

## WRITING FILM INDUSTRY HISTORY

*Andrew Spicer*

Writing any form of film history necessitates addressing three basic questions: “What is the object of study, what counts as evidence and, finally, what is being explained?” (Elsaesser 1986: 247). This chapter explores how these issues have been tackled by a range of different scholars, discussing the ways in which they have conceptualized film industry history in what is a dynamic and shifting field populated by researchers from a variety of perspectives and disciplinary backgrounds with contrasting priorities and preoccupations. It discusses a selection of studies, chosen either because they have been influential, and/or they illustrate broad trends or shifts in approach. What follows is divided into four sections: the first discusses how film industry history has been defined and delimited (the object of study); the second outlines the customary sources used and the major methodological approaches employed (what counts as evidence); thirdly, the chapter considers the purposes or intentions of film industry historians (what is being explained?); a brief concluding section then considers the possible future direction of film industry history.

**The object of study: Establishing the field of film industry history**

Although important pioneering work on film industry history already existed, including Tino Balio’s edited collection *The American Film Industry* (1976a) and the first volume of his study of United Artists (1976b), Robert C. Allen and Douglas Gomery’s *Film History: Theory and Practice* (1985) became the first attempt to explicitly and in a systematic manner define and reflect on both the purposes and practices of film historiography, including industry history. Allen and Gomery proposed four main approaches to writing film history:

aesthetic, technological, economic and social.<sup>1</sup> They define the object of economic film history as the industry's processes of production, distribution and exhibition (the "basic descriptive model"). In American cinema this was organized through a "system of business operations" that controlled the allocation of goods and services (pp. 132-34). The task of economic film history, they contend, is to construct models, derived from more general economic analyses, which identify the industry's basic conditions of supply and demand and then evaluate its market structure, conduct and performance. Although they recognize the importance of regulatory changes in shaping industry conduct, Allen and Gomery argue that technological changes should only be considered in so far as they alter business practices and commercial operations. In contrast to aesthetic history, economic history regards films as commodities. Perhaps most contentiously, Allen and Gomery (p. 138) suggest that "industrial analysis" seeks only "to understand economic variables" thus "leaving questions of sociology and ideology to others" who pursue social analyses.

Allen and Gomery's study was part of a spate of important publications in the mid-1980s that redefined how the (American) film industry was understood: David Bordwell, Janet Staiger and Kristen Thompson's (1985) *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*, Thompson's *Exporting Entertainment* (1986), Gomery's (1986) *The Hollywood Studio System*, and Thomas Schatz's (1988) *The Genius of the System*, plus Balio's updating (1986) of *The American Film Industry* and the second volume (1987) of his United Artists study. In *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*, Staiger's attention to shifting systems of production offered a way to understand how combinations of finance, labor and physical means of production determine the nature of filmmaking at specific moments. Gomery's analysis of the studio system provided a broad historical overview of Hollywood's development as a commercial operation, while Schatz used André Bazin's contention that Hollywood must be understood as a whole organization – the "genius of the system" – to analyze the institutionally-based

craftmanship that constituted creativity as opposed to the then-dominant focus on auteur directors. These studies largely viewed the American film business in terms of production activity, but Thompson provided an incisive analysis of Hollywood's international distribution, lobbying and marketing strategies for penetrating overseas markets, "exporting entertainment," while Gomery's *Shared Pleasures: A History of Movie Presentation in the United States* (1992) offered a systematic overview of the business strategies that shaped film exhibition from the beginnings to the widespread use of VCRs. Gomery not only drew attention to an area of the business frequently overlooked, but importantly reconceptualized the object of study as "cinema" rather than "film", an enlargement that most industry historians now accept.<sup>2</sup>

These foundational studies focused on the American industry. Although Hollywood remains the dominant focus for film industry histories, some histories analyze different national cinemas, for example Richard Abel's (1994) *The Cine Goes to Town: French Cinema, 1896-1914*, while others take a regional focus, including Anne Jackël's *European Film Industries* (2003). Yongchun Fu's (2019) *The Early Transnational Chinese Cinema Industry* exemplifies transnational film industry studies, demonstrating the complex and shifting relationships between Hollywood and other film industries in which both engage in complex assimilations and reworkings of each other's characteristic modalities. Drilling down below the level of any particular industry, Christopher Meir's (2019) *Mass Producing European Cinema* illustrates the value of studying major non-US corporations, in this case the French film producer-distributor StudioCanal, which have different business models and commercial strategies.

