, Review of *Pecker*, *The New York Times*, 25 September 1998.

[9] Roger Ebert, Review of *Pecker*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 25 September 1998.

[10] Roger Ebert, Review of *Harrison's Flowers*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 15 March 2002.

[11] Roger Ebert, Review of *We Were Soldiers*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 1 March 2002.

[12] Badsey, "The depiction of war reporters," 257.

[13] A. O. Scott, Review of *Spider-Man*, *The New York Times*, 3 May 2002.

[14] Roger Ebert, Review of *Spider-Man*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 3 May 2002.

[15] Stephen Holden, Review of *City of God*, *The New York Times*, 17 January 2003.

[16] Roger Ebert, Review of *City of God*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 24 January 2003.

[17] Dave Kehr, Review of *Paparazzi*, *The New York Times*, 4 September 2004.

[18] Janet Maslin, Review of *Eyes of Laura Mars*, *The New York Times*, 4 August 1978.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Roger Ebert, Review of *Eyes of Laura Mars*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 1 January 1978.

[21] Roger Ebert, Review of *Violets Are Blue*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 25 April 1986.

[22] Janet Maslin, Review of *High Art*, *The New York Times*, 12 June 1998.

[23] A. O. Scott, Review of *Closer*, *The New York Times*, 3 December 2004.

[24] Roger Ebert, Review of *November*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, 5 August 2005.

[25] Stephen Holden, Review of *November*, *The New York Times*, 22 July 2005.

[26] Manohla Dargis, Review of *Blood Diamond*, *The New York Times*, 8 December 2006.

Chapter 6

Discussion and Conclusions

Findings from Analysis and Discussion

The purpose of this research study was to analyze the ways in which films from the mid-1950s to 2006 have portrayed photojournalists in leading or supporting roles. Because a free press is an integral part of a democratic government and thus, an important component of the historical and political atmosphere of the United States, Hollywood and independent motion pictures have traditionally used a variety of newsmen in both leading and supporting roles. Although many of the films that feature journalists as prominent characters have used reporters and other media personnel in starring roles, a variety of other motion pictures, as well as independent films, have incorporated photographers and photojournalists into their storylines. But the early films from the "journalism genre" - those produced in the 1930s and 1940s - often portray photojournalists as comic-relief players or in supporting roles. Research conducted by both Brennen and Bridger was predominantly concerned with the stereotypes and ethical work habits of the press photographer from the films of the 1930s and 1940s. Both researchers found evidence for stereotyping of these characters through means of textual analysis.

However, this research study analyzed the image of photojournalists in films from the second-half of the 20th Century through the 2000s, primarily because other researchers had neglected to review the characterizations of the on-screen photojournalist from this time period. Two interrelated research questions were proposed for this study. How are fictional photojournalists presented in the films of the latter half of the 20th

Century to the present, and do these depictions create stereotypes of the press photographer? Also, how does the filmmaker present the ethical work habits of these photojournalists, and do ethics play a role in developing the stereotype(s)?

"Photojournalists," as defined by this study, included characterizations of both still and television cameramen who created images for publication. Many of the primary and secondary source texts used in this study also portrayed characters who were fashion, art and news photojournalists, although the outlet for publication was oftentimes loosely defined by the filmmaker. Furthermore, films such as *Blowup* and *Pecker*, in which the publication outlet is never defined, were chosen for this study because of the importance of the character within the context of the film, as well as their critical and historical importance within the realm of film studies. However, the majority of primary and secondary source texts used for this research study portrayed traditional photojournalists – those working for a mainstream or alternative news outlet - into their narratives.

A query of the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database revealed that photojournalists appeared in motion pictures in a variety of genres from the mid-1950s to the present. Films for this study were primarily selected based on the results generated from the query. An analysis of selected films from this time period suggests that stereotypes of on-screen photojournalists from 1954 to 2006 appeared and evolved from one decade to the next.

The analysis from this study found that the image of the photojournalist in film changed in the mid-1950s, with the introduction of the L. B. Jeffries character in *Rear Window*. Stereotyping continued to develop and evolve from the early characterizations of the lonely, detached, Caucasian male photojournalist, the primary stereotype of the on-

screen cameraman through 1979. Variations on the stereotype during this time period also included photojournalists that practiced unethical behaviors and work habits. And many of these characters were also portrayed as part-time sleuths. For example, Sean McAvoy in *Mahogany* is a psychotic, gun-toting cameraman, whose high-profile status allows him easy access to female mates. Additionally, Thomas in *Blowup*, as well as Keith Jennings in *The Omen*, initiated their own personal investigations into murders and cover-ups in these respective films.

By 1979, the image of the photojournalist in film had once again changed, with the Photo Journalist character in *Apocalypse Now* initiating the predominant stereotype of the 1980s. The character in Coppola's film is a crazed, drug-abusing, fast-talking loner, trapped in a Third World country and assigned to cover the Vietnam conflict. Similar characterizations would appear by 1983, with Russell Price in *Under Fire*, as well as Al Rockoff in *The Killing Fields* and Richard Boyle in *Salvador*. The war photojournalists portrayed in a number of films in the 1980s were over-the-top, foul-mouthed womanizers, with a love for substance abusing that matched that of their professional obligation to society.

By the 1990s, and through the mid-2000s, more varied and alternative portraits of photojournalists were replacing the characterizations of the war-torn cameramen of the previous decade. Motion pictures of varied genres, from the cultish John Waters film *Pecker* to the superhero comic book caper *Spider-Man*, included photojournalists into their plotlines. More recent films have continued to showcase these diverse characterizations from both independent and mainstream perspectives, including the portrayal of real-life Associated Press cameraman Joe Rosenthal in *Flags of Our Fathers*,

and the pedophilic fashion photojournalist Jeff Kohlver in *Hard Candy*. Female photojournalists, who did not become mainstream in motion pictures until the mid-1970s, have primarily been stereotyped by their gender, as well as through their sensitivities and mannerisms. Beginning with *Friday Foster*, the characterizations associated with female photojournalists, in parallel with their male counterparts, continue to evolve on-screen.

