WOMEN
IN THE EARLY FILM INDUSTRY

By Martin E. Norden

Anita Loos made her mark as a screenwriter, an area of early filmmaking quickly dominated by women.

The history of women's involvement in the film industry before World War I has remained a largely unexplored area. After reading the few volumes on the subject, one may be tempted to conclude that women’s roles in the film business were limited to acting, screenwriting and occasional directing. Yet women had found their way into all tiers of the industry, from production through distribution to exhibition. Indeed, industry-watcher Robert Grau was moved to remark in 1915 that, "In no line of endeavor has woman made so emphatic an impress than in the amazing film industry, which has created in its infant stage a new and compelling art wherein the gentler sex is now so active a factor that one may not name a single vocation in either the artistic or business side of its progress in which women are not conspicuously engaged. In the theaters, in the studios and even in the exchanges where film productions are marketed and released to exhibitors, the fair sex is represented as in no other calling to which women have harkened in the early years of the twentieth century." In the interest of
sheding some light on the professional activities of these women who, though relatively low in number, helped shape the new industry, this article examines their representative contributions in and to the field (as reflected primarily in the major trade journal of the time, Moving Picture World [hereafter MPW]) along with possible explanations for their successes and failures.

The film production tier of the industry is the area most frequently examined by historians attempting to discern women’s involvement in the earliest days of the medium, and it comes as no surprise to learn that, within that tier, women directors have garnered the most attention. Indeed, so much has already been written on the two doyennes of early directing, Alice Guy Blaché and Lois Weber, that further discussion of them here would seem redundant. Anthony Slide’s brief but dense Early Women Directors has been particularly useful for bringing to light their careers, noting that “there were more women directors at work in the American film industry prior to 1920 than during any period of its history.”

Actually, most silent-age female directorial careers—including those of Cleo Madison, Lupe Warrenton, Ruth Stonehouse, Elsie Jane Wilson, Ruth Ann Baldwin and Ida May Park, all of whom, along with Lois Weber, were alumnae of Carl Laemmle’s Universal Pictures—were launched in the years immediately following World War I and thus fall outside the scope of this paper. The conditions which led to their ascendancy as directors are very much within the parameters of this article, however, and will be examined shortly along with several films directed by Blaché and Weber.

Of course, other roles in the film production field existed besides directing and many women found their way into these positions. Anthony Slide has reported that at least three camerawomen, one female assistant director and four female studio managers were pursuing their respective careers by the mid-teens, though unfortunately little is known of their work today. Better remembered are the women screenwriters, who quickly dominated that section of the business during the medium’s earliest years, Anita Loos, Frances Marion and Beulah Marie Dix remain the best known (primarily through biographies, auto- and otherwise), but scores of other women made their mark. For instance, Gene Gauntier, identified by MPW as the “very first of the women writers,” penned many one-reel drama scripts, but is perhaps best remembered for writing the script for From the Manger to the Cross, an early five-part Kalem hit that was revived on every Christian holiday for years. Lois Weber was another prolific writer, reportedly turning out one script per week during her tenure with Universal’s Rex subsidiary.

Another prominent screenwriter of the time was Carolyn Wells of the Edison company. MPW was effusive in its praise for a 1909 Wells-authored film entitled Ethel’s Luncheon, a comedy about a clubman, his fiancée, his male friend and the pranks of two madcap women. MPW lauded the film for rising above the usual type of slapstick so common during the time, arguing that it “demonstrates that a comedy above the rough house type will make a successful picture. And this is worth much to the motion picture world . . . . This Edison picture is different in that the comedy is delicate and clean and leaves a pleasant impression. It is scarcely too much to say that this comedy has introduced a new type of motion picture and the producers deserve the heartiest encouragement in their laudable efforts to improve the character of purely amusement pictures.” Though historians have traditionally regarded the Edison concern as stodgy and conservative, due to its founder and his leadership of the monopolistic-minded Motion Picture Patents Company, it was quite progressive on the issue of women writers. It invited many of its actresses to write screenplays, and they eagerly responded. As MPW noted in 1914, “if we started to list the Edison players who are also writers, we would have to give the complete roster.”

Several women extended their screenwriting careers by becoming the heads of the production companies’ scenario departments. The best known of these was Louella Parsons, better remembered along with Hedda Hopper as Hollywood’s premier gossip columnists. In the years before World War I, Parsons was the head of scripts at the Essanay company. Though she actually wrote few screenplays herself, she developed a reputation for being very helpful to tyros trying to break into the scriptwriting business via the mail. In fact, she was so helpful that she became swamped with requests for critical remarks on scripts and had to issue several public announcements stating her reluctance to continue that service.