For film history, work on non-US film industries offered an obvious but important extension of the object of study, showing - explicitly or implicitly - that Hollywood was *a* way rather than *the* way in which film industry could be organized. Another approach,

reflecting the “spatial turn” in the humanities, focused on the importance of place in providing competitive advantage. Drawing on the influential work of the economist Michael Porter, Scott (2005: xi) demonstrates how part of Hollywood’s industrial strength derives from an “organized ecology of specialized but complementary production activities”. Scott argues that “Hollywood is neither just a metaphor nor a business model; it is also a unique geographical entity, with a very distinctive structure as a production locale” (p. 47). Brannon Donoghue (2017) extends this analysis to overseas production sites in which American companies work with indigenous talent to make locally inflected films and television shows that are often commercially successful.

Rather than extend the scope of existing approaches, other studies have sought to rethink what the film “industry” is. (Govil 2013) argues that industry needs to be understood as a conceptual construct rather than simply as a form of production, created by policy decisions, coalescing spheres of practices (such as craft associations), and other forms of sociality and collective affinity. Similarly, John Caldwell (2013) argues that “the industry” should not be conceptualized as “a clear, self-evident sphere”, an object ready to be researched, but as a discourse, constructed and reconstructed by intermediaries who manage and produce selective “data” that constitutes a “para-industry” surrounding the supposed object of study. Caldwell’s major study, *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television* (2008), examined the discourses of screen practitioners working in Hollywood, analyzing how they construct their own cultural and interpretative frameworks and their collective self-theorizing rituals that are central to how the screen industries operate.

Understanding “film” as a singular and separate medium has also been interrogated. Staiger contends that film “as a business and an art was never isolated from the other entertainments” but part of an interweaving mesh of leisure industries that were international

in scope and reach (2004: 127). Understanding film as interwoven with other media and entertainment practices has become more insistent because the impact of digital processes has caused media to “converge”, necessitating the replacement of film history with a wider media industry history (Staiger and Hake 2009). Jennifer Holt argues that rather than being technologically driven, convergence was the product of “globalization, deregulation and market concentration” (2011: 10), which, since the early 1980s, enabled the growth of horizontally and vertically integrated conglomerates that exploited their ownership of a range of entertainment outlets to maximize revenue. Film became subsumed into the wider entity of “media industries” (film, broadcast, cable and video), whose histories are “no longer distinct but ... fundamentally connected and contingent upon one another” (p. 7). Nevertheless, Schatz argues that these gigantic media conglomerates still have “film studios at the epicentre, and with ‘filmed entertainment’ as the key commodity” (2008: 27). Balio (2013) argues media conglomerates concentrate on the “tent pole” blockbuster (or the “event movie”) that, ideally, forms part of a franchise operating across the proliferation of platforms and generating the huge growth of ancillary markets. Lower budget films have been farmed out to “independent producers”, generating a connected but still separate American “indie” film industry organized on very different business models (see Tzioumakis 2017).

The object of film industry history has shifted. Analysis of production practices has expanded to include distribution, exhibition and marketing strategies as film became a global industry dominated by the US studios. However, the focus on the international film industry has extended beyond documenting this dominance to include not only a recognition of the distinctiveness of various national cinemas but also, particularly studies of transnational cinema, their reciprocal relationship with Hollywood, now understood as itself a specific set of industrial and business practices which change in its various encounters and engagements with other forms of film. More broadly, “film” has been reconceptualized, not as a separate,

singular practice but one that is positioned within a wider history of media forms; and the term “industry” as a shifting set of practices and discourses rather than a given.

### **What counts as evidence: Sources and approaches**

As exemplified by the foundational work on the US business, film industry history emphasizes detailed empirical investigation of primary sources as forms of evidence, using available written records, archives, specific collections, personal papers and memoirs, the trade press, policy documents, and censor reports. Balio’s two volume study of United Artists (1976b and 1987), for example, was based on careful examination of the studio’s internal production files and correspondence, including minutes of meetings, financial records, details of business transactions, and distribution data. Gorham Kindem’s collection *The American Movie Industry* was composed of detailed case studies assembled by scholars who had examined “business records, legal proceedings, government and industry statutes, and trade papers” (1983: xiii). The professional scholarship of these studies contrasted with earlier impressionistic, mainly biographical, film industry histories – “tales of pioneers and adventurers” – and were characterized by their wide-ranging use of sources (Elsaesser 1986: 246). Subsequent scholarship has expanded the range of primary sources further to encompass previously disregarded or overlooked material, including ephemera and fan magazines (Chapman, Glancy and Harper 2007: 7-8). Furthermore, archival analysis of unrealized films has demonstrated the value of studying aborted film production histories for what they reveal about the prevailing industrial conditions and constraints (North 2008; Spicer 2010; Fenwick, Foster and Eldridge 2020).