Through textual analysis of selected films from this time period, this study found that ethical dilemmas helped construct stereotypes. The ethical dilemmas faced by these on-screen cameramen also evolved over time, and changed alongside the professional advances and technological innovations within the field. However, other factors, including gender, dialogue, work habits and ethic, as well as behavioral patterns, also shaped the projected image of these motion picture characters.

Again, Silverman is the foremost researcher to define the basis of the structuralist theoretical framework:

> Structuralism is a model used in anthropology which aims to show how single cases relate to general social forms. Structural anthropologists view behavior as the expression of a 'society,' which works as a 'hidden hand' constraining and forming human action.[1]

The structuralist theoretical framework used in this study is the basis for understanding how stereotypes created and developed in motion pictures evolve over time. As the findings from this study suggest, each film portrays these characters based on their presentation within the context of the film. Furthermore, each character showcased in films, which can act as both independent research texts as well as a cumulative body, represent certain attitudes, values and expressions of a larger society. From a structuralist perspective, multiple cases that produce similar reoccurring patterns have the ability to reflect the thoughts and feelings of a particular group or culture. In the case of this

research study, the filmmakers' opinions and beliefs are directly reflected through the presentation of their characters, and of their on-screen cameramen, in particular. These characterizations, while rarely of importance for research purposes as independent entities, create stereotypes if reshaped and replayed from character to character, and from one motion picture to the next.

Again, this research study expanded to include photojournalists in motion pictures from the mid-1950s to the 21st Century. This study's definition of "photojournalist" included traditional press photographers as well as characters that create images for news outlets outside of the newspaper industry. Primarily, both still and television news photojournalists portrayed in films were analyzed for this study. However, fashion and art photojournalists were also taken into consideration, if their occupational role and responsibilities corroborated with this study's working definition of a "photojournalist." Furthermore, this study analyzed photojournalists portrayed in a variety of smaller, independent films as well, a market that other research studies have primarily neglected to include.

Because the analysis from this study suggests that photojournalists in motion pictures from the latter half of the 20th Century to the mid-2000s have been stereotyped, there is reason to believe that the on-screen cameraman will continue to be stereotyped in the future. Furthermore, the findings from this study also suggest that the characterizations associated with photojournalists in future motion pictures will develop in trends, similar to those that developed from 1954 to 2006. For example, the lonely, detached, Caucasian male, with a voyeuristic drive and penchant for sleuthing, was the predominant stereotype of the on-screen photojournalist from 1954 to 1979. From 1980

to 1989, this image was replaced with that of the war photojournalist as a womanizer and substance abuser, whose lack of ethics results in countless problems for those closest to him. Additional, more diverse and composite characterizations were created and developed in motion pictures from 1990 to 2006. The characterizations of on-screen cameramen, such as the ones presented in films since 1990, are likely to continue and develop in future journalism-genre motion pictures.

While the more recent alternative and composite characterizations showcase the on-screen cameramen differently from those prior to 1990, the overall public image of these characters is still primarily negative. Undoubtedly, as the profession of photojournalism evolved, the ethical dilemmas of the on-screen cameraman changed as well. For example, as more female photojournalists entered the profession, their on-screen counterparts were faced with ethical dilemmas that were focused on gender, as well as their role within a male-dominated workplace. Hints of ethical dilemmas such as these can be seen through Jean Janes in *The Weight of Water* as well as Maddy Bowen in *Blood Diamond*, in which female photojournalists use their femininity to for largely personal and corrupt motives. In contrast, the ethical dilemmas faced by male photojournalists in films from 1990 to 2006 were primarily targeted toward the overall change in their professional duties. While the lines between art photography, photojournalism and fashion portraiture continued to blur, on-screen cameramen were faced with challenging situations that primarily dealt with the ever-changing nature of the profession. The ethical challenges faced by the title character in *Pecker* – a character largely showcased as an art photographer – are situations that evolved from his occupational dilemma as both artist and photojournalist. Similarly, the tabloid

photographers in *Paparazzi* are torn between the responsibilities of their largely unethical profession, which includes creating and distributing images for celebrity magazines by using irresponsible and dangerous techniques, and documenting the public and private lives of their subjects. In sum, although a dominant stereotyping pattern of the photojournalist in film has not been presented since the 1980s, the varied portrayals of these characters, paralleling earlier characterizations, are continually presented as negative.

The presentation of on-screen photojournalists in this fashion is likely to shape the public's perceptions of the behavioral and ethical practices of real-life cameramen as well. Prior research, along with the findings from this study, suggests that stereotypes of the photojournalist in film have largely been negative, fictional characterizations. Although other factors such as gender and behavioral patterns aid in developing the image of these characters, the majority of the negative stereotypes are created because of these photojournalists' lack of personal and professional ethics. In *Rear Window*, Hitchcock showcases Jeffries as a peeping Tom and voyeur, and Antonioni portrays Thomas in *Blowup* as a sexually aggressive male, who abuses his professional power as well as his subjects. Additionally, Boyle's vulgarity and substance abuse leads to his eventual demise in *Salvador* and Lucy Berliner's attraction to and ensuing relationship with her editor causes the character to commit suicide in *High Art*. Negative characterizations of the on-screen cameraman, such as those showcased in films from *Rear Window* to *High Art* and into the 21st Century, developed as Hollywood and independent filmmakers continued to portray photojournalists in a greater number of motion pictures. In sum, few films have showcased the photojournalist as a positive,

contributing force of the working press. Even those motion pictures that showcase ethical photojournalists, most notably *Funny Face* (1957) – a film in which Fred Astaire plays a Richard Avedon-ish fashion photojournalist – and *Live a Little, Love a Little,* generally use the characters' profession as a type of plot device or the character is portrayed in a minor or supporting role. The findings from this study suggest that on-screen cameramen have been primarily showcased as negative in films from 1954 to 2006, despite their occasional ethical stances or crises of conscience.

Research from a variety of fields suggests that the popularity of motion pictures has lead to occupational stereotyping in other fields as well. More importantly, analysis from this study suggests that the continual negative perception of the photojournalist in film could be hazardous for both the occupation, as well as those working in the industry. The continual presentation of heavily flawed or unethical on-screen photojournalists could also lead to the public's creation of a skewed image of real-life photojournalists. Furthermore, these misconceptions could also shape the public's mistrust of the media, as well as its belief in the role of a free press in the United States.