Another head of a scenario department faced with a similar problem was a woman unfortunately identified by MPW only as “Mrs. Brandon.” As the chief script editor for the American branch of the Eclair company, Brandon was inundated with poorly written screenplays by beginners. To cope with the deluge, she began accepting scripts written only by writers who had at least three produced films to their credit.
One of the first women writers to form her own film production company was Eleanor Gates, well-known at the time as an author of short stories, novels and screenplays. The first releases of the Eleanor Gates Photo-Play Company were three- and four-reelers of her stories which had appeared in the Saturday Evening Post.9

Women also made inroads into the field of editing, an area which to this day remains a female stronghold in the film industry. As Anthony Slide has noted, countless numbers of anonymous women served as film cutters and as frame-tinters on early color productions. One may grasp a sense of this fact in an MPW news story reporting a fire which swept through the Hollywood cutting rooms of the Universal studios in January 1914. The journal noted in passing that the only employees in the rooms, who assisted in saving many valuable negatives, were women.10

A number of women held jobs that combined editing with other aspects of film production. For example, Mary O'Connor was photoplay editor as well as a script reader and a publicity manager for the Vitagraph company in 1914, while Hetty Gray Baker was both an editor and a scriptwriter for the Bosworth company, and whose specialty was adapting the works of Jack London into screenplays. Beta Breuil, former Vitagraph editor, became the “Artistic Manager” of the North American Films Corporation in early 1914. The position was above those of editor and production manager, and she was responsible for overseeing all creative elements that went into the films produced by that concern. MPW waxed enthusiastic over her appointment, suggesting that she would bring “to her work the valuable knowledge gained through her previous connections, but here her genius for devising effects and working out ideas will have an absolutely unlimited scope, for she will have no one between herself and the heads of the company.” Breuil brought in Catherine Carr and Peggy O’Neill, other alumnae of Vitagraph, along with Marie Jacobs to assist her in overseeing the creative aspects of every film produced by that company.11

Women had a far more difficult time breaking into the financial side of film production. Indeed, it appears only one woman ever became involved in production money matters during the pre-World War I era: Agnes Egan Cobb, sales manager for Union Features, Features Ideal and the Eclair company’s American wing. MPW noted her prosperity in that position: “In her capacity of sales managers for these feature concerns, Mrs. Cobb has been exceptionally successful. She has been able to hold up the price of the product she handles in a crowded market and to sell a reasonable quantity.” In noting the difficulty of such a job, MPW inadvertently revealed the reason for women’s lack of access to such positions: the dominant belief that women were ill-equipped to cope with financial matters. The journal wrote that Cobb’s position “is essentially a man’s job so, when we see a woman tackling the selling end of the business and getting away with it our hats must come off to that woman.”12 [my emphasis]

For similar reasons, women found themselves hard pressed to break into the higher echelons of the distribution and exhibition sides of the industry. Those that did often found their accomplishments trumpeted in the trade press. For example, MPW noted the emergence of Frida Klug within the distribution area with an article that bore the screaming headline, “A WOMAN INVADES THE AMERICAN MOVING PICTURE FIELD.” Klug was the U.S. representative for the August Schultze firm of Turin, Italy, the distribution agency for the Italian-based Helios, Roato, Roma and Pasquaii filmmaking companies. Klug, whom MPW described as “the only lady so far to our knowledge to grapple with the intricacies of the film importing and renting business,” had worked as a distribution agent in London, Paris, Budapest and other European cities. As a representative of the Schultze concern, the peripatetic Klug visited such major eastern U.S. cities as New York, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh to promote that company’s offerings. Klug was not hesitant to criticize American films and film theaters; in an interview with MPW, she stated she was very unimpressed with both, and claimed they lagged far behind European standards.13

Another woman involved in the distribution end of the business was E. M. Murphy. Murphy was the chief administrator for the Troy, N. Y., office of the United Film Company, and was extremely knowledgeable of the film industry, according to MPW. In detailing her duties, the journal underscored the rarity of a woman holding an executive position such as this one in the film field: “It is not very often that you run across a young lady assuming the entire charge of a live film exchange, getting new customers, taking care of their wants and superintending the bookings, etc.”14

In terms of the sheer numbers of reported instances, women exhibitors seemed to fare better than their distribution counterparts. Women who owned and managed moving-picture theaters found particular success in a number of cities east of the Mississippi River. For example, Ida Mayer was manager of a film
theater in Jamaica, Long Island, while Evelyn Corbett became the Chicago representative of the Colonial Theater Company, a theater-chain operator in Illinois and Indiana, after working in the Chicago office of the Motion Picture Screen Company. In Cincinnati, F. J. Lotz ran the 1,150-seat Norwood theater, while her daughters Freda and Martha operated the smaller Nemo theater, which boasted a 500-seat air dome used during the summer.