However, while film industry scholars agreed on the centrality of primary sources and the empirical orientation of research, their approaches showed marked differences. The early collections edited by Balio and Kindem mixed neoclassical analyses of supply and demand

with Marxist analyses; Kindem commented: “historical problems have been given contradictory or different explanatory models and emphasized different sets of economic, social, political, legal and aesthetic factors” (1983: xiii). Allen and Gomery (1985: 134-38) detected a similar split, contrasting the ideological neutrality of some film industry studies, with others such as Guback (1969) mounting a Marxist critique of how the American industry had used its commercial muscle to exploit European markets and thereby hindered the development of European film industries. By contrast, Waterman (2005) explains Hollywood’s commercial success since the 1970s as arising mainly through segmenting markets across an expanded range of selling points without commenting on the wider consequences of this strategy.

The approach of economic historians such as Waterman is primarily quantitative, deploying microeconomic tools of analysis, including statistical data, tables, graphs and mathematical modelling, to analyze industry practices. Perhaps the outstanding work in economic film history is Gerben Bakker’s *Entertainment Industrialised* (2008), which analyses how film replaced theatre as popular entertainment, and the ways in which the US became the dominant film industry. Bakker scrutinizes business innovations and the underlying forces that gave rise to them – increased leisure time and disposable income, urbanization, better transport networks and significant population growth – and identifies film’s unique commercial quality as its “tradeability”, packed into cans of celluloid that could be easily and cheaply transported. As the industry developed, high production expenditure (“endogenous sunk costs”) necessitated international distribution to recoup costs, which was economically viable because the costs of making additional sales were almost zero. He suggests that it was the size of America’s internal market that enabled film entrepreneurs to risk high costs, leaving the smaller European countries unable to compete in the “quality race”. Considered from a contemporary vantage point where Hollywood’s dominance of the

global film market is an established fact, Bakker's conclusions might seem unsurprising, yet through amassing the impressive range of detailed archival evidence on which his economic modelling is based, he demonstrates that America's commercial supremacy was far from inevitable.

However, the dominant approach to film industry analysis has been the forms of Marxist analysis adopted by Guback and others influenced by the critical political economy of the media, defined as "the power relations that constitute the production, distribution, and consumption of resources" and which focuses on "the fundamental forces and processes at work in the marketplace" (Mosco 2009: 2, 24). Political economy studies are characterized by their astringent critique of systems of ownership and control, advocacy for changes in public policy to curb or supplement market forces, and a concern for labor relations (Vasey 2008: 11). Commencing with her 1982 study *Movies and Money: Financing the American Film Industry*, Janet Wasko emerged as one of the most prominent and prolific political economists writing about film and media. In *Understanding Disney*, Wasko (2020: 117) analyses Disney's development of a "magic kingdom" produced by an organization which exhibits "the same goals as any profit-oriented company". She provides a detailed examination of Disney's "multiverse", encompassing all its entertainment activities from films to theme parks, looking at its corporate management and ethos, policies and strategies, its divisions, products, services and properties, directors, shareholders and employees. Wasko avoids the "great man" version of film industry history that dominated pioneering film history accounts (see Allen and Gomery 1985: 52-4 and 110-14) by situating what she calls an "instrumental" analysis of key entrepreneurs, Walt Disney himself and his successors such as Michael Eisner, within the context of more general economic and political contexts, analyzing the "complex interplay of intentional action and structural constraint at every level of the production process" (p. 10).

