Journal of 20th Century Media History

Manuscript 1031

Karl Freund's Hollywood Aesthetic: Maintaining Visual Style Within the Studio System

Casey Walker

Karl Freund's Hollywood Aesthetic: Maintaining Visual Style Within the Studio System

Casey Joe Walker (University of Texas)

Hungarian cinematographer Charles Stumar, who started his career in Germany before moving to Hollywood, once said that the art of cinematography in Germany is the "main thing" of a motion picture, noting that German cinematographers were often billed alongside the directors and stars on theatrical marquees promoting their films.[1] Although Stumar and other cinematographers working in Germany also found success in the Hollywood studio system after immigrating to the United States, most never found the same prominence they enjoyed in the waning years of the Weimar era before the Nazis gained power. In contrast, during the classical Hollywood era (roughly 1915-1960) in the US, only one cinematographer enjoyed equal billing with a director in the film's credits (twice): Gregg Toland. Countless articles and books recount Toland's authorship and unique visual style in films such as *Wuthering Heights* (1939), *The Grapes of Wrath* (1940), *The Long Voyage Home* (1940), *Citizen Kane* (1941), and *The Best Years of Our Lives* (1946). His use of deep focus and staging in depth in the frame are still taught in film schools many decades later, and yet while scholarly consensus has well established Toland's talent and legacy as a Hollywood cinematographer, scholarship has barely touched the surface of analyzing the extent to which *other* Hollywood cinematographers exhibited their own unique visual style in the films on which they directed photography.

Much like Toland, Karl Freund is one of the most renowned cinematographers of the classical Hollywood studio era. After working with such filmmakers as Fritz Lang and F.W. Murnau in Germany, he made the move to Hollywood, collaborating with such directors as John Ford, Victor Fleming, and John Huston, and even directed such horror favorites as *The Mummy* (1932) and *Mad Love* (1935). His work was nominated for three Academy Awards, and in 1938 he won Best Cinematography for *The Good Earth* (1937). His early use of the "unchained camera" revolutionized the mobility with which motion pictures could be filmed, similar to how Toland's employment of deep focus revolutionized composition.[2] Despite all these collaborations, contributions, and acclaim, very little published material has focused on the unique visual style of Karl Freund, most notably during his two decades in Hollywood. This problem is not specific to Karl Freund, however; very little is published about most cinematographers, both past and present. In the introduction to his book *A Hidden History of Film Style: Cinematographers, Directors, and the Collaborative Process*, Christopher Beach laments this lack of available research, stating "there are virtually no biographies of cinematographers, and there are only a few

books devoted to analyzing their work." He also notes that cinematographers are often overlooked contributors to authorship and style.[3] This article argues that Karl Freund did in fact have a unique personal style within the classical Hollywood studio system, and details the many techniques, shot selections, composition choices, and visual motifs that, when combined, made Freund's personal style so distinctive.

The relatively small number of studies of individual cinematographers that *have* been conducted are almost universally limited to Gregg Toland. Authors such as Pauline Kael,[4] Robert L. Carringer,[5] Patrick Cowan,[6] and Evan Lieberman & Kerry Hegarty[7] all document Toland's contributions to film authorship and visual style in great detail, most of them mentioning his use of deep focus, staging in depth, and low angle shots. Although these research findings on Toland are important, it must be noted that he enjoyed a large and uncommon degree of creative autonomy in the industry, having worked mostly outside of traditional studio control. Karl Freund's 40-year career at UFA, Universal, MGM, Warner Bros., and Desilu serves as a more illuminating and more typical case study of how a cinematographer worked within the confines of a studio or production company in the classical era, while also developing his own specific craft and displaying his own distinctive style on the screen.

Most of the scholarly research published about Freund's visual style to this point focuses primarily on his career in Europe, including notably Paul Matthew St. Pierre's book *Cinematography in the Weimar Republic: Lola Lola, Dirty Singles, and the Men Who Shot Them* (2016). A chapter titled "Karl Freund's Signature Visual Designs in Manifold Collaborations" from St. Pierre's book examines several films that Karl Freund worked on either as camera operator or DP during his time working on German films between 1919 and 1930, including *Die Spinnen* (*The Spiders*, 1919), *Metropolis* (1927), *Der Golem* (*The Golem,* 1920), *Mikaël* (*Michael*, 1924), *Die Finanzen des Grossherzogs* (*The Grand Duke's Finances*, 1924), *Herr Tartuff* (*Tartuff*, 1924), and *Der letzte Mann* (*The Last Laugh*, 1924). St. Pierre's exploration of these texts focuses primarily on Freund's camera movement, shot selection, and special effects, as each film is painstakingly inspected for Freund's stylistic signature. However, the scholarly focus on Karl Freund's unique style largely ends after his career in Germany, as previous research mostly ignores Freund's unique visual style during his time as a cinematographer in the Hollywood studio system, including his significant contributions to such films as *Dracula* (1931), *Murders in the Rue Morgue* (1932), *The Good Earth* (1937), *Pride and Prejudice* (1940), *The Seventh Cross* (1944), and *Key Largo* (1948). St. Pierre gives us two possible explanations for why German cinematographers were not only more celebrated than Hollywood cinematographers during the respective Weimar and classical Hollywood eras, but also potential answers for why scholars devote more focus to the former. First, he points out that German directors and cinematographers were "equal partners" on set during the Weimar era, a collaborative form of "work sharing" where a "distinctive visual grammar" and "syntax" of camera techniques and technologies developed.[8] Second, Weimar culture, and Berlin culture in

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

particular, became "the principal site of the interdisciplinary avant-garde of the Modernist movement," at a time when cinema was still an emerging art form, giving the German film industry a reputation for its artistry and aesthetic. Meanwhile, according to St. Pierre, Hollywood became the principal site of the motion picture *business*, adhering to an assembly line business model and hierarchical division of labor more driven by rank than artistic collaboration.[9]

Because of these differences, it is important to note that almost no Hollywood cinematographers (other than Toland) are recognized for their individual contributions and visual style, as most did not enjoy Toland's degree of autonomy while working mostly under traditional studio control. Patrick Keating states that because the Hollywood studio system was so devoted to the clear, comprehensible narration style, "Hollywood cinematographers often worked hard to make their techniques as unobtrusive as possible."[10] In his now canonical book *The Genius of the System*, Thomas Schatz defines the filmmaking process in the Hollywood studio system as "the melding of institutional forces," which occurred when "the 'style' of a writer, director, star—or even a cinematographer, art director, or costume designer—fused with the studio's production operations and management structure."[11] The "studio production operations" that Schatz is referring to includes something he calls the studio's "house style," which is evident in the collective filmic output of each studio with respect to stars, genre, tone, and aesthetic. Universal garnered success with their series of horror films, MGM created opulent, prestige literary adaptations, and Warner Bros. became synonymous with dark social dramas and crime films. Thus, part of Freund's adjustment to the Hollywood studio system was the process of transitioning to the emerging house style of Universal, and later MGM and Warner Bros, while also incorporating his own aesthetic, techniques, and visual motifs.

Cinematographers like Freund also had to navigate the early constraints of the synchronized sound era, beginning in the late 1920s, when bulky (and noisy) cameras were stashed in sound-proof boxes that inhibited the cinematographer's ability to move the camera and notably limited shot selection and technical innovation. After the early hurdles of synchronized sound were overcome, the mid-1930s brought a period of greater freedom and experimentation for cinematographers. Quieter cameras and lights allowed cinematographers to literally start shooting "outside the box," abandoning the constraints of soundproof buildings, and instead adopt a sharper visual style, aided by faster lenses, more sensitive film stocks, and a reduction in the lighting needed to illuminate a set. However, Chris Cagle notes these periods of novelty and experimentation for cinematographers were often followed by stages of adaptation and a new hegemony of film techniques, creating further standardization in the cinematographic craft and potentially allowing for less individual style.[12]

Some scholars believe the standardization of both technology and the house style during the classical Hollywood era dampened individual authorship and style. Christopher Beach, for instance, acknowledges some cinematographers enjoyed more

autonomy as technicians, but posits "the average studio cinematographer of the 1930's was not afforded a great deal of latitude in the development of a personal style."[13] As cinematographers standardized their technical processes in the 1910s and 1920s, Keating explains these technicians "established patterns of visual storytelling," while also "grow[ing] to think of themselves as artists."[14] Chris Cagle argues that the 1930s brought "smaller, incremental changes to the art and profession of cinematographer," and thus historians and scholars tend to belabor the institutional and aesthetic stability of the studio system, products of the industry's efforts toward standardization. However, Cagle fears "overemphasizing the standardization of the 'classical Hollywood system' can cause historians to undervalue important stylistic developments," including those made by individual cinematographers.[15] Given the potential for conflict between a personal style and a standardized industry aesthetic, Lieberman and Hegarty point out that each cinematographer "must always be analyzed on a case-by-case basis" and that "on any given film, the cinematographer has some degree of input, and his or her role is reflective of not only industrial norms, but also individual stylistic tendencies."[16] Thus, a cinematographer doesn't have to be free of studio constraints to have a consistent visual style, an important point to consider when analyzing Freund.