Boston also seemed to offer a favorable environment for women exhibitors; not only did Lotta Crabtree own the Savoy theater in that city, but also another woman, unfortunately identified solely by MPW as "Mrs. Clement," managed the B. F. Keith Bijou theater there. Clement insisted on offering a wide range of entertainment for her patrons. In addition to films, her theater presented lantern-slide shows (which she called "camera chats") and sundry live performances. As an admiring MPW noted, "A cultured woman like Mrs. Clement perceives the absolute necessity of supplementing the pictures with these camera talks, one-act plays and music." A tough-minded, efficient administrator, Clement strongly questioned the film-selection system followed by the film exchanges. As an independent exhibitor, she found she was denied access to the productions created by Pathé Frères, Essanay, Lubin, and the other members of the Motion Picture Patents Company. She clearly advocated an "open market" system, in which exhibitors could rent films produced by an concern.

On the educational front, Katherine F. Carter was the head of the General Film Company's education division before quitting in mid-1914 to found the Katherine F. Carter Educational and Motion Picture Service Bureau in New York. This company leased film projection equipment to schools, churches, clubs and hotels, in addition to scheduling films to be shown to these organizations.
Despite their unconventional positions within the industry, very little of the work of early women directors such as Lois Weber (center) could be called "feminist" or "progressive."
Lest I fall into a variant of the “Great Person” pitfall of historical research, I should point out that hundreds of other women occupied less prominent positions in the exhibition field, primarily as pianists who performed mood music to accompany the films. Sadly, these women were often the targets of ridicule by others in the industry. In a wondrously subtle 1911 article entitled “Jackass Music,” MPW columnist Louis Reeves Harrison attempted to satirize the female pianists, whom he collectively labeled “Lily Limpwrist.” The article featured several cartoons depicting the lamentable LL engaging in such inappropriate actions as ignoring an action scene of a film while primping and playing a lively tune during a death scene. Later that same year, MPW published an “ode” to the female pianist entitled “Lizzie Plays for the Pictures,” parts of which are reproduced below:

*With a tum-te-tum and an aching thumb
She keeps the time with her chewing gum,
She chews and chaws without a pause,
With a ragtime twist to her busy jaws,
And her fingers fly as the hours go by;
She pounds the keys with a languid ease
Till the folks go home and the pictures cease;

But Lizzie plays like a grim machine,
And she never thinks what the measures mean,
For she’s played them oft and the notes don’t wait
Any thought to her that is sweet and soft:
There’s a wrangling chime as her fingers climb
Up the yellowed keys as she beats the time,
For the show that costs but half-a-dime,
And she chaws and chews as she seems to muse
On the flying films and the flopping views,

And her hands jump here and her hands jump there,
While betimes with one she will fix her hair,
But she keeps right on with the other hand
In a ragtime tune that is simply grand
And a burst of bass when she whacks her thumb
On the lower keys, and a sudden frown
As she jabs the loud, loud pedal down.19

One could argue that such seemingly innocuous bits of whimsy reflected to some degree the conflicting male attitudes toward women’s involvement in the early film industry, and it is worth attempting to explain how these and other factors led to women’s prominence in some areas of the film business and eventual decline in others. Why, for example, were women’s most memorable achievements in the fields of acting, writing and editing, but in few other areas of the field? After all, the medium was still quite young and, as Marjorie Rosen has suggested, “before it became a powerful elitist operation, the industry’s hunger for material and moviemakers left little room for sexual prejudice.”20 The remainder of this essay will be devoted to pursuing and developing theories which might help explain the roles that women played—and did not play—in the pre-World War I film industry and immediately thereafter.