Since 2008, the dominance of political economy has been challenged by Production Studies. Production Studies scholars tend to adopt an ethnographic approach, combining interviews and field observations to generate “thick descriptions” of the minutiae of production cultures, the relationships in and between firms (“communities of practice”) with a careful attention to less regulated networks and ecologies, thus emphasizing the media industries’ cultural as well as economic dimensions. Interviews sources are treated with caution, analyzed as situated utterances that need careful interpretation. This approach, it is argued (for example by Havens, Lotz and Tinic 2009), has enabled a closer engagement with *agency*, the scrutiny of a wider selection of cultural workers performing a variety of roles including “below the line” screen workers, which highlights how more “menial” industry tasks are often performed by low-paid employees, often women and from minority ethnic backgrounds. In contrast to the assumptions of business, organizational or economic analysts who emphasize the rational choices and “utility maximization” of self-interested individuals operating in competitive markets (Lipartito 2013), production studies recognize media workers have mixed motivations and values. Attention is paid to “the vagaries of human subjects or culture’s thick complexities” (Caldwell 2013: 157), thus appreciating the potential importance of chance encounters, contingencies and fortuitous circumstances in determining commercial processes. In contradistinction to critical political economy’s focus on overarching patterns of ownership and global corporations, production studies examine small-medium enterprises (SMEs), which now form the overwhelming majority in the screen industries, and their variegated production cultures (Bakøy, Puijk and Spicer 2017).

Although production studies has introduced a wider range of potential sources and practices within the purview of film history, the differences between the two approaches have been exaggerated. Critical political economy, as Wasko’s analysis of Disney demonstrates, is fully capable of providing the detailed scrutiny of the minutiae of production cultures, and

production studies retains a critical perspective on the media industries, derived from Cultural Studies, situating micro-level analyses within the macro conditions of power relationships and unequal flows of talent or finance found in international media industries (Holt and Perren 2009). Both approaches are characterized by rigorous analysis of sources, the “evidence” on which they base arguments and conclusions, drawn from detailed empirical investigations. They represent different emphases in the study of film history rather than more fundamental distinctions, though production studies, as currently constituted, is very oriented to the present and would benefit from more sustained attention to history, including the historical evolution of contemporary forms.

### **Purposes: What is being explained?**

Arguing that the study of film had become dominated by textual interpretation, film industry historians considered their primary purpose was to explain how the industry worked as a profit-seeking commercial operation. This was appropriate because, as Balio remarked, no other art has been “influenced so heavily by the predilections of the business world” (1976a: vii). Equally, Allen and Gomery (1985: 135) argued that business practices in the American film industry conformed to those deployed by other large US corporations, and so needed to be investigated “systematically” to explain the role of film in the American economy and to understand how that role changed over time. John Sedgwick and Michael Pokorny argue that economic historians attempt to “explain film business practices” pragmatically rather than ideologically (2005b: 6). Although the film industry conforms to general business characteristics as a “system of provision” producing a particular “commodity-type” (films), its success distinctively depends on audience approval, which is highly unpredictable. In an industry typified by extreme commercial volatility (huge hits and massive flops) and high risk, the Hollywood studios attempted to mitigate risk by pursuing a series of “empirical

regularities”: short-burst cycles of films initiated by highly successful originator; releasing portfolios of films and/or initiating franchises; attempting to guarantee audience appeal through high production costs, expensive stars and substantial expenditure on marketing (pp. 16-19). Sedgwick and Pokorny, however, explain these “risk-attenuating” strategies cannot guarantee success in an industry that lacks a stable underlying business model and in which uncertainty is “integral” to the whole process of production and consumption. Gomery’s (2005: 3 and 5) account of the Hollywood studios attempted to explain their economic conduct (“How did they choose how many films to produce? How distribute them and exhibit them, at what price and in what order?”) but also emphasized agency (“I seek to understand how and in what manner the studio corporation bosses fashioned ways to maximize profits, as do all corporations in the USA”).<sup>3</sup> Economic accounts of Hollywood as a commercial practice serve as an effective counterpoint to the dominance of textual analysis, resituating films within their industrial context and accounting for the choices and strategies that led to what viewers see on the screen before any encounter or interpretation takes place.