The findings from this study are not only important because of the harms that develop through stereotyping professions, but also because of the afore-mentioned larger impact upon the viewing audience. The public's perceptions of real-life photojournalists must be taken into consideration, primarily because photojournalism is a profession in which its practitioners encounter and interact with the general public on a daily basis. Unlike other occupants that work under more confined settings, photojournalists are continually present at news events that are also attended by larger, more diverse audiences. Furthermore, the general public is affected by motion pictures and many of

their perceptions about real-life people and events are shaped by film. Thus, the negative portrayals of photojournalists in film can aid in forming the public's opinions and beliefs about real-life cameramen, whose professional duties, in turn, call for their presence at a variety of public events.

If the image of the on-screen photojournalist continues to be tarnished by filmmakers working in both mainstream Hollywood and independent outlets, and the public's perception of real-life photojournalists is shaped by the leaders of cinema, then real-life cameramen must choose to act ethically and professionally in order to reverse this public trend. Through their occupational work habits and ethics, photojournalists employed by both still and television media organizations will decide how their image, both personal and professional, will be viewed in the minds of the general public. While the analysis from this research study suggests that filmmakers will continue to characterize photojournalists in both leading and supporting roles, as well as portray these characters negatively, real-life photojournalists can alter the public's perceptions. This phenomenon may eventually eradicate negative portrayals of on-screen cameramen in film.

Limitations of the Textual Analysis Method for this Study

Although a number of limitations to the textual analysis method for this type of research study exists, other studies on the image of the journalist in film, such as those by Good, Badsey and Ehrlich, have used the approach to obtain a plethora of thorough, qualitative information. As previously stated, Silverman has observed that textual analysis works well in qualitative research studies that are primarily concerned with organizing and categorizing large amounts of information. Additionally, the author says

that studies performed under the method of textual analysis should not conclude with statements of fact; rather, they should look for bits and pieces of information inlaid within the texts. Doing so allows researchers to make generalizations about a group, culture or society.[2]

Undoubtedly, the primary benefit for performing a textual analysis on motion pictures is the vast amount of information that can be obtained, categorized and analyzed for making generalizations about a specific group, or in this case, a type of on-screen character. But the method has its limitations as well. For one, the titles of primary and secondary source texts for this study were generated through a database query, and therefore, the sample observed for this study was not chosen at random. Use of a more random body of texts for this study may have resulted in altogether different patterns of stereotyping, including those undetected by this research study. Therefore, the characterizations and patterns of stereotyping found in this study cannot be applied to all motion pictures that feature photojournalists in leading or supporting roles.

Because each primary and secondary source film used in this study required an individual and in-depth textual analysis in order to generate more detailed, useful information, a large number of motion pictures were omitted prior to the analysis. For example, a query of the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database for motion pictures from 1970 to 1979, that also included the words “photo” and “camera” in the Comments-Occupation field, generated 110 results. However, only seven films from the decade were actually used as either primary or secondary source texts, due in part to the time-intensive nature of the method of textual analysis.

Furthermore, each primary or secondary source text that was analyzed also generated a vast amount of information. But only those films in which photojournalists were found to play prominent roles or made a significant contribution to the storyline were considered for this study. Therefore, a number of texts that may have been useful for this research study were omitted, while the value of the photojournalists in these films may have significantly changed the findings from this study. In sum, certain films that may have contained a photojournalist in the storyline were not used for this study, and were oftentimes replaced with other films that were either easier to access, and thus more mainstream, or more readily available for analysis.

Certain films initially chosen for this study that were omitted after an initial screening, or deemed of lesser importance, were done so based on the inherent value of their photojournalists within the context of the storyline. For example, the occupational role of the Greg Nolan character in the semi-musical *Live a Little, Love a Little*, a film analyzed for this study, had little to do with the plot and the development of the character's persona. *Smoke*, a character study focused on the happenings at a Brooklyn cigar shop, was initially chosen for this study because of the lead character's obsession with the power of photography. However, a screening of the film revealed that this character's profession did not coincide with this study's definition of a "photojournalist," and therefore, the film was omitted from the list of primary and secondary source texts. Other films initially selected for this study, which were believed to contain portrayals of photojournalists, contained additional factors that led to their omission from the analysis. *The Young Girl and the Monsoon*, for example, was released in only limited formats and

thus, was difficult to obtain. Similarly, *Fur: An Imaginary Portrait of Diane Arbus* (2006) was released one month after the deadline for this research study.

Other limitations of the textual analysis method for this study existed as well. Certain limitations were created because a number of motion pictures analyzed were independent features and not mainstream, Hollywood vehicles. Thus, some films generated by the database query, as well as a number of those chosen independently for this study, may not have had as great an impact on audiences as others, because of the limited release and difficulty in obtaining these motion pictures. For example, *Peeping Tom* became a cult classic years after its initial theatrical release, but critics and motion picture aficionados are those most likely to have viewed the film. On the other hand, *The Bridges of Madison County*, a critically acclaimed blockbuster and Academy Award nominee, was a mainstream success that generated substantial box-office revenue. Therefore, audiences most likely to review a portion of the films selected for this study may not have screened a number of others. The existing gap in time periods, as well as genre differences, for many of the primary and secondary source texts used for this study, is a limitation of the method of textual analysis on motion pictures.

As a method for research studies, textual analysis is useful when a large amount of detailed information is needed from one or more texts. However, a sample of research texts must first be generated, either randomly or through query, and certain texts must be omitted in order for the analysis to begin. Undoubtedly, these factors have the ability to skew the results or conclusions of a study employing textual analysis. Additionally, this method relies on research techniques incorporating personal interaction and one-on-one compatibility with the texts. Therefore, the proper use of textual analysis in research

studies requires knowledge about the language of the texts, as well as their historical development and context within a selected time frame.

