2012

John Collier, Thomas Edison and the Educational Promotion of Moving Pictures

Amanda R. Keeler
Marquette University, amanda.keeler@marquette.edu

John Collier, Thomas Edison, and the Educational Promotion of Moving Pictures

Amanda R. Keeler

By the early 1910s, the debates over using moving pictures for education coalesced into a seemingly influential discursive presence in the United States.[1] Film was still a relatively new technology in the early twentieth century and accordingly, experimentation with the medium continued to explore uses beyond theatrical screenings. The promotion of moving pictures for educational purposes grew out of several concerns, including the popularity and influence of moving pictures, the subject matter they covered, and the spaces in which they were shown.[2] By 1910, several individuals and businesses attempted to expand film screenings to nontheatrical spaces and produce moving pictures for use in classrooms.

The rhetoric touting the use of films in education found its way into general interest magazines, newspapers, moving picture trade journals, and books. Four men were at the center of this first wave of the promotion of film for education: Charles Urban, George Kleine, Thomas Edison, and John Collier. In this short essay I will focus briefly on two of these men, Thomas Edison and John Collier. Urban and Kleine's careers, though integral to the larger discussion around this historical exploration, have been examined in detail in other places. Edison has been written about extensively as well, though from the

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

perspective of the inventions that emerged from his laboratory. To understand Edison's promotion of film for educational purposes, I will discuss several articles published in general interest magazines and film trade journals that featured his philosophy around moving pictures and education. Next, I will examine John Collier, whose work promoting the educational power of moving pictures was detailed in a number of articles he wrote beginning in 1908. Though both Edison and Collier encouraged the educational use of moving pictures, each had his own contrasting ideas about whom these films should educate, and where they should be utilized. Moreover, they also represent two disparate perspectives: Edison, working within the industry, privileged business interests; Collier from outside the industry, operated with a reform agenda in mind.

One should not be surprised that Thomas Edison, the master of self-promotion, was featured so heavily in general interest magazine articles touting the educational future of the moving picture. Up to this time, Edison had been widely celebrated for his pioneering work on electricity, phonographs, and moving picture cameras, projectors, and films. His notoriety from these previous endeavors may have propelled the discussion of educational film further into the national consciousness. In the 1910s Edison unveiled his Home Kinetoscope with an accompanying catalogue of moving pictures designed for "Education and Entertainment at home, in schools, Sunday-schools, clubs, lodges, etc."[3] To promote the projector and catalogue, Edison agreed to be interviewed in a number of magazines, as well as appearing frequently in the film industry trade journal discourse. Magazines like the *Survey* and *Harper's Weekly* detailed Edison's ideas about the endless possibilities for moving pictures in schools. Featuring Edison allowed these articles to equate the abstract concept of moving pictures for education with a highly respected name in the film industry.

Edison's basic principle behind his promotion of moving pictures for educational use was simple: he felt they would make school more attractive for students. For example, in a 1911 interview with Edison, William Inglis wrote that Edison's latest development was "going to make school so attractive that a big army with swords and guns couldn't keep boys and girls out of it."[4] Edison told Inglis that his plan to keep children interested in schools was "education by moving

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

picture. Teach the children everything from mathematics to morality, by little dramas acted out before the camera, and reproduced in the schoolroom at very low cost. Sort o' swing the education in on them so attractively that they'll *want* to go to school."[5] To convince readers and educators that making school more fun would in turn help students learn better, Edison emphasized that if teachers used moving pictures in the classroom it might help prevent young people from skipping school.

Making school more attractive to students was just one step in Edison's plan to revolutionize learning in the classroom. Edison also claimed that moving pictures would bring subjects to life and help keep children focused on classroom subjects. In the July 1911 issue of *Moving Picture World* Edison stated that "above all else, the fact must not be lost sight of that for educational purposes the moving picture possesses the tremendous advantage of not only giving the more correct and vivid idea of a subject that can possibly be obtained in books, but it places the knowledge before the child in an attractive and entertaining way…I shall not be surprised to see the school children of the future clustered on the steps waiting for the door to open."[6] This assessment of films pointed to the way that their moving images unleashed the potential vividness of school lessons. The benefit of using moving pictures to bring subjects to life for learning purposes would, according to Edison, additionally keep students focused on the subject matter, which would facilitate the learning process. Winthrop Lane agreed with Edison's proclamations about the powers of moving pictures for education. Lane attested that moving pictures "will teach the elementary branches throughout the eight years of the public school; staging the laws of physics and giving line and form to the processes of chemistry; teaching arithmetic by pictures and letting grammar in through the eye."[7] By "letting" subjects in "through the eye," Lane and Edison suggested that the visual learning achieved through moving pictures had a more direct link to knowledge acquisition than other methods.