However, the goal was not simply to explain Hollywood’s internal operations, its studio chiefs, or even the industry’s role in the US economy, but also how it achieved global dominance. As Ruth Vasey argues, “it is precisely Hollywood’s enduring status as the world’s most popular and financially successful cinema that requires analysis and explication” (2008: 287). Vasey contends she is not “interpreting Hollywood’s world but trying to account for it” through an analysis of the “specific historical and industrial factors” that explain its global dominance (1996: 225). Vasey insists the Hollywood studios must be regarded as “profit-seeking corporations” rather than film-making entities, with their overall policy determined by corporate executives in New York rather than the much more high-profile subordinates who ran the production plants in Los Angeles. Industry historians also recognized that Hollywood’s influence was not purely economic, but that “films, unlike other

manufactured goods, have significant social, political, and aesthetic value” (Kindem 1982: xviii). Thus, Hollywood’s historical importance has come through its ability to shape audience tastes across the globe, molding their expectations of what constitutes a film as a pleasurable experience. Understanding the history of Hollywood’s cultural impact, therefore, necessitates “emphasiz[ing] the economic/business dimensions of the industry, thereby broadening and deepening the context within which any cultural analysis takes place ... to fully understand the cultural impact that Hollywood has had, and continues to have, it is also necessary to understand the economics and economic history of the industry” (Sedgwick and Pokorny 2005a: 2).

Gomery notes, grasping the global dimensions of the industry can enable better understanding of how Hollywood has exercised “international *political and cultural* power” (emphasis added, 2005: 6). As noted, critical political economy seeks to explain in whose interests these global corporations work. Holt (2011) sees the present era of media convergence and conglomeration was the outcome of a longer-term neoliberal transformation in industrial politics in which market forces are deemed sovereign. Grieveson (2018) locates the origins of the present neo-liberal compact between politics and the media in the interwar period, during which US government departments were reorganized to conform to corporate business practices, ideologies and values. Analyses of other national film industries cinemas also have to explain, not only how their different business models and industrial strategies are related to the specifics of national cultures and to precise historical moments, but also the ways in which those industries responded to Hollywood’s commercial power. Such histories need to elucidate what has constituted a “national cinema” or an “indigenous film industry” in what became, from around 1907, an international marketplace that after World War One was dominated by American companies.

Thus, while concerned with economics, the overall purpose of film industry historians should be to contribute to a broader analysis of cultural, social and political processes, and so to explain film's "relationship to the development of modernity and its characteristic structures and procedures" (Garnham 2000: 38). Charney and Schwartz (1995) contended that film was not simply a new medium but central to how modernity was experienced and understood by a broad public. Similarly, Doane (2002) argues film was central to the development of "industrialized time," and so essential to the penetration of capitalist work practices into modern societies. While it has been argued that film's "disappearance" into digital multimedia offers a "threshold moment", in which the teleology of film's triumphant and inevitable emergence from a homogenized "pre-cinema" can be re-inspected (Mulvey 2007: xv-xvi), Charles Musser's (1990) meticulous research shows the emergence of what we can recognize as "film" was the result of commercial strategies adopted by entrepreneurs and largely determined by changes in exhibition practices, demonstrating the value of industrial history in these debates.

### **Possible futures for film industry historiography**

The three vectors of film industry historiography – the object of study, the status and types of evidence adduced, and the purposes of writing film industry histories – are undergoing significant change.

Hollywood, as the dominant global commercial entity, continues to be the central object of analysis. Although the old Hollywood studios may have morphed into "multiverses", "filmed entertainment" remains economically central to the huge, diversified media conglomerates even if film viewing is now distributed across a proliferation of different platforms. However, film industry scholars have also given detailed attention to the rise of the "new King Kongs", the rapidly growing financial muscle of online Subscription

Based Video on Demand (SVOD) companies such as Netflix, which have started to morph from distributor-exhibitors into commissioner-producers with huge resources, able to make feature films whose production values are indistinguishable from the Hollywood majors. Lobato (2019), for instance, analyses Netflix's sophisticated business strategy that exploits local variations demonstrating the continued importance of place, and which forms the latest phase of a longer history of US-based transnational commercial practices.

In a parallel development, increasing attention has been given to "other" cinemas, notably those from the Global South – India ("Bollywood") and Nigeria ("Nollywood") – that have become internationalized entities based on very different models of production, distribution and exhibition. As Miller (2012) shows for example, Nollywood developed as a low-budget video industry by exploiting alternative, often informal, distribution networks. Her work meshes with that of Lobato (2012), who has extended the study of the film industry to include "shadow economies": spheres of economic activity generating value from film outside formally ordered and regulated markets.