Future Research on the Image of the Photojournalist in Film

Prior research has primarily focused on the image of journalists in film, and most notably, these studies have focused on the ethical and behavioral stereotypes of on-screen reporters from the first decades of the 20th Century. Other, more recent research has reviewed the image of the photojournalist in motion pictures. While many of these studies, including those by Brennen and Bridger, were concerned with the stereotypes associated with photojournalists in motion pictures prior to the 1950s, little research has been conducted on the more recent interpretations of the photojournalist in film. The goal of this study was to examine the ways in which on-screen cameramen were stereotyped through their ethical work habits. While the findings from this study suggest that photojournalists in motion pictures from the latter half of the 20th Century to 2006 were characterized by their ethical nature, the majority of stereotypes developed from the gender, dialogue, behavioral patterns and interactions of these characters as well.

Undoubtedly, textual analysis has been the most prominent method for analyzing the image of the journalist and photojournalist in motion pictures. However, future research has the possibility to examine the stereotyping patterns of these characters through other, non-traditional means, many of which could also incorporate textual analysis into the framework. For example, an analysis of a more random selection of films featuring photojournalists in leading or supporting roles may generate different results. Furthermore, a comparison of the increasing number of motion pictures incorporating female photojournalists could be compared to a selection of films featuring

their male counterparts from a predetermined time period. An analysis of the characterizations of male and female photojournalists could be compared and contrasted in this research as well. Finally, a more thorough examination of the technological advances and role-related responsibilities of the photojournalist in films from the mid-1950s to the present should be examined in order to chart the evolving image of these characters within the context of their workplace, and their occupational duties while working in the field.

As previously mentioned, a number of limitations exist for the method of textual analysis. While the method is an effective tool that allows for generalizations to be made on the topic under observation, many inconsistencies are apparent in the process. Most importantly, textual analysis is inherently a time-consuming method that requires a selection of sample of texts for inquiry, and simultaneously active participation in the research process.

Due to the limitations of this method, other means for examining the image of the photojournalist in film should be explored in future research studies. A variety of possibilities, both qualitative and quantitative in nature, have yet to be approached with regards to this topic. For one, researchers should examine how stereotyping these characters in motion pictures affects audiences. Future research studies could explore audience effects through focus groups and other qualitative outlets, in which viewers share their personal thoughts and feelings on the image of photojournalists portrayed in a selection of films. These types of studies have the potential to take place the focus on the viewer, which, in turn, allows a larger group of respondents to actively participate in the process. Additionally, these types of studies influence more diverse thoughts and rich,

detailed information, which could result in alternative and varied interpretations of the characterizations associated with on-screen photojournalists.

Elliott and Lester are the only researchers to-date who have reviewed the impact these stereotypes have had upon real-life photojournalists. Their research, which dealt with the ethical lessons learned by photojournalists who viewed selected journalism-genre films, found that many real-life cameramen questioned related to the thoughts, actions and feelings of their motion picture counterparts.[3] But a more intensive research study, with a predetermined focus group of real-life photojournalists viewing more recent films that also contain a more diverse selection of photojournalists, is needed in order to more thoroughly examine this topic. The thoughts and opinions of current professionals could shift the trend of negative characterizations of their on-screen counterparts toward a more realistic image.

Along with other qualitative possibilities, quantitative research studies on the image of the photojournalist in film have yet to be fully explored. For instance, survey-oriented research studies, like those involving focus groups, allow participants to convey their thoughts and feelings through a set of predetermined questions focused on a particular topic. This type of study lends itself to the development of certain trends or patterns, which could also lead to the discovery of additional stereotypes of the on-screen cameraman. Furthermore, content analysis-oriented studies depict repetitions in phrase or language usage. Because a number of films feature photojournalists in leading roles that call for dialogue-heavy moments or sequences, studies could also examine how characterizations of on-screen photojournalists are developed through lingual patterns or repetition of words and grammatical phrases.

Reviewing the image of the photojournalist in film through textual analysis can be difficult because of the assumptions that must be made in order to reach certain conclusions. For instance, the filmmakers' intentions are oftentimes neglected during the research process, but in fact, they are of utmost importance when examining the behavior or personality traits of a certain character or group of characters in a given film. While it is difficult to dissect the minds of motion picture directors, and others who aid in the creation and development of a film, or to know their intentions without making false assumptions, the influence of filmmakers, writers, producers and studio executives are undoubtedly consequential when researching these portrayals. Do filmmakers and other motion picture personnel construct these characters from fictional perspectives or are their characterizations primarily based on prior personal experience? What additional factors influenced their judgments during the creative process? To what degree did those involved with the creative process utilize their creativity and force when developing their on-screen photojournalists? And were these motion picture personnel merely perpetuating an already existing stereotype?

Future research studies on the image of the photojournalist in film have an obligation to examine each of these questions and others, while keeping in mind the filmmaker's perspective, as well as the filters that influenced the finished product. Undoubtedly, the artistic integrity and vision of motion picture directors serves as one of the decisive instigators in the creation and development of cinematic stereotypes. Although other influences, including writers, studio executives and even actors, are personally and professionally involved with the construction of these characters, the motion picture director acts as an overseer to the entire project, shaping and molding the

narrative through the behavior, mannerisms and dialogue of his or her characters. Therefore, future studies employing advanced and alternative research techniques on the image of the photojournalist in motion pictures must explore these characterizations while simultaneously, giving equal consideration to the creative process that led to these cinematic portrayals.

[1] Silverman, *Doing Qualitative Research*, 380.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Elliott and Lester, "Media Ethics Goes to the Movies," 1-6.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abascal, Paul. *Paparazzi*. Produced by Bruce Davey, Mel Gibson, Kevin Lake, Stephen McEveety and Louise Rosner. 84 min. Icon Productions, 2004. DVD.

Antonioni, Michelangelo. *Blowup*. Produced by Carlo Ponti. 111 min. Premier Pictures, 1966. DVD.

Bridges, James. *The China Syndrome*. Produced by Michael Douglas. 122 min. Columbia Pictures, 1979. DVD.

Canby, Vincent. (1969, August 28). Review of *Medium Cool*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Canby, Vincent. (1978, April 5). Review of *Pretty Baby*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Canby, Vincent. (1979, August 15). Review of *Apocalypse Now*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Canby, Vincent. (1983, January 21). Review of *The Year of Living Dangerously*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Canby, Vincent. (1984, November 2). Review of *The Killing Fields*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Canby, Vincent. (1992, October 14). Review of *The Public Eye*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2007 from http://movies.nytimes.com

Cholodenko, Lisa. *High Art*. Produced by Dolly Hall, Jeff Levy-Hinte and Susan A. Stover. 96 min. October Films, 1998. DVD.