Another advantage Edison saw in moving pictures in schools was illustrated in the article "Edison's Substitute for Schoolbooks." In it Edison invoked a nameless son, a twelve-year old boy who hated school.[8] Edison proclaimed that "while schoolbooks are made for children, children were never made for schoolbooks. If this were not

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

true, schools would be the universal delight that they really should be."[9] He used this point repeatedly to help persuade readers that moving pictures accomplished something that textbooks never could: they brought images to life before the eyes of curious school children. Edison told Mary Master Needham for the *Saturday Evening Post* that "I intend to do away with books in the school, that is, I mean to try to do away with schoolbooks…How? By Moving pictures…Well, this will certainly change education—will it not?" Needham replied, "Change education? It will revolutionize education!"[10] Edison also opined that watching moving pictures was "always a thousand times as powerful as the effect of a thing described."[11] This notion was a radical retooling of school through the elimination of textbooks, which Edison felt were no longer an ideal teaching tool. Though he clamored for the elimination of textbooks, his rhetoric here may have been polemical, attempting to convince the reader to rethink his ideas about classroom technology rather than proposing a complete overhaul of existing procedures.

In September 1913 the *Survey* published a piece titled "Edison vs. Euclid, Has He Invented a Moving Stairway to Learning?" The fourteen-page collection consisted of several smaller articles by notable people and institutions, such as Leonard Ayres from the Russell Sage Foundation and John Dewey from the Department of Philosophy at Columbia University. This article again spends several pages touting Edison's feelings on the vast educational potential of moving pictures. It also featured discussions by men and women than Edison invited to his laboratory to check out his latest invention. However, alongside the usual hyperbolic insistence on the educational power of moving pictures from the articles discussed above, the article featured the opinions of several of his guests, who did not necessarily agree whether "pictorial education" was "revolutionary" and did not reach consensus as to the usefulness and viability of moving pictures in the classroom.[12] In line with Edison, Henry W. Thurston, of the New York School of Philanthropy, wrote that he was "greatly impressed by the educational possibilities of the motion picture."[13] R. R. Reeder, Superintendent of the New York Orphan Asylum, saw the potential in using moving pictures to "reduce truancy…and hold in school those hundreds of thousands who every year drop out on account of lack of interest in study and a desire to go to work."[14] Leonard P. Ayres claimed that "the new motion pictures are an educational tool of great

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

potential value."[15] Marietta L. Johnson, of the School of Organic Education, observed that "Mr. Edison has found a way…in which children may acquire education without the stress and strain that endangers the nervous system."[16]

Other visitors, however, were less hopeful about Edison's educational experiment. Henry H. Goddard, of the Vineland Training School, feared that "lazy teachers" might utilize moving pictures in the classroom to avoid having to labor over lesson plans, and that manufacturers might produce "unwise" films not well suited for pedagogy.[17] John Dewey expressed worry about the passivity of students watching activities rather than participating in them. He suspected that the "widespread adoption of motion pictures in schools might have a tendency to retard the introduction of occupations in which children themselves actually do things."[18] Since Dewey's educational philosophies privileged experiential and interactive learning processes, the passive viewing of moving pictures was not necessarily in accord with the way he wanted classroom education to occur.

Overall, the men and women who participated in the visit to Edison's laboratory to view his moving picture experiment were impressed by what they saw and agreed with its potential for the classroom. While some had concerns and reservations, most found the possibilities of films in the classroom to be a welcome addition to existing teaching methods, rather than operating as a replacement of the teacher or some other radical pedagogical intervention. Nonetheless, the inclusion of counterpoints in this article ran counter to the earlier interviews with Edison, which had highlighted only the positive attributes of moving picture education; opposition to his plans suggested that his name alone was not enough to convince all the visitors.