Barry Salt asserts that identifying an individual cinematographer's style can be very difficult. "I can see little obvious connection between the strong chiaroscuro appearance of the lighting in *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* and the rather pedestrian mid-key look of *Back Street*, both photographed by Karl Freund for Universal in 1932," writes Salt. "However, when Freund's work is juxtaposed with that of William Daniels on *Camille* in (1937), a difference is recognizable. The point where Freund took over the lighting of this film from Daniels is fairly obvious."[17] While this finding may be "obvious" to Salt, a cinematographer's unique visual style is often not apparent to the average film viewer, and thus this study attempts to isolate the consistent trends in Freund's visual style, such as persistent and motivated movement of the camera; long takes; effects-lighting; and use of shadows, fog, and mirrors as visual motifs. These trends and others are examined in this study and screenshots are provided to illustrate, support, and elucidate the study's findings. Conclusions from this analysis identify both consistencies and anomalies in Freund's style and discuss the evolution of that style across studios, directors, and technological advancements.

The purpose of this study is to explore Karl Freund's Hollywood movie career through his unique visual style, a revealing case study given Freund's entrenchment in the studio system when compared to Toland. Research for this article largely entailed a formalist textual analysis of Karl Freund's films, both as director and as cinematographer. While some websites assign him as many as 160 credits, many of these are his German silent films and are no longer available to the viewing public. This study focuses primarily on the 35 Hollywood films still available with Freund credited as cinematographer, and also includes his five available directorial credits for Universal and MGM. In addition to

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

shedding light on Freund's visual style, this study provides much needed general analysis of the art of cinematography in the Hollywood studio era and details the facets of authorship and visual style for which these cameramen could stake a claim within the studio system. By conducting this type of research on these craftsmen of the studio era, we garner a more enriched understanding of the early years of American movie industry, the studio system that produced its filmic output, and the technicians and craftsmen that labored to create its product. We also gain a better understanding of Freund himself, one of cinema's most talented and influential cinematographers.

THE VISUAL STYLE OF KARL FREUND IN HOLLYWOOD

When exploring cinematographer authorship in the classical Hollywood system, production histories and anecdotes from cast and crew members will tell us many things, but what they won't tell us is the extent to which the cinematographer's own personal style—i.e., the visual evidence of said authorship—is displayed in their body of work. The most common aspects of Karl Freund's style defined by scholars and critics are usually some combination of his use of the "unchained camera" and his skill at creating expressionistic images. Although both of these were true of his German career, his Hollywood career was defined by a more diverse and unobtrusive style that evolved depending on the film, studio, or director with whom he worked. Some of Freund's early films at Universal relied heavily on his German Expressionism roots, but utilization of these skills was largely exclusive to his work in the growing horror franchise at the studio. And while Freund would always utilize a very mobile camera throughout his Hollywood career, the movement would be less conspicuous and serve a greater narrative purpose than the more pronounced and sometimes eccentric camera movement in his early German films, such as *Der letzte Mann* (*The Last Laugh*, 1924) and *Varieté* (*Variety*, 1925). Freund's use of camera movement in the classical Hollywood era can largely be divided into three consistently used techniques: the follow shot (or tracking shot), the dolly-in or dolly-out shot, and the crane shot. Cinematographers used these three types of camera movement in many different ways, but Freund deployed them more frequently than most and their utilization served many distinct purposes.

In addition to camera movement, textual analysis of the films on which Freund worked reveals numerous visual motifs that define his style, including the use of shadows, fog, and mirrors. This shadow motif extended to Freund's heavy use of effects-lighting, designed to create natural (and in many cases symbolic) shadows in a setting or on an actor. To further accentuate a setting, he would foreground objects in the frame, including other characters, props, or set dressings pertinent to the scene. Freund also used framing devices, such as circular shapes to frame a character's head or windows to frame a character or conversation. And his use of expansive long shots could dwarf characters in the vastness of their surroundings.

All of these techniques, motifs, and methods combine to define the distinct personal style of Karl Freund, whether he was the film's director or cinematographer, and they are also largely missing or muted in projects in which he served in a shared or temporary role as a film's director of photography. For instance, Karl Freund worked briefly on two films that were largely shot by other cinematographers: *Three Comrades* (1938) and the aforementioned *Camille* (1936). Both films feature impressive cinematography, but the style of the two films feels very different than that of a typical film shot by Karl Freund. And there are reasons for those dissimilarities. Freund took over for cinematographer William Daniels mid-picture on *Camille* after the latter fell ill. And Joseph Ruttenberg took over for Freund before filming began on *Three Comrades*, for reasons unknown.[18] In the case of *Camille*, director George Cukor and Freund worked together to make sure the remainder of the footage shot for the film matched that of the footage already shot by Daniels. Thus, the visual style of that film proved much different than one shot entirely by Freund: less moving camera, fewer stylistic motifs, and more conventional framing. When comparing the first ten minutes of *Camille* (mostly shot by Daniels) with the first ten minutes of *A Guy Named* Joe (a film shot entirely by Freund), there are four moving camera shots in the former compared to 15 in the latter, and the average shot length in *Camille* is 6.95 seconds compared to 8.69 seconds in *A Guy Named Joe*. And with *Three Comrades* (1938), the first ten minutes only contained 6 moving shots to *A Guy Named Joe*'s 15 and the average shot length was 6.45 seconds compared to *A Guy Named Joe*'s 8.69. In other words, when compared to these two other M-G-M cinematographers (Daniels and Ruttenberg), Freund was moving the camera more and intercutting between shots less often.

These two examples are important, because if it can be demonstrated that Freund had his own unique visual style in the films on which he was the primary cinematographer, then it also suggests that the films on which he was not the primary cinematographer differ noticeably enough that we recognize those films do not contain the same consistent techniques, motifs, and methods. Certain cinematographers, such as Gregg Toland, used foregrounding and expansive long shots similar to Freund, but they did not frequently move their camera or use the same visual motifs, as studies from Liberman, Hegarty, and Cowan show. Other cinematographers, such as James Wong Howe, innovated with camera movement and frequently depicted shadows in their frame, but relied more on deep focus and experimentation with handheld camera work then Freund. So, what makes Freund's style unique is not necessarily the techniques he used, but the combination of those techniques, in addition to their frequency and prevalence throughout his body of work.

And while many of the visual examples provided in this article were likely the decision of multiple collaborating crew members with the director having the ultimate say, the fact that a signature visual style emerges time and time again in the films on which Freund served as primary cinematographer suggests that a director of photography

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

could hold a substantial degree of authorship in the resulting style of a picture in the classical Hollywood era. Freund was the closest thing to a famous cameraman in this period, coming out of Germany with unprecedented celebrity. His star status as a cameraman put him in demand and commanded a certain amount of respect in collaborative partnerships. Therefore, although many of Freund's techniques, motifs, and methods would have to be approved by a director, their reoccurrence in Freund's work shows they often were. Of course, Freund could also be a particularly dominant presence on the set of a film, much to the dismay of some of the cast and crew with whom he worked. But whether it was cinematographic leeway, tyrannical intimidation, or a likely combination of the two, films shot by Freund have a consistent and diverse use of moving camera, motifs, and composition that can make a film Freund directed or shot recognizable as such. This cannot be said of all cameramen in the classical Hollywood era, which is why the work of Karl Freund is worthy of scholarly attention and analysis.