Chouraqui, Elie. *Harrison's Flowers*. Produced by Elie Chouraqui. 130 min. Universal Focus, 2000. DVD.

Coppola, Francis Ford. *Apocalypse Now*. Produced by Francis Ford Coppola. 146 min. United Artists, 1979. DVD.

Costa-Gavras. *Z*. Produced by Jacques Perrin and Hamed Rachidi. 127 min. Cinema V, 1969. DVD.

Dargis, Manohla. (2006, December 8). Review of *Blood Diamond*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 4, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Eastwood, Clint. *The Bridges of Madison County*. Produced by Clint Eastwood and Kathleen Kennedy. 135 min. Warner Bros., 1995. DVD.

Ebert, Roger. (1975, January 1). Review of *Mahogany*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1978, January 1). Review of *Eyes of Laura Mars*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1978, June 1). Review of *Pretty Baby*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1983, October 21). Review of *Under Fire*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1984, January 1). Review of *The Killing Fields*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1986, April 25). Review of *Salvador*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1986, April 25). Review of *Violets Are Blue*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1995, March 10). Review of *Before the Rain*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1995, June 2). Review of *The Bridges of Madison County*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2007, from http://rogereberrt.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1998, November 8). Review of *Blowup*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (1999, May 2). Review of *Peeping Tom*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (2000, February 20). Review of *Rear Window*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (2002, March 1). Review of *We Were Soldiers*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (2002, March 15). Review of *Harrison's Flowers*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (2003, January 24). Review of *City of God*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Ebert, Roger. (2005, August 5). Review of *November*. *Chicago Sun-Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://rogerebert.suntimes.com

Franklin, Howard. *The Public Eye*. Produced by Sue Baden – Powell. 99 min. Universal Pictures, 1992. DVD.

Goodman, Walter. (1986, March 5). Review of *Salvador*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Hitchcock, Alfred. *Rear Window*. Produced by James C. Katz. 112 min. Paramount Pictures, 1954. DVD.

Holden, Stephen. (2003, January 17). Review of *City of God*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Holden, Stephen. (2005, July 22). Review of *November*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Howard, Bosley. (1966, December 19). Review of *Blowup*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Joffé, Roland. *The Killing Fields*. Produced by David Puttnam. 139 min. Warner Bros., 1984. DVD.

Kehr, Dave. (2004, September 4). Review of *Paparazzi*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved on March 15, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Kershner, Irvin. *Eyes of Laura Mars*. Produced by Jack H. Harris and Jon Peters. 104 min. Columbia Pictures, 1978. DVD.

Lund, Kátia and Meirelles, Fernando. *City of God*. Produced by Andrea Barata Ribeiro and Maurício Andrade Ramos. Miramax Films, 2003. DVD.

Malle, Louis. *Pretty Baby*. Produced by Louis Malle. 109 minutes. Paramount Pictures, 1978. DVD.

Maslin, Janet. (1978, August 4). Review of *Eyes of Laura Mars*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Maslin, Janet. (1995, June 2). Review of *The Bridges of Madison County*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Maslin, Janet. (1998, June 12). Review of *High Art*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 24, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Manchevski, Milcho. *Before the Rain*. Produced by Judy Counihan. 116 min. Gramercy Pictures, 1994. DVD.

Pierson, Frank. *Somebody Has to Shoot the Picture*. Produced by Alan Barnette. 104 min. HBO Pictures, 1990. DVD.

Scott, A. O. (2004, December 3). Review of *Closer*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://movies.nytimes.com

Slade, David. *Hard Candy*. Produced by Richard Hutton, Michael Caldwell and David W. Higgins. 99 min. Lionsgate, 2004. DVD.

Spottiswoode, Roger. *Under Fire*. Produced by Jonathan Taplin. 108 min. Orion Pictures, 1983. DVD.

Stone, Oliver. *Salvador*. Produced by Gerald Green and Oliver Stone. 122 min. Hemdale Film Corp., 1986. DVD.

Wallace, Randall. *We Were Soldiers*. Produced by Bruce Davey, Stephen McEveety and Randall Wallace. 138 min. Paramount Pictures, 2002. DVD.

Waters, John. *Pecker*. Produced by John Fiedler and Mark Tarlov. 87 min. Fine Line Features, 1998. DVD.

Weir, Peter. *The Year of Living Dangerously*. Produced by James McElroy. 114 min. MGM UA/Entertainment Co., 1983. DVD.

Wexler, Haskell. *Medium Cool*. Produced by Tully Friedman and Haskell Wexler. 110 min. Paramount Pictures, 1969. DVD.

Secondary Sources

Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. *Academy Awards Database*, 2005. Database on-line. Available from http://www.oscars.org/awardsdatabase/index.html.

Badsey, Stephen. (2002). The depiction of war reporters in Hollywood feature films from the Vietnam War to the present. *Film History*, 14. 243-260.

Brennen, Bonnie. (2004). From headline shooter to picture snatcher. *Journalism*, 5(4), 423-439.

Brennen, Bonnie and Hardt, Hanno, eds. *Picturing the Past: Media, History and Photography*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999.

Bridger, Earle. (1997). From the ridiculous to the sublime; stereotypes of photojournalists in the movies. *Visual Communications Quarterly*. 4(1) 4-11.

Bromley, D. B. *Reputation, Image and Impression Management*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, 1993.

Dillon, Michael J. and Good, Howard. *Media Ethics Goes to the Movies*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002.

Dooley, Patricia L. *Taking Their Political Place: Journalists and the Making of an Occupation*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 1997.

Ehrlich, Matthew C. *Journalism in the Movies*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Elliott, Deni and Lester, Paul Martin. "Media Ethics Goes to the Movies: What Photojournalism Films Can Teach Us About Our Profession," *News Photographer* (February 2001): 1-6.

Fulton, Marianne. *Eyes of Time: Photojournalism in America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1988.

Good, Howard. *Outcasts: The Image of Journalists in Contemporary Film*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1989.