Overall, Edison's vision of using film for educational purposes was targeted towards young boys, to keep them interested in attending school. In terms of subject areas to cover, he suggested that there was potential in the classroom for moving pictures to demonstrate scientific experiments and principles, for teaching mathematics, geography and history. He employed hyperbole to show the vaunted superiority of moving pictures as a teaching tool. Edison

frequently noted the dull, rote nature of book-based learning and contrasted it to the living, moving example of moving pictures. In the articles discussed here Edison attempted to convince the public that moving pictures brought life, the world, excitement, and entertainment to the classroom, experiential qualities that a mere teacher could not provide. But the question of what exactly students were supposed to learn from moving pictures remained: Historical facts? Scientific principles? The lessons for students may have been more exciting via moving pictures, but nonetheless Edison's promised drastic improvement over textbooks remained unclear.

The promotion of film for education retained prominence in these articles, and it was sometimes easy to forget that they were written in support of Edison's new, low cost, portable projector. Many of the writers found ways to mention the projector, claiming that it was not just that Edison was now promoting the educational use of moving pictures, but that he had successfully created the projector and the associated films to bring pictorial education to classrooms everywhere. William Inglis wrote that Edison put the Home Kinetoscope "within the reach of every school in the country" and that Edison's company had many films available for rent "for eight dollars a week."[19] E. B. Lockwood proclaimed that "the Edison Company has recently perfected a small moving picture machine and film which will do a great deal in making moving pictures one of the great mediums of education."[20] Allen Benson remarked that "Edison has made the machines safe by inventing a non-inflammable film."[21] Henry Lanier wrote that Edison made "films that his great company can market successfully."[22]

Edison's claims about the superiority of visual learning raise suspicions because of their connection to the marketing of his new Kinetoscope projector. At face value, Edison's rhetoric seems insistent on the possibilities for real educational reform and progress if moving pictures were to be employed in the classroom. At the same time, this promotion of moving pictures for schools hints at the vast, untapped market of nontheatrical sites that Edison and others like him might exploit if they were able to convince the thousands of schools in the United States that films and projectors were a worthwhile investment. Though his business interests seem at the forefront of his educational promotion of moving pictures, similar discourse was occurring in many

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

other magazines, from a number of other writers and supporters who saw the benefit of moving pictures in classrooms. Edison created a vibrant dialogue through his interviews, which may have helped to propel the discussion further.

Edison's discourse on the educational uses of film was in line with that of many other people from the time, like John Collier, who saw the moving pictures as possessing great power to influence and educate the populace, though film needed to be properly harnessed so that this education was helpful rather than hurtful towards society. Collier was not a businessman like Edison, and therefore approached moving pictures and education from a different angle. He was, however, just as excited and hopeful that film could be used to help educate people. Collier formed his ideas on the educational uses of moving pictures beginning in 1907, when he joined the People's Institute, a progressive neighborhood organization. There he served first as Civic Secretary and Editor of the People's Institute Weekly newspaper, *The Civic Journal*, and later as the Secretary of the Recreation Department. With the People's Institute, Collier also served on the National Board of Censorship through 1914. At the People's Institute he pursued a diverse reform agenda that focused primarily on moving pictures, theater reform and regulation, appropriate family leisure, and education.[23] His career promoting the positive aspects of moving pictures paralleled much of the discourse that Edison had advanced, though the two men saw the educational benefit of moving pictures quite differently.

John Collier's tenure at the People's Institute was notable for the programs and studies in which he participated, beginning with an investigation into New York City's "cheap amusements," looking at nickelodeons, arcades, and other popular amusement venues. Collier's investigation led to the January 31, 1908 report, "Cheap Amusements Shows in Manhattan: Preliminary Report of Investigation." Collier wrote that "each day, and night after night, I visited, again and again, the more than 250 film houses in the city, studying their shows."[24] While Collier specifically took umbrage with the conditions of the moving picture theaters, he was able to separate his problems with them from his opinion of the films themselves, which he felt had tremendous educational potential. He opined that the moving pictures possessed a "constructive influence, meeting a genuine need in the

people."[25] Collier wrote that the films might prove to be an "important opportunity for schools, settlements, churches, and educators generally," if and when they might be utilized outside of existing theaters, or when theaters were properly cleaned and ventilated.[26]