Film industry historians continue to make use of traditional, if neglected, overlooked or recently discovered archival sources to provide evidence that revises conventional accounts. Jon Burrows' (2017) business history *The British Cinema Boom, 1909-1914*, for instance, analyses a period of rapid change in the UK film industry based on detailed scrutiny of surviving business and local government records, company accounts and box-office data situated as part of a scrutiny of Edwardian leisure activities and changing audience tastes, which challenges existing British cinema histories. An exciting development has been the increasingly sophisticated use of geocomputational methods that conducts spatial analysis using locational data. Representative of this work is Julia Hallam and Les Roberts' (2011) study of Liverpool which constructs a moving image database to explore the evolution of spatial narratives of the city, using this case study to open out what they see as the cultural

and historiographical implications for research into film, place and space, and from that to suggest how this might reshape national discourses of film industry historiography.

Turning to the purposes of writing film industry history, a noteworthy development has been the increasing attention given to environmental politics and sustainability, including media industries' often promiscuous use of energy, rare minerals and other resources (see Herbert, Lotz and Punathambekar 2020: 124-25). The growth of eco-critical approaches to film and other screen media is indicated by a recent dossier in the *Journal of Cinema and Media Studies* (Peterson and Uhlin 2019), and the formation of the *Journal of Environmental Media*. One of the journal editors, Hunter Vaughan, advocates "ecocriticism" focusing on the "geopolitics, industrial infrastructure, and material impact of media industries and practices" (2019: 10). This ethical focus is an appropriate place to end this overview, as it returns us to what has been argued is the central purpose of film industry historical research: to explain film's economic and commercial practices in detail but understood as part of wider social, cultural and political processes.

## References

- Abel, R. (1994) *The Ciné Goes to Town: French Cinema, 1896-1914*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Allen R. C. and D. Gomery (1985) *Film History: Theory and Practice*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bakker, G. (2008) *Entertainment Industrialised: The Emergence of the International Film Industry, 1890-1940*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakøy, E., Puijk, R. and Spicer, A. (eds) (2017) *Building Successful Film and Television Businesses: A Cross-National Perspective*, Bristol: Intellect.

- Balio, T. (ed.) (1976a) *The American Film Industry*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Balio, T. (1976b) *United Artists: The Company Built by the Stars*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Balio, T. (1987) *United Artists, Volume 2, 1951-1978: The Company That Changed the Film Industry*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Balio, T. (2013) *Hollywood in the New Millennium*, London: British Film Institute.
- Bordwell, D., Thompson, K. and Staiger, J. (1985) *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*, London: Routledge.
- Brannon Donoghue, C. (2017) *Localising Hollywood*, London: British Film Institute.
- Burrows, J. (2017) *The British Cinema Boom, 1909-1914: A Commercial History*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caldwell, J. T. (2008) *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Caldwell, J. T. (2013) "Para-Industry: Researching Hollywood's Blackwaters," *Cinema Journal*, 52 (3): 157-65.
- Chapman, J., Glancy, M. and Harper, S. (2007) *The New Film History: Sources, Methods, Approaches*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Elsaesser, T. (1986) "The New Film History," *Sight and Sound* 55 (4): 246-51.
- Fenwick, J., Foster, K. and Eldridge D. (eds) (2020) *Shadow Cinema: The Historical and Production Context of Unmade Films*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Fu, Y. (2019) *The Early Transnational Chinese Cinema Industry*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Garnham, N. (2000) *Emancipation, the Media and Modernity: Arguments about the Media and Social Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gomery, D. (2005) *The Hollywood Studio System: A History*, London: British Film Institute.

- Gomery, D. (1992) *Shared Pleasures: A History of Movie Presentation in the United States*, London: British Film Institute.
- Govil, N. (2013) "Recognizing 'Industry,'" *Cinema Journal*, 52 (3): 172-76.
- Grieverson, L. (2018) *Cinema and the Wealth of Nations: Media, Capital, and the Liberal World System*, Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Guback, T. (1969) *The International Film History: Western Europe and America Since 1945*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hallam, J. and Roberts, L. (2011) "Mapping, Memory and the City: Archives, Databases and Film Historiography," *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14 (3): 355-72.
- Havens, T., Lotz, A. and Tinic, S. (2009) "Critical Media Industry Studies: A Research Approach," *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 2 (2): 234-53.
- Herbert, D., Lotz, A. and Punathambekar, A. (2020) *Media Industry Studies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Holt, J. (2011) *Empires of Entertainment: Media Industries and the Politics of Deregulation*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Holt, J. and Perren, A. (eds) (2009) *Media Industries: History, Theory and Method*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jackël, A. (2003) *European Film Industries*, London: British Film Institute.
- Kindem, G. (ed.) (1982) *The American Movie Industry: The Business of Motion Pictures*, Carbondale, IL; Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lipartito, K. (2013) "Connecting the Cultural and Material in Business History," *Enterprise and Society*, 14 (4): 686-704.
- Lobarto, R. (2012) *Shadow Economies of Cinema: Mapping Informal Film Distribution*, London: British Film Institute.