CAMERA MOVEMENT

The artistry of Karl Freund, including his use of a mobile camera, was something that Freund himself would publicly denounce upon his arrival in Hollywood in the early 1930's. "Artistic pictures! Nuts!," he said. "It's a business—entertainment business. It's not an art. That's boloney [sic]."[19] This quote is in direct contrast to the ongoing push at the time from the American Society of Cinematographers (ASC) to publicize their membership of Hollywood cinematographers and camera technicians as artists, not just craftsmen. Patrick Keating states this is because by the beginning of the sound era in the late 1920s, cinematographers "acquired a new public identity" as artists. Promoted through its technical journal *American Cinematographer*, the ASC "crafted a compelling narrative" that cinematographers were not just "a laborer turning a crank," but instead were "skilled professional[s] making a valuable contribution to the cinema—a contribution that could best be described as aesthetic."[20] In reality, Ronny Regev argues that "the line separating art from craftsmanship is quite blurry," and Hollywood cinematographers and other craftsmen "had a liminal identity—between arts and crafts."[21] While many cinematographers strived to be recognized as artists, the fact that cinematographers practiced traditional craft practices, such as hierarchical division of labor, trade apprenticeships, and the creation of trade organizations such as the ASC, likely made them feel more like craftsman and trade workers, potentially explaining Freund's mockery of artistry.

Freund's quotes denying artistry are reminiscent of a discourse that Patrick Keating identifies from the early years of sound cinema regarding camera movement, where cinematographers denounced camera movement in public, but frequently practiced it in their films. Filmmakers such as Rouben Mamoulian, James Wong Howe, and George Cukor were all quoted as being critical of camera movement, but as Keating notes, all

three were "quite daring" in their use of it in films such as *Applause* (1929), *Body and Soul* (1947), and *The Women* (1939). "The moving camera was an integral part of Hollywood's filmmaking technique, and [these filmmakers] knew it," says Keating.[22] Freund also knew it, and while he decried artistry in public, he practiced it throughout his film career, even forming an organization in Berlin with the purpose of producing solely artistic films.[23] Perhaps Freund was just bemoaning the lack of artistry in the Hollywood studio system when compared to his time in Germany, but as Keating points out, "the high-powered studio system enabled some of the most fluid camera work in the world." But given that the classical Hollywood style was defined by its coherent narrative storytelling, Keating argues that with camera movement, "the challenge for filmmakers lay not in the how but in the why."[24] In other words, the camera movement needed to be motivated and have meaning. It could not be movement for movement's sake.

For Freund, camera movement could have multiple meanings depending on the technique, but its utilization seemed primarily rooted in his preference for long takes. David Bordwell refers to Freund's early Hollywood work on the film *Back Street* (1932) as "built out of abnormally long takes."[25] Freund also desired to avoid frequent intercutting between scenes. This was a similar preference for cinematographer Gregg Toland, but the two filmmakers achieved this desired avoidance using different techniques. Toland used deep focus photography in conjunction with his long takes, stating his primary goal was geared "toward increasing realism and making mechanical details imperceptible," by "avoid[ing] direct cuts" and "achieving further visual simplification."[26] However, Freund used camera movement to achieve this same goal. By tracking with moving characters through follow shots, dollying in or out during a long take to change the shot distance, or using a crane to float through crowded spaces, Freund was able to achieve two simultaneous goals: 1) to avoid excessive intercutting in scenes that he believed might detract from the realism of the scene and 2) to instill his long takes with a sense of dynamism missing from static long takes. In addition to these two primary motivations, Freund's moving camera served other purposes that varied from shot to shot with the commonality that the shot either served the narrative, the character, the setting, or some combination of the three. Thus, while other cinematographers moved their cameras using follow shots, dollying in or out, or craning, Freund's frequent and pervasive combination of the three techniques and their desired effect constituted part of Freund's unique style.

THE FOLLOW SHOT

The follow shot is a dolly technique where the camera tracks with a person, group, object, or a series of people or objects. The opening scene of *Touch of Evil* (1958) is a perfect example of a complex follow shot using a crane, where the camera follows a bomb to its intended destination in the trunk of a car, and then follows the car through the streets of Mexico where the camera shifts its attention back and forth between a walking

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

married couple and the car. The entire shot lasts three-and-a-half minutes before the film cuts to a shot of the car exploding. While the shot is definitely an authorial flourish by the film's director, Orson Welles, it also serves to establish the inciting incident (the bomb exploding), the primary characters (Mike and Susan Vargas), the primary setting (the border between the US and Mexico), and the stakes, as the primary characters were directly next to the bomb seconds before it exploded.

Although Freund's follow shots are never as long or complex as the opening shot of *Touch of Evil*, they often serve similar purposes. In *A Guy Named Joe* (1943), the film opens as B-25 pilot Pete Sandidge (Spencer Tracy) survives a crash landing while returning to his base. Freund uses a follow shot to track with Sandidge and his commanding officer, "Nails" Kilpatrick (James Gleason), from the site of the wreckage to the base headquarters. Lasting 45 seconds, the shot seems simple enough, but the long take and the fluid motion of the camera following the two men accomplishes multiple goals. First, the fluid shot establishes an important character trait about Sandidge, in that he seems ill at ease with staying still, as though he would rather be in motion in the sky. Second, as the shot serves to provide necessary character and plot exposition to the audience, the motion of the camera instills the long take with an element of dynamism. The motion of the camera shows the audience that this scene (like the characters) is taking them somewhere. Third, by following both characters instead of intercutting between the two, the shot provides the first glimpse of the relationship and juxtaposition between Sandidge and Kilpatrick with respect to their disposition, body language, and facial expressions. Freund often used follow shots to explore the *developing* relationship between two characters, such as in *The Good Earth* (1937) and *Parnell* (1937), where the motion of the camera symbolized the motion forward of the characters' relationship. And finally, the shot also established the layout of the military base to the audience, giving them a sense of the setting where the first part of the film takes place. All of these necessary storytelling goals are accomplished in one 45-second follow shot that allows them to be achieved collectively and efficiently.

Freund also used follow shots to show the frenetic surroundings of a particular setting. In *Cry 'Havoc'* (1943), the film opens with Lt. Mary Smith (Margaret Sullavan) working at an Army nurse's station overseas during World War II. To show that she is overworked, Freund used a follow shot to track with Smith through the chaotic and understaffed work place. Rather than using just a straight lateral follow shot, Freund's camera weaves around the beds. The complexity of the movement mirrors the complexity of the hospital. Of course, filming these complex follow shots had its dangers as well. If the shot was too complex and moved too many different directions, the cinematographers risked accidentally filming the floor tracking in the frame. This shot in *Cry 'Havoc'* contains an example of this very mishap, as you can briefly see the track system on the floor as the camera moves.

Freund used these shots to convey as much narrative, character, and setting information in the most engaging way possible, and so it makes sense that he would frequently use these shots to begin movies. One of Freund's longest opening following shots was the 90-second opening shot of *That Hagen Girl* (1947). The shot begins with a chauffeur pulling up to a train station, exiting the car, and approaching a train station attendant (fig. 2.1). The two men have a brief discussion about the nature of the driver's presence there (fig. 2.2). Then the shot introduces a third man, a husband who is waiting to pick up his wife (fig. 2.3). Introducing the three characters separately and then following all three of them to train connects them in the audience's mind (fig. 2.4). The driver is there to pick up a wealthy family for whom he works, the husband is there to pick up his wife with a newborn baby that they are adopting, and the attendant is there to witness that the two events are related; the adopted baby is one that the wealthy family is giving up for adoption to avoid scandal. Intercutting among these characters, connections, and revelations and still making sense to the audience may have proven tricky, but by using a follow shot, Freund is able to connect all these things in an interesting way.

FIGS. 2.1-2.4. Characters converge in a follow shot from *That Hagen Girl* (1947). Author's screenshots.

In addition to convergence, Keating identifies two other themes that the moving camera can emphasize: dynamism and seriality. By focusing on motifs surrounding the

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

"big city," dynamism comments on modernity in the US. Freund's films tend to avoid this type of thematic movement, but do occasionally dabble in seriality. Keating defines the seriality shot as a technique to use the moving camera "to evoke the idea of stultifying sameness."[27] One of the examples that Keating provides is a shot from *The Seventh Cross* (1944), which is a film that Karl Freund shot. Like the other examples of follow shots, this shot begins the film. The film opens on a single wooden cross at a concentration camp and begins to track down a path showing more and more crosses, each one joining the frame (fig. 2.5). The camera reaches a final cross, with the others now out of view, and stops, letting the audience know the character intended for this cross is the subject of the film (fig. 2.6). Keating has strong opinions about the efficacy of this shot, arguing "the shot's seriality, revealing one cross after another, gestures to the vastness of the camp's crimes, as if the series could extend forever," but ultimately he concludes the shot "implicitly criticizes [the film's] own narrative strategy" and "admits an uncomfortable truth: telling this story (of an escapee, explicitly identified as non-Jewish) inevitably obscures the other stories that the film is not telling (of the Jewish victims unable to escape)."[28] Setting the potential negative connotations of this shot aside briefly, it's worth noting that this type of follow shot adheres closely to Freund's aesthetic, in that it uses movement to introduce the audience to a central narrative device to help frame the film's story, in this instance the seven crosses. Whenever one of the escapees is captured, they are brutally secured to the cross, and therefore their presences helps chart the progress of the story, with the final cross remaining empty intended for the one prisoner never recovered.