The cultural phenomenon most responsible for encouraging the tide of women entering the business was the suffrage movement, then underway in several countries. Though nominally limited to women’s voting rights, the suffrage movement became synonymous with women’s overall rights, and MPW, always prepared to laud women in the film industry work force, was quick to perceive its influence; in a 1913 article on a woman who sold posters to movie companies for a living, the journal observed: “In these days of the militant suffragette, we are prepared for almost anything in the way of womanly activity.” In addition, the industry as a whole, which was never known for resisting the temptation to exploit current social issues, made dozens if not hundreds of films dealing with suffragists and other progressive women, Molly Haskell’s claim that suffragists never found their way into films notwithstanding.21

Yet many women had a hard time overcoming legacies of the Victorian age that took the form of male biases against them. While pondering the shortage of women directors, Alice Guy Blaché acknowledged “that a woman’s success in many lines of endeavor is still made very difficult by a strong prejudice against one of her sex doing work that has been done only by men for hundreds of years.” Another bias is easily detectable in this bit of 1910 enlightenment concerning alleged reasons for many women’s attraction to acting: “Nothing appeals to the feminine heart so much as the wearing of nice dresses and the opportunity of displaying them on the stage or elsewhere. Where there is the possibility of a girl being photographed in a moving picture and her portrait shown to millions of moving picture patrons, what wonder that the feminine heart aspires to have the opportunity? Here we are striking at the very root of feminine human nature: the love of finery, the love of display, the love of admiration. So it goes. So it will always go.”22

If this notion is a reasonably accurate reflection of the then-prevalent male attitude toward women, it should come as no surprise to learn that women’s most visible presence in the business emerged in the acting field, into which women bent on a film career were often
Experts say that whatever appeals to the heart draws women, and whatever appeals to the head draws men.” —MPW, 1910

shunted. It is doubtless true that a successful acting career was the major goal for many women entering the film field; indeed, they were fortunate even to have the opportunity to pursue that career prior to 1909, since most female roles at that time were played by men. Yet other women who might have had visions of finding challenging work behind the scenes often had little choice. Another pundit of the times offered this penetrating insight into those things that interest men and women: “Experts say that whatever appeals to the heart draws women, and that whatever appeals to the head draws men.”23 Again, if this observation, based on some “definitive authority” lost to the ages, is close to the dominant sentiments of the day, then there is little wonder why women in general were initially excluded from the major decisionmaking positions such as producing and directing in favor of acting, where pleasing personalities and equally pleasing bone structures were the going concern and where women would be in a position to exert minimal authority.

But what about scriptwriting? Why did this area come to be strongly associated with women’s involvement in film? The answers seem to reside in the fact that it represented a field in which women’s nonacting creative talents could be easily exploited. As suggested in a recent Wide Angle essay, the Hollywood writer has always been treated rather like the bastard of the industry,24 and one may argue that this attitude began forming when women were developing a strong foothold in the writing field. It is worth noting that the scripts were often written by women who lived far away from the production centers of the industry. For example, Katharine Boland Clemens, who won a scenario contest sponsored by Carl Laemmle’s Imp Company with a tragic romance set against the Spanish-American war entitled The Double, lived in St. Louis. Two prominent screenwriters of the time, Lillian Sweetser and Bettie Fitzgerald, lived respectively in Maine and Alabama.25 All of the major production companies had their own scenario departments, many of which solicited screenplays by mail. This situation represented an attractive opportunity for many women, trapped in the stay-at-home life expected of them, to pursue more creative experiences and even modest careers.

Yet, as all screenwriters know, their resulting scripts cease to belong to them once the works have moved into the hands of the directors and the other production people. The directors of the pre-World War I period could easily change around any elements of the screenplays from which they worked, knowing full well they would encounter minimal resistance from the scripts’ authors, who probably lived hundreds if not thousands of miles away. Thus, those women who wrote screenplays at home were at an enormous disadvantage; they may have put considerable creativity into their works but were poorly paid and in no position to exert veto power over any script changes that might arise. They often failed to receive credit for their efforts as in the case of Grace Adele Pierce, who wrote the script for D. W. Griffith’s early epic Judith of Bethulia (1913) and who asked the League of American Pen women to help screenwriters gain rights.26 Given our society’s longstanding abuse and disparagement of people not in positions of power (including the still-widespread belief that women trivialize any occupations or skills they master), it is not difficult to see the origins of the condescending, even hostile, attitudes toward screenwriters.

As for women’s involvement in editing, it is reasonably clear that the cutter positions, widely held by women, were initially regarded as menial: cutters merely carried out the dictates of others with regard to the length and order of the shots in a film. Yet many women worked hard at their craft and helped elevate it to greater executive and creative status. One such woman was Katherine Eggleston, a then-famous magazine and newspaper writer hired in late 1913 by the Mutual Film Corporation as a “picture editor.” In describing her duties, MPW wrote that she “views the different scenes of the picture after it is completed and arranges them with an eye to clearness of story-construction and dramatic value, establishing sequence and ridding the picture of all that does not contribute to its effectiveness.”27 Such a position, with all the creativity and decisionmaking it entailed, was a far cry from the earliest cutting jobs.