Good, Howard. *The Drunken Journalist*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, Inc, 2000.

Hanson, Christopher. (1996). Where Have All the Heroes Gone? *Columbia Journalism Review*, (March/April), 45-48.

Hicks, Wilson. *Words and Pictures*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Jay, Bill. "The Photographer as Aggressor." In *Observations*: *Essays on Documentary Photography,* ed. David Featherstone, 7-23. The Friends of Photography,1984.

Jensen, Klaus B. and Jankowski, Nicholas W. *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Kobre, Kenneth. *Photojournalism: The Professionals' Approach*. Boston: Focal, 1996.

Kovach, Bill and Rosenstiel, Tom. *The Elements of Journalism.* New York: Crown, 2001.

Lester, Paul Martin, ed. *Images That Injure: Pictorial Stereotypes in the Media, Ethical and Moral Responsibilities of the Media,* by Deni Elliott. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1996.

Lester, Paul. *Photojournalism: An Ethical Approach*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1991.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion.* New York: Free Press, 1922.

Maltin, Leonard. *Leonard Maltin's 2007 Movie Guide*. New York: Plume, 2006.

McKee, Alan. *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide*. London: Sage Publications, 2003.

McQuail, Denis. *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.

Ness, Richard R. *From Headline Hunter to Superman: A Journalism Filmography*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997.

Newman, Cathy, "Reel to real," *National Geographic*, August 1995.

"NPPA Code of Ethics," *National Press Photographers Association*, 2006; available from http://www.nppa.org/professional_development/business_practices/ethics.html; Internet; accessed 12 September 2006.

Saltzman, Joe. "Analyzing the Images of the Journalist in Popular Culture: A Unique Method of Studying the Public's Perception of Its Journalists and the News Media." In *Association for Education in Journalism & Communication*. San Antonio, Texas, 2005.

Saltzman, Joe. *Frank Capra and the Image of the Journalist in American Film.* Annenberg: The Norman Lear Center, 2002.

Silverman, David. *Doing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005.

Sontag, Susan. *On Photography*. New York: Picador, 1977.

Steinle, Paul. *Print (and Video) to Screen: Journalism in Motion Pictures of the 1990s*. Paper presented at the at the Popular Culture/American Culture Conference, New Orleans, La., 22 April 2000, available from <http://www.ijpc.org/>.

The Norman Lear Center. *The Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture (IJPC)Database*, 2005. By Joe Saltzman. 4 October 2006.

Turner, Graeme. *Film as Social Practice*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Wolcott, James. "Weegee's Naked Style." *Vanity Fair*, October 1997.

Zynda, Thomas. (1979). The Hollywood version: movie portrayals of the press. *Journalism History*, 2, 17-25, 32.

Appendix A

Sample Query from the Image of the Journalist in Popular Culture Database for films from 1965 to 1979

```
SELECT *
FROM [Journalists Movie-TV 1997]
WHERE ((([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1965"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1966"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1967"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1968"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1969"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1970"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1971"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1972"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1973"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1974"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1975"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1976"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1977"
Or
([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like  "1978"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR) Like "1979"
AND
 (([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].TYPE) Like "M"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].TYPE) Like "MF")
AND
(([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].[COMMENTS - OCCUPATION])
Like "Photo*"
Or
 ([Journalists Movie-TV 1997].[COMMENTS - OCCUPATION])
Like "CAMERA*"))
ORDER BY
 [Journalists Movie-TV 1997].YEAR;
```

Appendix B

Primary Source Films

Sources for Plot Summaries include The New York Times website and the Internet Movie Database Inc.

***Rear Window* (1954)**
Director: Alfred Hitchcock
Story: Cornell Woolrich (short story), John Michael Hayes
Cast: James Stewart, Grace Kelly, Thelma Ritter, Raymond Burr
Country: USA
Running Time: 112 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 4 Academy Award Nominations – Best Cinematography, Color (Robert Burks), Best Director (Hitchcock), Best Sound, Recording (Loren L. Ryder), Best Writing, Screenplay (Hayes)
Plot Summary: *A wheelchair-ridden magazine photojournalist becomes obsessed with spying on those living inside and near his New York apartment complex. He soon realizes that he may have witnessed a murder and begins conducting a personal investigation.*

***Blowup* (1966)**
Director: Michelangelo Antonioni
Story: Julio Cortazar (short story), Michelangelo Antonioni
Cast: Vanessa Redgrave, Sara Miles, David Hemmings
Country: United Kingdom and Italy
Running Time: 111 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 2 Academy Award Nominations - Best Director (Antonioni), Best Writing, Story and Screenplay (Antonioni, Tonino Guerra, Edward Bond)
Plot Summary: *A sexually promiscuous fashion photographer in "Swinging London" photographs an unknowing couple interacting in a park. After developing his film, the photographer realizes that he may have witnessed a murder and thus pursues the possible suspect.*

***Medium Cool* (1969)**
Director: Haskell Wexler
Story: Haskell Wexler
Cast: Robert Forster, Verna Bloom, Peter Bonerz, Marianna Hill
Country: USA
Running Time: 110 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Directors Guild of America (USA) Nomination – Outstanding Directorial Achievement in Motion Pictures (Wexler); 1 Mannheim-Heidelberg International Filmfestival Win – Grand Prize (Wexler)
Plot Summary: *A television cameraman, consumed with photographing gory events while remaining detached from those events himself, begins dwelling on society's obsession with violence after he films the riots at the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention.*

***Z* (1969)**
Director: Costa-Gavras
Story: Vassilis Vassilikos and Jorge Semprun
Cast: Yves Montand, Irene Papas, Jean-Louis Trintignant, Jacques Perrin
Country: Algeria and France
Running Time: 127 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 5 Academy Award Nominations and 2 Wins – Best Film Editing (Francoise Bennot), Best Foreign Language Film, Best Director (Costa-Gavras), Best Picture, Best Writing, Screenplay Based on Material from Another Medium (Semprum, Costa-Gavras)
Plot Summary: *In the early 1960s, a Grecian reformist is murdered in France and a plot unravels to cover-up the event. A young photojournalist, among others, hunts down the guilty parties, despite opposition from high-powered diplomats.*