FIGS. 2.5-2.6. Follow shot tracks down a series of crosses in *The Seventh Cross* (1944). Author's screenshots.

THE DOLLY-IN AND DOLLY-OUT

Dolly-in and dolly-out shots use the same floor tracking system that a follow shot uses, but rather than following action, the dolly-in and dolly-out draws the audience's

attention to or away from a particular object, person, or action. Freund used the dolly-in and dolly-out shots for very specific results, and often operated in one of three ways. First, the camera would frame an important character or object in a scene, such as a meal, a clock, or an ashtray, and then dolly-out to re-frame the importance of that character or object to the scene. Second, Freund would often end a scene with a dolly-in on an important object or on a specific character's reaction to what just transpired in the scene. These shots often served as a transition to the following scene. And finally, Freund used dolly-in/dolly-out shots to change the shot distance in a scene without intercutting. For instance. Freund frequently dollied from a long shot to a medium shot or from a close-up of a person's face to a medium shot or a long shot of the room.

The first of these three uses of dolly shots, in which Freund would frame an important character or object and then dolly-out to re-frame the character or object within a scene, was typically used to show the passage of time. The most obvious instance of this is in *Conquest* (1937), where the scene opens with a shot of a clock to show the late hour before a dolly-out and a slight pan reveals the entire room in which the clock sits. A house servant has fallen asleep in a chair waiting for the Countess Marie Walewska (Greta Garbo) to return from her late-night meeting with Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte (Charles Boyer). Upon hearing the sound of her return, her anxious husband, Count Anastas Waslewski (Henry Stepehenson), comes rushing out of his bedroom to open the door for her. Beginning this shot with the clock frames the entire scene around the late hour and what her late-night return may imply about the Countess' relationship with Napoleon, in addition to the anxiety the Count feels about what may have transpired between the two.

Freund used this technique in numerous other films. In *The Mummy* (1932), it was the close-up of full ashtray and a dolly-out to show how long a character has been waiting to hear about someone's condition. In *Tortilla Flat* (1942), a scene opens on a close-up of a cooked chicken that has been picked down to the bones and then a dolly-out to show the kitchen table where the characters who enjoyed the meal are sitting sluggishly with full bellies. A close-up of a Christmas tree and a dolly-out to show characters opening presents in the room helps set the season of a scene in *Blossoms in the Dust* (1941). Or a close-up of a birthday cake that reads "Happy Birthday, Nick" and a dolly-out to show Nick Charles' parents putting candles in the cake establishes to the audience the importance of this particular day in *The Thin Man Goes Home* (1944).

While starting with a close-up of an object that helps establish the time or setting of a scene is not that unusual in classical Hollywood studio films, Freund's consistent use of using the dolly-out rather than a cut is a signature aspect of the Karl Freund style, adhering to both his preference for camera movement and the long take over frequent intercutting. It was a technique that allowed Freund and the crew with which he collaborated to depict important narrative information without a single bit of dialogue. For instance, a scene in *Bright Leaf* (1950) is able to simultaneously depict Brant Royle's

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

(Gary Cooper) extravagance and loneliness by opening a scene with a close-up of a fancy and elaborate Christmas cake, followed by a dolly-out that shows the huge dining room table on which it sits is empty, save for Royle. Royle has accumulated enormous wealth, but he has no one to share it with, as his business tactics and worsening alcoholism have alienated those closest to him. In *Back Street* (1932), a medium shot of a character near a bandstand begins a dolly-out to reveal row after row of empty benches. The camera continues to dolly out to increasingly reveal the character's isolation in this empty setting. These shots say so much without a character saying anything at all.

Freund also used the reverse of this shot, ending a scene with a dolly-in on an important object or character action to end a scene to draw attention to its significance. In a *Scandal for Sale* (1932), a scene ends on a dolly-in of an important room number on an apartment door. In *Pride and Prejudice* (1940), a dolly-in of on Mr. Darcy (Laurence Olivier) standing outside of a window at the end of a scene shows us that he witnessed important information mentioned at a party. In *Air Mail* (1932), a dolly-in shows us air mail pilots reacting to the posting of their work schedule. And in *Bright Leaf*, the camera captures the stencil letters on a window that read "Elite Gown Shoppe" before a dolly-in reveals a specific character inside the shop. Like the dolly-out shots, Freund uses the dolly-in shots as a means to give the audience important information without intercutting, integrating the narrative flow with the mobile flow of the camera.

Freund also preferred to avoid intercutting between shot distances and would dolly in and dolly out to go from one shot distance to another. In *A Guy Named Joe*, Freund films a scene with Pete Sandidge talking to youthful fans of his piloting antics. He begins in a long shot, but as the characters move closer to the camera and sit on some barrels, they are now in medium-long. After a dolly-in, we are closer to the characters in a medium shot that makes the scene feel more intimate not only between the characters, but with the audience. In *Back Street*, two characters begin an uncomfortable conversation in medium-long. The two characters seat themselves on a bed and as the conversation becomes more comfortable, a dolly-in to a medium shot makes the change in shot distance reflect the change in the intimacy of the conversation. A dolly-in could be also used to both change the shot distance and re-frame a shot when some characters depart a scene, as it did in *Montana* (1950), when a dolly-in re-framed Errol Flynn from a medium shot to a medium-close up. And in rare cases, a slow dolly-in or dolly-out could change the shot distance multiple times. An early scene in *The Mummy* opens on a close-up of the broken pieces of an ancient tablet (fig. 2.7). The continuous dolly-out changes the shot distance to a medium shot in which two characters discuss the significance of the tablets (fig. 2.8), and then to a long shot, now showing us the entire room where the open sarcophagus and its mummified contents establish the connection between the tablet pieces and the mummy and foreshadow the danger that the mummy's presence will eventually represent (fig. 2.9). This shot from *The Mummy* is important because it shows that many of these dolly-in and dolly-out shots could accomplish multiple things at once.

A dolly-out could both change the shot distance and emphasize the importance of an object to a scene. A dolly-in could both change the shot distance and re-frame a shot around a particular character, such as the shots from *Montana* and *Pride and Prejudice*.

FIGS. 2.7-2.9. A dolly-out could change the shot distance multiple times, such as this continuous shot in *The Mummy* (1932). Author's screenshots.

THE CRANE SHOT

To accomplish camera movement more elaborate than a dolly could provide, Freund utilized a crane that could turn a close-up into a long shot, turn a long shot into a medium shot or close-up, or seemingly float in any direction, giving the camera free reign in a particular setting. In *Pride and Prejudice*, a close-up of a chandelier cranes down and out to reveal a long shot of party guests dancing and continues to crane out until it floats over a serving table. In *A Guy Named Joe*, a shot begins with a close-up of Ted Randall (Van Johnson) and cranes out and up to reveal a table full of seated guests at a nightclub, depicting the growing popularity of Randall's character. In *That Hagen Girl*, Freund used the reverse of this shot, opening a scene with an extreme long shot of a school dance and craning in and down to a medium close-up of a couple dancing. And in *The Mummy*, Freund films a conversation between Ardath Bey (Boris Karloff) and Helen Grosvenor (Zita Johann) before craning up and in, tilting down, and then craning back down toward a mysterious pool that magically displays visions of the past.

Freund also used crane shots to move more freely through spaces, as in *Dracula* (1931) when the camera cranes under and through the arched sign for the Seward Sanitarium, roams the grounds, and then cranes up and in while panning left to land on a long shot through the barred window of Renfield's room. Freund utilized these types of shots frequently in depicting scenes that took place on a theater stage. The films *The Chocolate Soldier* (1941) and *Du Barry Was a Lady* (1943) contain multiple song and dance numbers on a theater stage, and Freund uses the crane to float in and out or side to side to capture the action. This type of camera movement turns what might have been static long shots of the proscenium into a dynamic moving space where the camera can change shot distances, follow different characters or actions, and give the audience a more engaging experience watching the on-stage performances. Intercutting between a variety

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

of shots could have also depicted the actions on-stage, but Freund preferred the long take and movement to accomplish these shots.