- Lobato, R. (2019) *Netflix Nations: The Geography of Digital Distribution*, New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Maltby, R., Biltereyst, D. and Meers, P. (eds) *Explorations in New Cinema History: Approaches and Case Studies*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Meir, C. (2019) *Mass Producing European Cinema: Studio Canal and its Works*, New York and Oxford: Bloomsbury.
- Miller, J. (2012) "Global Nollywood: The Nigerian Movie Industry and Alternative Global Networks in Production and Distribution," *Global Media and Communication*, 8 (2): 117-33.
- Mosco, V. (2009) *The Political Economy of Communication*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London: Sage.
- Mulvey, L. (2007) "Foreword," in J. Lyons and J. Plunkett (eds), *Multimedia Histories: from the Magic Lantern to the Internet*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press: xv-xvi.
- Musser, C. (1990) *The Emergence of Cinema: American Screen to 1907*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- North, D. (ed.) (2008) *Sights Unseen Unfinished British Films*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Peterson, J., and Uhlin, G. (eds) (2019) "In Focus: Film and Media Studies in the Anthropocene," *Journal of Cinema and Media Studies*, 58 (2): 142–179.
- Schtaz, T. (1988) *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Schatz, T. (2008) "The Studio System and Conglomerate Hollywood," in P. McDonald and J. Wasko (eds) *The Contemporary Hollywood Film Industry*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 13- 42.
- Scott, A. J. (2005) *On Hollywood: The Place, the Industry*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Sedgwick, J. and Pokorny, M. (2005a) "Introduction," in J. Sedgwick and M. Pokorny (eds) *An Economic History of Film*, Abingdon: Routledge: 1-5.
- Sedgwick, J. and Pokorny, M. (2005b) "The Characteristics of Film as a Commodity," in J. Sedgwick and M. Pokorny (eds) *An Economic History of Film*, Abingdon: Routledge: 6-23.
- Spicer, A. (2010) "Creativity and Commerce: Michael Klinger and New Film History," *New Review of Film and Television Studies*, 8 (3): 297-314.
- Staiger, J. and Hake, S. (eds) (2009) *Convergence Media History*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thompson. K. (1986) *Exporting Entertainment: America in the World Film Market, 1907-1934*, London: British Film Institute.
- Thompson K. and Bordwell, D. (2018) *Film History: An Introduction* 4<sup>th</sup> ed., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tzioumakis, Y. (2017) *The American Independent Cinema* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Vaughan, H. (2019) *Hollywood's Dirtiest Secret: The Hidden Environmental Cost of the Movies*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Vasey, R. (1997) *The World According to Hollywood, 1918-1939*, Exeter: Exeter University Press.
- Vasey, R. (2008) "The Hollywood Industry Paradigm," in J. Donald and M. Renov (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Film Studies*, London: Sage: 287-311.
- Wasko, J. (1982) *Movies and Money: Financing the Hollywood Film Industry*, New York, NY: Ablex Publishing.
- Wasko, J. (2020) *Understanding Disney: The Manufacture of Fantasy* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge: Polity Press.

Waterman, D. (2005) *Hollywood's Rags to Riches*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

---

<sup>1</sup> Allen and Gomery's divisions closely mirror the "explanatory frameworks" proposed by Thompson and Bordwell (2018): biographical, industrial or economic (business practices), aesthetic, technological, and social/cultural/political.

<sup>2</sup> This approach has been further advanced by the work of the History of Moviegoing, Exhibition and Reception (HoMER) group of scholars (see Maltby, Biltereyst and Meers 2011). However, because their work focuses on exhibition in terms of the social experience of cinema (and so is representative of what Allen and Gomery (1985) regard as social film history) rather than economic/industrial organization, it is outside the scope of this chapter.

<sup>3</sup> Gomery's explanation seems to ascribe the creation of the system to Adolph Zukor at Paramount and its reinvention in the 1960s to Lew Wasserman, the talent agent who took over Universal, which slides into "Great Man" causality.