The "cheap amusements" investigation led to multiple articles and public appearances where Collier reported his findings. For example, he detailed his report in an article in *Charities and the Commons*, where he proclaimed that the "cheap amusement problem" of low-class activities like "cheap vaudeville" and "burlesque" could be remedied with more wholesome leisure activities.[27] For one, he observed that "the nickelodeon's the thing," meaning it was an acceptable place for leisure that offered "history, travel, [and] the reproduction of industries."[28] Collier was aware that movies allowed working-class New Yorkers to spend leisure time with their families at a very low cost. He reasoned that "all the settlements and churches combined do not reach daily the tithe of the simple and impressionable folk that the nickelodeons reach and vitally impress every day."[29] Collier described the moving picture theater as "a true theater of the people…an instrument whose power can only be realized when social workers begin to use it."[30] Collier counted himself among these qualified social workers, and would spend the next several years promoting his educational vision.

Collier served for several years on the National Board of Censorship, a self-regulatory group that was described as being "made up of representatives from several civic bodies and certain individuals, none of whom were financially interested in motion pictures."[31] Collier wrote in 1909 for *Moving Picture World* that "the National Board of Censorship has been organized for the improvement of motion pictures and for their further extension in this country as social and educational forces. Its work consists of censoring moving pictures and dealing constructively with the social, civic and educational problems connected therewith…The Board also sees in the moving picture an agent which can educate...capable of use in direct pedagogical ways."[32] Cinema historian Lee Grieveson writes that "censorship was never the sole aim of the National Board of Censorship, though, for it sought also to promote an educative cultural function for cinema."[33] To this end, Collier wrote that "the prevailing view at the People's Institute, among its Board of Censorship, and at that time among the

exhibitors and producers at large, was that the cinema was 'the people's theater,' and held great potential for education and for life."[34] Notable in these statements Collier made is the reference to education, for, in his opinion, the Board had a dual responsibility, not only to persuade manufacturers to continue working towards a "better program," but also to convince the public of the educational potential of moving pictures, a goal Collier pursued vigorously.[35] As Graham Taylor wrote in 1909, "Mr. Collier predicted that in the very near future motion pictures will be used in schools and playgrounds for both their educational and recreational value."[36]

In order to entice schools to show moving pictures, both during the day and evening, Collier reported that "the People's Institute plans to establish one or more 'model' moving picture theaters, which will be run on a cooperative basis. They will give emphasis to the educational side of moving pictures, and will dramatize subjects like tuberculosis, the Consumer's League plea, [and] the distribution of immigration."[37] The experiment he described was affiliated with a local school in New York, where the Institute investigated the use of commercial amusements, among them motion pictures, "within the educational atmosphere of the school."[38] The hope was that this initiative would help transform the school into a "family gathering place," where appropriate leisure could be emphasized, like "motion pictures…folk dance…civic clubs...[and] public meetings."[39] Collier noted that "motion pictures are an adjunct of teaching along a great many lines, including biology, history, geography, literature, social science…the motion picture appeals to the whole family."[40] He concluded that "the social and political possibilities of this idea are too evident to require statement."[41] This experiment eventually brought New York educators, People's Institute founder Charles Sprague Smith, and the Board of Education to the school to observe a "model moving picture show" showcased by the Board.[42] The group watched a number of films deemed to be educational, including *The Life of Washington*, *A Lesson in Chemistry*, and *East Indian Temples*.[43] *Moving Picture World* reported that "notable gentleman," Dr. Maxwell, "recently witnessed an exhibition of moving pictures by Mr. Charles Sprague Smith and was very favorably impressed with the idea of using them to help educate the children."[44]

In May 1912, under the leadership of the People's Institute's new managing director, Frederick C. Howe, Collier wrote a summary of the Institute's good works to date for *The Independent*. He reiterated the work that the People's Institute has done "to transform the motion picture theater into an educational agenda."[45] Collier suggested that the work done by the National Board of Censorship had contributed greatly to the increased quality of moving pictures in the previous several years. He claimed that "motion pictures have been transformed into perhaps the cleanest and most educational form of public amusement at this time available in America, and a remarkable impetus has been given to the production of strictly educational films."[46]