Panning was another camera movement that Freund used, but not nearly to the extent as the others. A pan by Freund's camera was almost always used to follow action from one side of the screen to the other. His most dynamic use of the pan was in *The Kiss Before the Mirror* (1933), where his operator executes an impressive 360 degree pan in the middle of a courtroom. The shot slowly reveals the entirety of the courtroom, focusing on the reactions of the lawyers, gallery of spectators, jury, and finally the judge. It not only provides us with an uninterrupted sweep of everyone in the courtroom, but further suspends audience disbelief by seemingly showing there's nothing behind the camera.

Many of these shots fit into multiple categories that I have outlined, demonstrating that Freund was able to accomplish numerous things with a simple (or not-so-simple) movement of the camera. He could crane or dolly to follow a character or he could dolly and pan to reveal the entirety of a room. It's also important to remember that these movements were not constant. Usually, these movements bookended the long static takes Freund preferred, which could sometimes lead to intercutting between tighter coverage shots. As previously mentioned, camera movement in the classical Hollywood era was used frequently, but had to be motivated by a purpose, and the mobile camera of Karl Freund was no different.

VISUAL MOTIFS

The early Universal monster movies on which Freund began his Hollywood career frequently used visual devices such as shadows, fog, and mirrors to help create an eerie expressionistic atmosphere of suspense. But Freund continued to use these devices long past his transition from horror to other genres, and for an increasingly diverse number of reasons. However, this isn't to say that Freund was always responsible for the presence of these motifs in a picture. In many cases, shadows, fog, and mirrors were likely already in the script or were the decision of a director, production designer, or a combination of multiple crew members. Timothy Barnard uses the French term *decoupage* to explain this process that "involves the filmmaker in tandem with the scriptwriter, cinematographer and other personnel…deciding on the film's treatment before and during the film shoot."[29] Although the inclusion of these motifs could come from multiple sources, textual analysis of Freund's films as both director and cinematographer reveal the use of these motifs over and over again, no matter with whom Freund was collaborating. Freund used shadows to depict acts of violence without fully showing them, to conceal a character's identity, or to emphasize or imply the possibly sinister nature of a character. Fog was used to create eerie or ominous exteriors, represent the appearance of something supernatural or magical, or as a means of isolating a scene or character(s). Mirrors were used to create

interesting two-shots, externalize the self-reflection of a character, or depict the juxtaposition between two characters. Freund also frequently winked at his own use of mirrors, playing with them in unique and comical ways, so as to keep the motif fresh. All three of these motifs were incorporated into most of Freund's films and are a sign of his contribution to the visual style of the pictures he shot.

SHADOWS

From the 1930s to the 1950s, the Motion Picture Production Code (MPPC) served as means for Hollywood to self-regulate and censor itself to avoid government intervention aimed at making Hollywood films less risqué and violent. Designed to protect the standards of decency of the era, the MPPC, and its enforcement by Joseph Breen from the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA), prohibited studios and filmmakers from depicting certain acts, especially extreme violence.[30] As violence was an integral component of the early Universal horror films, filmmakers had to find discrete, but suggestive ways to show the extreme violence (or evidence of it) without actually showing it. For Freund, the preferred technique for depicting violence was through shadows. In *Dracula*, the shadow of the murdered ship captain of the *Vesta* is shown lifeless, tied to the wheel of the ship (fig. 2.10). In *Murders in the Rue Morgue* (1932), a shadow of Erik, the homicidal gorilla, and his outreached hand are cast over the head of Camille, the woman he will abduct (fig. 2.11). Later in the film, when Erik strangles his master, Dr. Mirakle (Bela Lugosi), the act of murder is depicted in the form of a shadow on the wall (fig. 2.12). This technique could also be used to depict an immoral (but not necessarily deadly) act from a film's protagonist. In *Tortilla Flat*, when Pilon (Spencer Tracy) breaks into the home of Dolores (Hedy Lamarr) to steal her newly acquired electric vacuum cleaner, the act is shown through shadows cast on the opposite wall where the appliance sits (fig. 2.13). Because the audience is expected to celebrate Pilon's redemption at the end of the film, the shadowed depiction of the crime spares him (and us) the outright depiction of his transgression. Stephen Prince calls the use of shadows to conceal acts of violence "shadow play," and he notes that this type of concealment was a visual code that "enabled filmmakers to indirectly depict acts of violence and offered a strategy for evading the (Production Code) and the regional censors." Prince argues these shadow plays worked toward two contradictory ends in gangster and horror movies; on the one hand, they concealed the violence, the shadows allowed the films to "slip past censors," while also distilling the violence into its most purest and concentrated form, "a silhouette seen against a pure white background."[31]

Freund also used shadows to conceal a character's identity, although the purpose of that concealment varied across genres. In a murder-mystery such as *The Thin Man Goes Home*, a shadowed figured uses a blunt object to knock out Nick Charles, thus

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

FIGS. 2.10-2.13. Violent or immoral acts depicted through shadows in *Dracula, Murders in the Rue Morgue*, and *Tortilla Flat.* Author's screenshots.

provoking the audience to ask, "Whodunnit?" In a thriller centered around marital mistrust such as *Undercurrent* (1946), an approaching shadow slowly descending a staircase builds suspense, as we assume it belongs to Ann Hamilton's (Katharine Hepburn) duplicitous and possibly murderous husband, Alan Garroway (Robert Taylor). In a wartime thriller like *The Seventh Cross*, an approaching shadow can also build suspense, as when the characters (and the audience) don't know if the approaching shadow is friend or foe. And in some cases, shadows could be used to conceal a minor character's physical identity if they were not a central figure to the story, allowing audiences to remember fewer faces while watching the film. In *That Hagen Girl*, a dolly-in shot of a baby girl in a bassinet begins a montage showing the child's growth, as a narrator explains the torment of gossip the child will experience in her lifetime as a result of her unknown parentage. In the scene, rather than show the adopted mother watching over the baby, the woman's shadow is cast against the wall to show the baby is not alone in the room and is being cared for (fig. 2.14). In *Two Smart People* (1946), the shadows of musicians and parade attendees appear on the wall of an alley and show the audience the proximity of the parade to the alley. And in *This Time for Keeps* (1947), two nightclub dancers are shown on stage with the shadow of a musician behind them to show the presence of the band (fig. 2.15).

FIGS. 2.14-2.15. Shadows show the presence of minor characters whose identity is not central to the film's narrative in *That Hagen Girl* and *This Time For Keeps.* Author's screenshots.

Freund proved shadows could also be useful in foreshadowing (accurately or falsely) that a character was more sinister than they appeared to be. Dr. Mirakle in *Murders in the Rue Morgue*, Alan Garroway in *Undercurrent*, and Crazy Mary in *The Thin Man Comes Home* were all given this treatment by Freund. The characters were filmed with towering shadows over them to insinuate their evil intentions, or in the case of Crazy Mary, whose shadow was cast taller over the other characters shadows symbolizing the perceived threat she represents. The fact that Crazy Mary ends up being (relatively) harmless shows the shadow was a ruse by Freund to trick the audience and leave them questioning the real identity of the murderer. The most famous example of Freund using this tactic is the much-discussed shot in *Conquest*, where the shadow of Napoleon looms over a map of Europe on the wall, symbolizing his ambition for continental subjugation (fig. 2.16). The *New York Times* made special note of this achievement by Freund, calling it an "impressive shot."[32]

FIG. 2.16. Napoleon's shadow symbolically cast on a map of Europe in *Conquest.* Author's screenshot.