***Pretty Baby* (1978)**
Director: Louis Malle
Story: Polly Platt
Cast: Brooke Shields, Susan Sarandon, Keith Carradine, Frances Faye
Country: USA
Running Time: 109 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Academy Award Nomination, 2 Cannes Film Festival Nominations and 1 Win - Best Music, Original Song Score and Its Adaptation or Best Adaptation Score (Jerry Wexler), Technical Grand Prize (Louis Malle), Golden Palm (Malle)
Plot Summary: *A young girl, living in New Orleans' Storyville district circa 1917, is raised in a brothel and becomes enchanted with a local photographer who is, simultaneously, infatuated with the brothel and its inhabitants.*

***Eyes of Laura Mars* (1978)**
Director: Irvin Kershner
Story: John Carpenter and David Zelag Goodman
Cast: Faye Dunaway, Tommy Lee Jones, Brad Dourif, Rene Auberjonois, Raul Julia
Country: USA
Running Time: 104 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 2 Academy of Science Fiction, Fantasy & Horror Films Nominations and 1 Win – Best Costumes (Theoni V. Aldredge), Best Make-Up (Lee Harman, Vincent Callaghan, Lynn Donahue)
Plot Summary: *A New York fashion photographer begins foreseeing the gruesome murders of many of her friends and cohorts. A detective who believes the photographer's story aids in hunting down the perpetrator.*

***Apocalypse Now* (1979)**
Director: Francis Ford Coppola
Story: Joseph Conrad (novel), John Milius, Francis Ford Coppola
Cast: Marlon Brando, Martin Sheen, Robert Duvall, Dennis Hopper
Country: USA
Running Time: 153 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 8 Academy Award Nominations and 2 Wins: Best Cinematography (Vittorio Storaro), Best Sound (Walter Murch, Mark Berger, Richard Beggs, Nathan Boxer), Best Supporting Actor (Duvall), Best Art Direction (Dean Tavoularis, Angelo P. Graham, George R. Nelson), Best Director (Coppola), Best Film Editing (Richard Marks, Walter Murch, Gerald B. Greenberg, Lisa Fruchtman), Best Picture, Best Writing, Screenplay Based on Material from Another Medium (Milius, Coppola)
Plot Summary: *Loosely based on Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness," a young army captain sets out on a search for a colonel who mysteriously disappears from his post during the Vietnam War. The captain runs into a variety of characters during his lengthy journey through the Cambodian jungles, including a wild-eyed photojournalist who believes in the colonel's self-created utopia.*

***The China Syndrome* (1979)**
Director: James Bridges
Story: Mike Gray, T. S. Cook and James Bridges
Cast: Jane Fonda, Michael Douglas, Jack Lemmon
Country: USA
Running Time: 122 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 4 Academy Award Nominations – Best Supporting Actor (Lemmon), Best Actress (Fonda), Best Art Direction (George Jenkins, Arthur Jeph Parker), Best Writing, Screenplay Written Directly for the Screen (Gray, Cook, Bridges)
Plot Summary: *A television reporter and her radical cameraman witness a near-nuclear fallout at a local power plant while reporting a story on energy. The reporter and photographer try fruitlessly to get their piece published despite the reservations of the station heads, while a plant engineer investigates the reasons behind the accident.*

***The Year of Living Dangerously* (1983)**
Director: Peter Weir
Story: C. J. Koch, Peter Weir, David Williamson
Cast: Mel Gibson, Sigourney Weaver, Linda Hunt
Country: USA
Running Time: 117 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Academy Award Nomination and 1 Win – Best Supporting Actress (Hunt)
Plot Summary: *In Indonesia in 1965, an Australian reporter is aided by a local photojournalist while covering the coup against the nation's president, while simultaneously pursuing a romance with a British attaché.*

***Under Fire* (1983)**
Director: Roger Spottiswoode
Story: Clayton Frohman, Ron Shelton
Cast: Nick Nolte, Ed Harris, Gene Hackman, Joanna Cassidy
Country: USA
Running Time: 128 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Academy Award Nomination and 2 Golden Globe Nominations – Best Music, Original Score (Jerry Goldsmith), Best Original Score, Motion Picture (Goldsmith), Best Performance by an Actor in a Supporting Role in a Motion Picture (Hackman)
Plot Summary: *A roving international photojournalist teams up with a radio reporter during the Nicaraguan conflict of the early 1980s. After the two become familiar with the nature of the Central American war, they begin to interject themselves into various events, leading to the photojournalist's internal crisis of conscience.*

***The Killing Fields* (1984)**
Director: Roland Joffé
Story: Bruce Robinson
Cast: Sam Waterston, Haing S. Ngor, John Malkovich
Country: USA
Running Time: 141 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 7 Academy Award Nominations and 3 Wins – Best Supporting Actor (Ngor), Best Cinematography (Chris Menges), Best Film Editing (Jim Clark), Best Actor (Waterston), Best Director (Joffé), Best Picture, Best Writing, Screenplay Based on Material from Another Medium (Robinson)
Plot Summary: *A New York Times reporter, a photojournalist and a Cambodian informant become involved in the daily turmoil of Southeast Asia while covering the final days of the Vietnam War in 1975. The reporter and the informant develop a close relationship while the photographer becomes emotionally attached to both the country and the story itself.*

***Salvador* (1986)**
Director: Oliver Stone
Story: Oliver Stone and Rick Boyle
Cast: James Woods, James Belushi, Michael Murphy, John Savage
Country: USA
Running Time: 123 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 2 Academy Award Nominations – Best Actor (Woods), Best Writing, Screenplay Written Directly for the Screen (Stone, Boyle)
Plot Summary: *A veteran war photojournalist, with a penchant for abusing alcohol and drugs, travels to El Salvador with an out-of-work disc jockey in hopes of obtaining freelance work in the early 1980s. After realizing the seriousness of the conflict in the Latin American country, the photojournalist dreams of escaping the area but refuses to do so until his native lover is out of harm's way.*