The industry further demonstrated its ambivalence toward working women by the ways it depicted women, progressive and otherwise, in the films produced then. As many feminist film critics have pointed out, the silent-film industry heavily favored women’s roles that were little more than the basic stereotypes of mothers, ingénues, soubrettes and vamps; in other words, roles defined mainly in terms of relationships with others. (One can easily get a sense of this from the titles of such representative films of the time as A Widow and Her Child, The Fickle Fiancée, His Friend’s Wife and For Her Brother’s Sake.) Yet with the suffrage movement well underway during the pre-World War I era, the international film industry began making
As a director, Ruth Stonehouse was one of the women who defied male prejudice by becoming established in film production.
movies which depicted women in situations other than exclusively familial or romantic ones.

Unfortunately, but predictably, these earliest efforts to portray the “New Woman” were almost always comedies which lampooned or belittled women’s attempts to pursue interests outside the home. Suffragists in particular received the full force of the industry’s satiric jabs, and were frequently characterized as either men-haters, ugly spinsters or wives whose attempts to liberate themselves proved futile if not ridiculous. A handful of later silent films did treat suffrage with seriousness (virtually all of which were independently produced under the auspices of various suffrage organizations), but the majority of the suffrage films could be summed up in MPW’s description of The Man Suffragette for the Abolition of Work for Women (1910): “a comedy which will keep the audience roaring, and is, in reality, a good travesty upon the suffragette movement.”

Not all women in film aspired to be actresses. Director Ruth Stonehouse is seen here with cameraman Franklyn Pamum (left) and screenwriter Mark Larkin.

Though few if any of such “travesties” were written or directed by women, the films they did make were hardly supportive of progressive women, at least at first. Indeed, their films initially tended to be rather conventional romantic/familial dramas. Precious little of the pre-World War I output of such women as Alice Guy Blaché, Lois Weber and Anita Loos could be labeled “feminist” or “progressive” with fairness. For example, little of the 1910 Edison film History Repeats Itself, written by Carolyn Wells, could be called even mildly progressive; the film dealt with two young lovers enjoying their first kiss, who, after being interrupted by her mother, convince the older woman that their romance was but a repetition of her own. If these women had any feminist tendencies, they kept them in check, perhaps believing their careers might be jeopardized if they did not.

Both Lois Weber and Alice Guy Blaché eventually veered from the straight and narrow, however, by occasionally exploring vampish themes. Consider, for example, The Spider and Her Web (1914), written and co-directed by Lois Weber. This movie starred Weber as “Madame DuBarry,” a “spider” who caused good men to commit crimes. MPW defined a spider as a woman “who is dazzlingly beautiful, who has a fascinating personality and who has everything that a woman should have except a heart.” This film was matched by Alice Guy Blaché’s The Woman of Mystery (1914), a four-reeler about a Hindu princess who created a Jekyll/Hyde personality in an American male detective, using “the uncanny psychic powers developed to such an astonishing degree in the Far East.” Of equal interest was Blaché’s The Dream Woman (1914), about the weirdness that ensued after a man, who dreamed he was murdered on his birthday by his as-yet-unmet wife, actually encountered the woman in real life.

Though vamp stories proved popular at the box office, the male-dominated industry may have viewed such films with growing concern; it may have believed that such women-directed films featuring the destruction of men were sending out the wrong signals to the rest of society. Such films may have contributed to women’s eventual near-exclusion from directorial positions in Hollywood.

In sum: the years prior to World War I held much promise for women entering all fields of the film industry, with many women directors and writers—Lois Weber, Frances Marion, Anita Loos, Jeanie MacPherson, Bess Meredyth, to name a few—reaching their greatest successes in the years immediately following the war. Yet these women were not feminists; or if they were,
they kept such tendencies under wraps. As suggested by Molly Haskell, “These women, businesswomen and artists, were not ‘political,’ that is, they were less the expression of a feminist movement (except indirectly, as examples of successful women professionals) than a reflection of the general female orientation of the film industry and the specific popularity of women’s themes as subjects.”32 As the industry matured into a vertically integrated oligopoly bent on outmaneuvering the remaining independent factions at every turn, and as interest in women’s themes declined, women found themselves squeezed out of many substantive positions in all levels of the business. These actions on the part of a nervous, newly solidified, male-dominated industry may have been due to a belief that women were not as strongly profit-minded or business-oriented as men, and that some women-directed films were mildly subversive. Only recently have we seen women in the industry in numbers comparable to those during that early glowing era in film history.
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