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

Shadows were definitely one of Freund's specialties and not just those cast by a character's form. Freund is highly regarded for his use of effects-lighting, which *American Cinematographer* defines as "any type of lighting which attempts to reproduce the effect of the illumination you'd actually see in any particular room or place under the conditions of the story."[33] Keating further defines effects-lighting as "the look of sunlight shining through a set of blinds," "the effect of moonlight peeking through the trees," and "a shot that appeared to be dimly lit by a single light bulb," and makes a specific reference to Freund's use of the technique in *The Mummy*.[34] In most cases, this type of lighting was something simple, like the shadows of tree leaves cast on a wall or door to give the appearance of daytime outside. But like character shadows, Freund used effects-lighting as an effective means of symbolism. In *Parnell*, the shadows of window bars cast on Parnell (Clark Gable) symbolize not only his literal imprisonment, but also the figurative imprisonment of Ireland by English rule (fig. 2.17). In *Bright Leaf*, Brant Royle gazes obsessively out a window of his home that looks directly at the home and plantation of his biggest competitor, Major Singleton (Donald Crisp). The arch-shaped window casts a shadow in the room that is always present, symbolizing that Singleton's success casts both a literal and figurative shadow over Royle's every action (fig. 2.18). Freund understood the importance of lighting tricks like these to emphasize thematic elements of a picture.

FIGS 2.17-2.18. Freund's use of symbolic effects-lighting in *Parnell* and *Bright Leaf.* Author's screenshots.

FOG

Freund's use of fog was also full of symbolism and emerged with his work in the early Universal horror films. In *Dracula* and *Murders in the Rue Morgue*, fog was used in almost every night exterior scene as a tool to create an eerie and ominous atmosphere (fig. 2.19). Whether in Dracula's crypt, on a trail through the Carpathian Mountains, or in the city streets of London or Paris, the two films often feel shrouded in the symbolism of an evil that will envelop them at any time, just like the fog. As Freund's Hollywood career

progressed, he began to use fog to symbolize the possibility of danger in almost any exterior setting, especially in films with airplanes, such as *Air-Mail* (1932) or *A Guy Named Joe*. Because fog decreases visibility, its presence was a threat to the pilots and their respective missions and creates suspense in a scene that might otherwise be a routine flight. Freund used fog in *The Seventh Cross* to blanket the concentration camp when several of the prisoners attempt to escape (fig. 2.20). The fog in much of the film symbolizes the constant threat of the Nazis discovering the final escaped prisoner and serves as a constant literal and figurative "fog of war."

FIGS. 2.19-2.20. Fog scenes in *Dracula* and *The Seventh Cross.* Author's screenshots.

Fog could also be used to represent something supernatural, fantastic, or even heavenly. When Ardath Bey shows Helen Grosvenor the vision pool in *The Mummy*, the pool is clouded with a layer of fog floating on the service, giving it a magical and mysterious quality. A crane shot dives deep into the fog to show the audience the visions it holds. In *Du Barry Was a Lady*, fog is superimposed over a sleeping character to show the character is dreaming. The musical *Moonlight and Pretzels* (1933) features a song about the effect of the stock market crash, which includes a fantastical and expressionistic representation of a woman trying to rise above the conditions of poverty in a thick fog as dozens of hands try to reach up to join her. And in *A Guy Named Joe*, fog was used to create a cloud-like representation of heaven after Pete Sandidge dies in a crash and reports to heaven to discuss a new mission with "The General" (Lionel Barrymore). In these instances, fog is a manifestation of something exceptional, exotic, or other-worldly, rather than evil, eerie, or foreboding.

Freund also used fog as a means to isolate characters, such as in a scene where Parnell and Katie O'Shea (Myrna Loy) take an evening stroll together in the fog in *Parnell*. The two walk in seclusion from their surroundings as the fog appears to block the rest of the world out. The fog is literal, but it's also symbolic of the moment, in which the couple has blocked everything else out but each other. A similar scene takes place in *A Guy Named Joe*, where Pete must say goodbye to his girlfriend, Dorinda Durston (Irene

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

Dunne), before what will be his final mission. The two have been embracing by a fireplace in a country cottage and as Pete leaves to head back to base, the two look longingly at each other outside, surrounded by a dense fog, as the two say "goodbye" one final time (fig. 2.21). Fog could also isolate characters in a dangerous situation, for example during the climatic boat scene in *Key Largo* (1948). When Frank McCloud (Humphrey Bogart) is forced to transport gangster Johnny Rocco (Edward G. Robinson) and his thugs on a boat to Cuba, their voyage is engulfed in a thick fog (fig. 2.22). The feeling of isolation the fog represents is exactly what Frank is feeling, as he knows his only hope of survival is to take matters into his own hands.

FIGS. 2.21-2.22. The fog of isolation in *A Guy Named Joe* and *Key Largo.* Author's screenshots.

MIRRORS

Freund's final and most frequently used motif was the use of mirrors, which could be used to create interesting two-shots in the frame. Whether it was shots of Brant Royle and his barber (*Bright Leaf*), Mina and Lucy (*Dracula*), Napoleon and his attendant (*Conquest,* fig. 2.23), or Dr. Gogol (Peter Lorre) and his fellow physician, Dr. Wong (Keye Luke, *Mad Love*, 1935, fig. 2.24), Freund found a multitude of ways to use mirrors to film two characters. These instances could be a character talking to the reflection of another character in a mirror, both characters in the mirror's reflection, or a character holding a mirror for another character. Because Freund preferred and often employed long takes, he looked for ways to keep them entertaining. As previously discussed, this could include moving the camera but he also used mirrors to challenge the conventional two-shot.

Mirrors could also serve as source of self-reflection (literally and figuratively) for a character. After a brawl in a soda shop in *That Hagen Girl*, Tom Bates (Ronald Reagan) looks at himself in a mirror questioning the events that transpired. In *Conquest*, Napoleon has a similar moment during a discussion with the mother of Countess Wakewska, where his self-reflection in the conversation is matched by his self-reflection in the mirror over

FIGS. 2.23-2.24. Freund creating two-shots with mirrors in *Conquest* and *Mad Love.* Author's screenshots.

the fireplace. When Dr. Paul Held (Frank Morgan) suspects his wife, Maria (Nancy Carroll), of having an affair in *The Kiss Before the Mirror*, her suspected two-timing is symbolized by two mirrors reflecting different sides of herself (fig. 2.25). The increasing fragmentation of Dr. Gogol's psyche in *Mad Love* is depicted through him seeing his different reflections in multiple mirrors scattered throughout the operating room, each one showing a different side of him (fig. 2.26). After a hard life full of sacrifice in *I Give My Love* (1934), a former model, Judy Blair (Wynne Gibson), looks at the toll that time has taken on her once youthful and glamorous appearance. These reflections allow Freund to either create added emphasis on a character's state of mind, hint at a character's true nature, or express how a character is feeling without dialogue.

FIGS. 2.25-2.26. The fractured or split self in *The Kiss Before the Mirror* and *Mad Love.* Author's screenshots.

Freund also used these mirror shots to show character relations or juxtapositions between characters. In *The Kiss Before the Mirror*, the suggestion of infidelity is disproven at the end of the film as the husband and wife, who have both looked only at themselves

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

separately in mirrors throughout the movie, are now reunited in the reflection of a mirror. A suspicious bride in *Undercurrent* looks at herself stiffly in the mirror and refuses to turn and face her groom. In *The Seventh Cross*, an argument between a husband and wife is foreshadowed by the bifurcating line of a mirror, splitting the screen between the reflection of the husband on one side and the wife standing in the doorway on the other. One of the best examples of Freund's use of mirrors to juxtapose characters occurs in *Key Largo*. The developing conflict and impending collision between Frank and Rocco are symbolized through the characters' different reactions to their reflections in a mirror. Frank looks calm and confident (fig. 2.27); Rocco looks vulnerable and insecure (fig. 2.28). John Huston famously said he introduced Rocco this way, because "[he] wanted to get a look at the animal with its shell off."[35] By depicting this vulnerability in the reflection of the mirror, Freund was able to create a necessary contrast between Rocco and Frank by falling back on his most frequently used motif.

FIGS. 2.27-2.28. Character juxtaposition in *Key Largo.* Author's screenshots.

Freund used this motif so often that he began to playfully poke fun at it. In *The Seventh Cross*, the aforementioned bifurcating line created by the mirror becomes so confusing, Paul Roeder (Hume Cronyn) mistakenly almost walks into his own reflection. His disorientation is quickly corrected and he finds his way out of the room through the door on the other side of the screen. And the motif was stretched to its limits in *This Time for Keeps*, as Jimmy Durante used the mirror as his ethical conscience. At one point in the film, he turns toward the mirror in a moment of self-reflection, but the character is so disgusted with himself, he turns toward the camera instead, subverting the typical Freund self-reflection shot. Later in the movie, he sees his reflection again in the mirror behind a bar. Rather than turn away this time, the self-reflection seems to serve as an impetus for the character's choice to redeem himself. Both *The Seventh Cross* and *This Time for Keeps* were made in the twilight of Freund's Hollywood film career and served as examples that, even this late his career, Freund could still have fun and poke a little fun at himself in the process.