***Somebody Has to Shoot the Picture* (1990)**
Director: Frank Pierson
Story: Doug Magee
Cast: Roy Scheider, Bonnie Bedelia, Andre Braugher, Arliss Howard
Country: USA
Running Time: 104 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *A man on death row requests that a famous magazine photographer photograph his execution. When the photographer uncovers evidence that suggests the man might be innocent, he sets out on a one-man investigation for the truth.*

***The Public Eye* (1992)**
Director: Howard Franklin
Story: Howard Franklin
Cast: Joe Pesci, Barbara Hershey
Country: USA
Running Time: 99 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *A 1940s, Weegee-like tabloid photographer helps out a Manhattan nightclub owner, which leads to his becoming involved with a murder. The photographer begins his own investigation in hopes of clearing his name and avoiding the FBI.*

***Before the Rain* (1994)**
Director: Milcho Manchevski
Story: Milcho Manchevski
Cast: Katrin Cartlidge, Rade Aleksandr, Grégoire Colin, Labina Mitevska
Country: USA
Running Time: 113 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Academy Award Nomination and 1 Independent Spirit Award Nomination and Win – Best Foreign Language Film, Best Foreign Film (Manchevsky)
Plot Summary: *In this three-part story set in Macedonia and London, a disillusioned war photographer has an affair with a married woman, finding little comfort in what remains of his war-torn homeland.*

***The Bridges of Madison County* (1995)**
Director: Clint Eastwood
Story: Robert James Waller and Richard LaGravenese
Cast: Clint Eastwood, Meryl Streep
Country: USA
Running Time: 135 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 1 Academy Award Nomination, 1 Screen Actors Guild Nomination and 2 Golden Globe Nominations – Best Actress (Streep), Outstanding Performance by a Female Actor in a Leading Role (Streep), Best Motion Picture [Drama], Best Performance by an Actress in a Motion Picture [Drama] (Streep)
Plot Summary: *In 1965, an aging National Geographic photographer, assigned to shoot a series of covered bridges in rural Iowa, involves himself in a four-day romantic affair with a farmer's wife, which leads them both into new personal territory. Based on the novella of the same title.*

***Pecker* (1998)**
Director: John Waters
Story: John Waters
Cast: Edward Furlong, Christina Ricci, Bess Armstrong, Lili Taylor
Country: USA
Running Time: 87 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *An annoying teenage street photographer becomes an overnight sensation after a noted New York agent discovers his talent and offers him a ticket to stardom.*

***High Art* (1998)**
Director: Lisa Cholodenko
Story: Lisa Cholodenko
Cast: Radha Mitchell, Gabriel Mann, Patricia Clarkson, Ally Sheedy
Country: Canada and USA
Running Time: 101 minutes
Nominations and Awards: 5 Independent Spirit Award Nominations and 1 Win and 2 Sundance Film Festival Nominations and 1 Win – Best Female Lead (Sheedy), Best Cinematography (Tami Reiker), Best First Feature (Cholodenko, Dolly Hall, Jeffrey Levy-Hinte, Susan A. Stover), Best First Screenplay (Cholodenko), Best Supporting Female (Patricia Clarkson), Waldo Salt Screenwriting Award (Cholodenko), Grand Jury Prize [Dramatic] (Cholodenko)
Plot Summary: *A female magazine photography editor becomes involved with a retired female photographer who lives with a heroin-addicted actress. As their relationship progresses, the two women's lives begin to change.*

***Harrison's Flowers* (2000)**
Director: Elie Chouraqui
Story: Isabel Ellsen (book), Elie Chouraqui, Didier Le Pecheur, Isabel Ellsen, Michael Katims
Cast: Andie MacDowell, David Strathairn, Elias Koteas, Brendan Gleeson, Adrien Brody
Country: France
Running Time: 121 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *A Newsweek reporter becomes obsessed with finding her husband, a well-respected war photojournalist, who mysteriously disappears during the Yugoslavian conflict of the early 1990s. She then embarks to the Eastern European nation in search of her lost spouse, despite the advice of many of her closest friends and colleagues.*

***We Were Soldiers* (2002)**
Director: Randall Wallace
Story: Harold G. Moore (book), Joseph L. Galloway (book), Randall Wallace
Cast: Mel Gibson, Madeline Stowe, Greg Kinnear, Sam Elliott, Barry Pepper
Country: USA, Germany
Running Time: 138 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *The story of a three-day blood-drenched battle between the U. S. Seventh Calvary and the North Vietnamese army at the beginning of the Vietnam War. A detached young combat photographer tries to capture the events of the conflict while his fellow soldiers learn to rely on one another and follow the orders of their heroic leader.*

***City of God* (2003)**
Director: Fernando Meirelles, Kátia Lund (co-director)
Story: Paulo Lins (novel), Bráulio Mantovani
Cast: Matheus Nachtergaele, Seu Jorge, Alexandre Rodrigues, Firmino Da Hora
Country: Brazil, France, USA
Running Time: 130 minutes
Nominations and Awards: Nominated for 4 Academy Awards – Best Cinematography (César Charlone), Best Director (Meirelles), Best Editing (Daniel Rezende), Best Writing, Screenplay Based on Material Previously Produced or Published (Mantovani)
Plot Summary: *A young photographer grows up during a turbulent period of gang-war violence in Rio de Janeiro. As he comes of age, he begins chronicling the escalading neighborhood street wars with his camera, eventually obtaining work as a freelancer for a local newspaper.*

***Paparazzi* (2004)**
Director: Paul Abascal
Story: Forrest Smith
Cast: Cole Hauser, Robin Tunney, Dennis Farina, Tom Sizemore, Daniel Baldwin
Country: USA
Running Time: 84 minutes
Nominations and Awards: None
Plot Summary: *A group of celebrity photographers cause a rising Hollywood star and his family to experience a near-fatal car accident. The movie star takes his anger out on the photographers, who continue to invade the privacy of both the actor and his family.*

***Hard Candy* (2006)**
Director: David Slade
Story: Brian Nelson
Cast: Patrick Wilson, Ellen Page, Sandra Oh
Country: USA
Running Time: 99 minutes
Nominations and Awards: Nominated for 1 British Independent Film Award - Best Foreign Independent Film
Plot Summary: A bright, mysterious teenage girl meets a fashion photographer online. The young woman turns the tables on the photographer after revealing that she knows his deep, dark secret.