COMPOSITION

As with visual motifs, decisions about composition in the frame were often a group effort, with the director usually having the ultimate say. However, cinematographers could be valuable counsel when making these decisions and their own personal style or preference could influence at least some of the director's decisions. In the films on which Freund served as director or cinematographer, a few key compositional patterns emerge: the foregrounding of characters or objects in the frame, the use of windows as framing devices for characters to see or be seen, and the framing of a character's face through or behind a circular shape. Sometimes the shape of the frame could vary from a diamond to a square, but a circle was used most frequently. And, similar to the motifs, the desired effect of these compositional techniques varied depending on each use, but were often used to establish perspective, setting, or character emotions.

FOREGROUNDING

Charles Ramírez Berg explains the effect of foregrounding as creating "a kind of anchor for the rest of the frame" that "immediately add[s] depth by presenting tension between foreground and background."[36] For Freund, foregrounding was also a means to enhance the location setting of a shot or to establish a character witnessing a specific event or action. Enhancing the location setting of a shot often used native plants, such as a desert cactus (*A Guy Named Joe*), tobacco plants (*Bright Leaf*), or tropical plants (*Key Largo*). For interior settings, it could be laboratory equipment (*The Thin Man Goes Home*), empty glasses at a bar (*A Guy Named Joe*), or ale casks at a tavern (*Du Barry Was a Lady*). Freund also liked to foreground lighting sources, such as candles (*Conquest*), lamps (*Pride and Prejudice*), or street lamps (*Montana*). Or if the scene featured diegetic music, the musicians or their instruments were often foregrounded, such as a harp (*Man-Proof*, 1938), a piano (*Pride and Prejudice*), or an entire group of musicians (*Montana*). Freund used all of these methods to compose complex shots with enough realistic components to immerse the audience into the setting of the shot.

Freund also foregrounded characters to establish them as a witness to a specific event or action in the background, usually in deep focus, over the shoulder shot to depict both the foreground and background clearly. These shots serve two simultaneous purposes: 1) they depict a certain event or action important to the narrative of the film in the background and 2) they force the audience to see that event or action from the foregrounded character's perspective. For instance, in *A Guy Named Joe*, when Pete Sandidge's former girlfriend, Dorinda Durston, embraces her new love interest, Ted Randall, we see Sandidge's form in the foreground, while the actual embrace takes place much further away in the background (fig. 2.29). In *The Good Earth*, when Wang (Paul Muni) returns to his home with his new wife, O-Lan (Luise Rainer), the couple is seen in

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

an extreme long shot descending the hill to their home, while Uncle (Walter Connolly) watches on, anticipating their return (fig. 2.30). In most of the cases, the characters being observed in the background are oblivious to the character watching them from the foreground, which also allowed for scenes to create tension with the use of an unseen threat. For instance, in *South of St. Louis* (1949), a gunman in the foreground draws his weapon and aims at two characters walking through town. Using foregrounding in this shot shows the audience a threat that the unsuspecting characters can't see, thus creating dramatic tension in the scene.

FIGS. 2.29-2.30. Foregrounding of characters in *A Guy Named Joe* and *The Good Earth*. Author's screenshots.

Foregrounding was also used to emphasize isolation in scenes. In *The Good Earth*, villagers must make the trip to the Great City when famine strikes their farms. Their long trek in treacherous conditions with little food leaves them weakened and in some cases near death. This perilous situation is emphasized in a shot where Freund foregrounds buzzards on a tree as the villagers slowly leave their farms behind (fig. 2.31). In *South of St. Louis*, horse riders take a trail through dry and barren elements. In this shot, Freund foregrounds a dead tree, with the approaching riders in the background. The shot shows the audience this is dead land, foreshadowing the possible fate of some of the riders. Foregrounding could also be used to isolate actions of a personal nature. A perfect example of this is in *A Guy Named Joe*, when Sandidge dances with Durston in what will be their final dance together. Freund foregrounds obstacles to the audience's view of the couple dancing in the middle ground, as if signaling to the audience that we are witnessing a personal moment that we should not be watching (fig. 2.32). Isolating the characters in such a way also reinforces the intimacy of the two characters, which makes Sandidge's eventual fate all the more heartbreaking.

FIGS. 2.31-2.32. Foregrounding to show isolation and intimacy in *The Good Earth* and *A Guy Named Joe.* Author's screenshots.

WINDOWS

One of Freund's most famous shots during his German career is from *Der letzte Mann*, when the hotel doorman (Emil Jannings) is given a letter of termination from his manager through paned glass. Freund continued to use internal framing through windows into his Hollywood career, and did so using one of three techniques: 1) shooting a scene from the other side of a window, similar to *Der letzte Mann*, 2) filming characters in an interior location from an exterior position outside of an open window, or 3) filming characters witnessing events, actions, or other characters through windows. The first method was used in such films as *That Hagen Girl* (fig. 2.33), *Two Smart People* (fig. 2.34), and *Bright Leaf*, and was used largely to initially position the audience outside of the scene or to establish the location of the room where the scene is taking place. Often, these scenes would transition to shots on the opposite side of the windows to slowly immerse the audience into the room, such as the one in *Der letzte Mann.*

FIGS. 2.33-2.34. Filming scenes through windows in *That Hagen Girl* and *Two Smart People.* Author's screenshots.

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

Freund also used windows as a means to film interior scenes from exterior set-ups. This is used in countless scenarios and for various specific purposes. It was a common scene blocking technique in classical Hollywood films for characters to stare out a window when revealing either sensitive information or when a character is lost deep in thought. These moments were often very important to scenes, but positioned the character's back or side to the audience as their front faced the window. By filming these scenes from outside the window, Freund revealed the character's face in these shots, allowing the audience to see the emotional state of the character(s) in these scenes. Not all of these scenes were revelatory or emotional. Freund also filmed these shots in lighter and more playful scenes, in which the exterior sounds of birds chirping, kids playing, or cars passing by is juxtaposed against the more quiet interior just beyond the window. This technique was used to depict characters that were more focused on the outside world instead of what was going on inside their room.

Composing shots with characters witnessing actions, events, or other characters through a window served the same purpose as using foregrounding to establish perspective of a scene. These shots revealed something important to the audience, established the perspective of the character witnessing the important information, and often concealed the identity of the person watching. In *Undercurrent*, a wife suspicious of her husband's secret life sees the husband approaching home through the window alerting her and the audience to the potential threat of his presence. In *The Chocolate Soldier*, Maria Lanyi (Risë Stevens) witnesses her husband, Karl Lang (Nelson Eddy), impersonating a Russian singer, Vassily Vassilievitch, from outside her window. We see Lang comically rehearsing his persona, while Lanyi and her maid joke inside the room about the ridiculousness of her husband's actions (fig. 2.35). Or in some cases, two characters could exchange a greeting or acknowledge each other through a window, symbolizing the distance or an obstacle between the two characters, which was the case in a shot used in *Two Smart People* (fig. 2.36).

FIGS. 2.35-2.36. Character perspective through windows in *The Chocolate Soldier* and *Two Smart People.* Author's screenshots.

FRAMING FACES THROUGH CIRCLES

In addition to foregrounding and framing through windows, Freund consistently used circular shapes to frame characters faces. In some cases, this technique was used to accentuate the focus of the shot on the character's face in an emotional scene, as in the case of a shot of Katie O'Shea in *Parnell* (fig. 2.37). Sometimes, it was used to draw focus to a face in one of Freund's many window or mirror shots, such as in *A Yank at Eaton* (1942), *I Give My Love*, or *Gift of Gab* (1934). But it could also be used to obscure a face, such as in *Key Largo*, when a circular fan obscures Rocco's face, introducing us to his form in the bathtub before we see his face (fig. 2.38). The circular shape could also be superimposed over a character's face, such as in *Mad Love,* when a spinning circle superimposed over Dr. Gogol's face symbolized the character spinning out of control (fig. 2.39). In *A Guy Named Joe,* Ted Randall's face is shown behind the target sight in the cockpit of his plane (fig. 2.40). Even though Randall is using the sight to aim at specific

FIGS. 2.37-2.40. Circular facial framing in *Parnell*, *Key Largo*, *Mad Love*, and *A Guy Named Joe*. Author's screenshots.

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

targets, the camera facing Randall shows his own face behind the target, symbolizing the nervous emotional state of the pilot who is himself feeling under fire. Freund didn't always use a circle, although it was his most frequent shape. In a scene in *Balalaika* (1939), Freund framed Prince Peter Karagin (Nelson Eddy) in a medium shot through a square in a lattice wall. But whatever the shape, Freund consistently used them to draw the audience's attention to a character in a particular shot for dramatic effect.

EXPANSIVE LONG SHOTS

When Renfield (Dwight Frye) first enters Dracula's castle in *Dracula*, Freund films the scene in a vast long shot depicting the enormous expanse of the structure, while also dwarfing the character Renfield in the enormity of the space. Renfield is symbolically swallowed up by the room, a foreshadowing of Renfield eventually being swallowed up by Count Dracula (fig. 2.41). Freund consistently used these types of long shots to position characters within an enormous space, creating isolation, symbolizing vulnerability, or hinting at something spiritual and larger than the character's human form. These shots could take place in a forest of sequoias (*Tortilla Flat*), a church (also *Tortilla Flat*), heaven (*A Guy Named Joe*), or on a rural farm (*The Good Earth*). In all of these instances, the character's human form is diminished in the immensity of their location, hinting at something greater or more sinister overpowering the character. Sometimes these long shots incorporated Freund's used of foregrounding to add an additional layer of depth and symbolism to the shot, but in the instances mentioned here, Freund wanted the audience's attention to be on the sheer size of the space and not on something in the foreground of the shot. These long shots were not always devoid of other characters though. In fact, one long shot early in *Conquest* shows Countess Walewska lost in a long line of people waiting to greet Napoleon upon his entrance into a great hall. By

FIGS. 2.41-2.42. Characters minimalized by the enormity of their surroundings in *Dracula* and *Conquest*. Author's screenshots.

establishing her as just another guest in a long line of people in this huge space, her character is diminished in the scene. It is only when Napoleon notices her in the line and his form fills the frame that she no longer seems overwhelmed by the space and surrounding guests (fig. 2.42).

CONCLUSION

When Karl Freund left the Hollywood film industry in 1949, before eventually making the move to television, the long-time cinematographer reflected on the end of his film career. He recalled, "When motion pictures started to go down, lots of contracts were not renewed. So this was the [situation]. My own contract with Warner's ended in 1949." Freund concluded, "I didn't live one life, I lived three; if I drop dead, life doesn't owe me a penny."[37] What Freund left behind is an indelible legacy of film technique and technological innovation, as well as a recurring and consistent visual style that influenced cinematographers for decades to come. From his moving camera to his stylistic motifs to his compositional predilections, the case study of Karl Freund suggests that Gregg Toland was not the only Hollywood cinematographer that produced a unique visual style in his films, and that cinematographers within the confines of the classical Hollywood studio system could still have a signature aesthetic in a hierarchical industry where a coherent narrative and unobtrusive aesthetic reigned supreme.

But what about other classical Hollywood cinematographers? To repeat Lieberman and Hegarty's contention, cinematographers "must always be analyzed on a case-by-case basis" and that "on any given film, the cinematographer has some degree of input, and his or her role is reflective of not only industrial norms, but also individual stylistic tendencies." Future research should focus on these potential cases studies, analyzing other cinematographers' visual styles, their degree of input, and the industrial and technological standards of the era that influenced both their art and their craft. These future studies' findings, in addition to the findings of this article, will hopefully help shed light on the greater industrial implications of creative style with respect to authorship, collaboration, and motion picture production labor. While Freund (perhaps sarcastically) mocked the assertion that film was an artistic medium, other cinematographers pushed hard to be recognized as both artists and craftsmen during the Golden Age of Hollywood. As scholars, we too must continue the research that recognizes them as such.

ENDNOTES

[1] "Stumar Tells of German Production." *The International Photographer*. November 1930, 16.

[2] Herbert G. Luft, "Karl Freund," *Films in Review* (February 1963), 93-108.

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031

[3] Christopher Beach. *A Hidden History of Film Style: Cinematographers, Directors, and the Collaborative Process* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), 4.

[4] Pauline Kael, Herman J. Mankiewicz, and Orson Welles *The Citizen Kane Book: Raising Kane, by Pauline Kael. The Shooting Script, by Herman J. Mankiewicz and Orson Welles, and the Cutting Continuity of the Completed Film* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).

[5] Robert L. Carringer, *The Making of Citizen Kane* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

[6] Philip Cowan, "Authorship and the Director of Photography: A Case Study of Gregg Toland and *Citizen Kane*." *Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA Postgraduate Network* 5, no. 1 (2012).

[7] Evan Lieberman and Kerry Hegarty, "Authors of the Image: Cinematographers Gabriel Figueroa and Gregg Toland," *Journal of Film and Video* 62, no. 1 (2010).

[8] Paul Matthew St. Pierre, *Cinematography in the Weimar Republic: Lola Lola, Dirty Singles, and the Men Who Shot Them* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 14

[9] Ibid., 2.

[10] Patrick Keating, *Cinematography* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2014), 6.

[11] Thomas Schatz, *The Genius of the System* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), 6.

[12] Chris Cagle, "Classical Hollywood, 1929-1946." *Cinematography* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2014), 45.

[13] Christopher Beach. *A Hidden History of Film Style: Cinematographers, Directors, and the Collaborative Process* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), 5, 9.

[14] Keating, *Cinematography*, 11-12.

[15] Chris Cagle, "Classical Hollywood, 1929-1946." *Cinematography* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2014), 35.

[16] Evan Lieberman and Kerry Hegarty, "Authors of the Image: Cinematographers Gabriel Figueroa and Gregg Toland," *Journal of Film and Video* 62, no. 1 (2010), 33.

[17] Barry Salt, *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis* 2nd ed. (London: Starword, 1992), 202.

[18] "Remarque Sequel," *Motion Picture Herald* (March 26, 1938), 31.

[19] "In Pictures Geniuses Make Flops: Karl Freund Says 'Nuts' to 'Artistic Pictures'—All Start Out for Money," *Variety* (July 4, 1933, 3.

[20] Patrick Keating, *Hollywood Lighting from the Silent Era to Film Noir* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 15-16.

[21] Ronny Regev, *Working in Hollywood: How the Studio System Turned Creativity into Labor* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018), 143, 146.

[22] Patrick Keating, *The Dynamic Frame: Camera Movement in Classical Hollywood* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 1.

[23] James P. Cunningham, "Freund in Art Movement," *The Film Daily* (December 18, 1927), 5.

[24] Patrick Keating, *The Dynamic Frame: Camera Movement in Classical Hollywood* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 2.

[25] David Bordwell, *The Way Hollywood Tells It: Story and Style in Modern Movies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 121.

[26] Gregg Toland, "I Broke the Rules in *Citizen Kane*," *Popular Photography* (June 1941), 90-91.

[27] Keating, *The Dynamic Frame*,108-9.

[28] Ibid.*,* 145.

[29] Timothy Barnard, Footnote in "William Wyler, the Jansenist of Mise-en-Scéne." *What is Cinema?* Translated by Timothy Bardnard. Written by André Bazin.. Caboose Books, Montreal, 2009, 265-266.

[30] Thomas Doherty. *Hollywood's Censor:: Joseph I. Breen and the Production Code Administration.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2009.; Sheri Chinen Biesen. *Film Censorship: Regulating America's Screen*. Columbia University Press, 2018.

[31] Stephen Prince, *Classical Film Violence: Designing and Regulating Brutality in Hollywood Cinema, 1930-1968* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 109-110.

[32] Ezra Goodman, "Those Creative Camera Men," *New York Times* (May 7, 1939), X6.

[33] Phil Tannura, "What Do We Mean When We Talk About Effect Lighting," *American Cinematographer* (March 1942), 25.

[34] Keating, *Hollywood Lighting from the Silent Era to Film Noir*, 3, 136.

[35] James Agee, "Undirectable Director," *Life* (September 18, 1950), 140.

[36] Charles Ramírez Berg, *The Classical Mexican Cinema: The Poetics of the Exceptional Golden Age Films* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015), 107

[37] Bernard Kalb, "The 'Sitooation' is Well in Hand: Karl Freund, Camera Man, Talks About Video and Sundry Other Topics," *New York Times (*Aug 23, 1953), X9.

DOI: 10.33470/2997-2523.1031