Collier's vision of educational film aligned to a degree with that expressed by Thomas Edison. He predicted that "moving pictures will be used generally in the school room" in the near future.[47] There were, however, several ways in which Edison's and Collier's views of the educational function of moving pictures differed. Collier, like Edison, readily pointed out that he was interested in the educational uses of moving pictures, though unlike Edison, he was working outside the film industry, and did not have the same agenda to sell projectors and films. Collier and Edison agreed on the range of subjects which the moving picture might treat to aid the educational system. Unlike Edison, however, Collier felt that in addition to their classroom use for young boys, moving pictures "will be used also to afford evening entertainment for the parents and thus interest them in schoolwork."[48] According to Collier, whole families in New York City were looking for education and activities suitable for all ages. Collier writes that moving picture shows were an inexpensive and effective way "for filling the leisure time of the people with wholesome and educational activities."[49] This notion was radically different from Edison's vision of using moving pictures to placate and entertain restless little boys in school classrooms. Rather, Collier envisioned using moving pictures in multiple spaces to provide education, entertainment, and leisure for children and their parents, bringing families together for their educational benefit.

CONCLUSION

After Collier resigned from the Board of Censorship in 1914, he continued to write about moving pictures and drama for the *Survey*. In 1915 he wrote ten articles as part of the series "The Lantern Bearers," which was billed as "a series of essays exploring some thoroughfares of the people's leisure."[50] The *Survey* remarked that Collier's articles would "offer the experience and state the philosophic positions of a writer who is at once a student of the drama, a practical censor and a seer of visions."[51] The series of articles, which formed the bulk of Collier's later statements on moving pictures and education, together contextualized his continued interest in the subject while also conceding that his vision for it had not yet been realized. Over the course of the series, Collier explained how he continued to see the educational merit in moving pictures. However, circumstances surrounding the moving picture industry were hindering the educational potential of moving pictures, particularly the growing implementation of state-sanctioned censorship, and the failure of film manufacturers to make adequately educational moving pictures for school use.

Likewise, Thomas Edison's experiments with the educational use of moving pictures failed to achieve the success of his earlier filmic endeavors. According to historian Ben Singer, Edison Home Kinetosocope was "an unqualified commercial disaster" because both the projector and its films were cost prohibitive, and the projector had many design and performance flaws.[52] Edison was not someone who was accustomed to failure, though an event occurred soon after that meant that he did not have to address this business defeat. On December 9, 1914 there was a fire at his laboratory and factory that eventually shuttered his film equipment manufacturing business. Edison made no attempts to rebuild this aspect of his business. The closure of this arena of his business suggests that his educational initiatives had proved unprofitable and unsustainable.

This paper touches on the complexity of these two men's philosophies on the educational use of moving pictures, and how each defined their specific vision. Using Edison and Collier as case studies illustrates some of the parallel and contrasting ideas that permeated the discourse during the 1910s. Interestingly, while both Edison and

Collier avidly promoted the educational aspects of moving pictures for a number of years, by the end of the decade both had essentially abandoned this pursuit.[53] Regardless, their discourse represents contrasting voices on the nontheatrical uses of moving pictures. It also helps to elucidate that this first wave of interest in using moving pictures for education was not monolithic, but rather a symphony of disparate visions regarding how to promote and utilize nontheatrical moving pictures.

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

Notes

[1] I use the phrase "moving pictures for educational purposes" because the period literature conflates many different types of films when speaking of film as educational, including what we now call science films, industrial films, and instructional films. In this context "educational film" refers not just to the films themselves, but the spaces in which people hoped to use them, such as schools, churches, community spaces, and moving picture theaters. "Educational moving pictures" were often theatrical films repurposed for nontheatrical use, and therefore not specifically produced for purely educational use.

[2] Eileen Bowser, *The Transformation of Cinema: 1907-1915* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 37-52.

[3] Thomas A. Edison, "Catalogue for Motion Picture Films for use on Edison Home Kinetoscope" 1913: front cover.

[4] William Inglis, "Edison and the New Education," *Harper's Weekly* (4 November 1911): 8.

[5] Inglis, "Edison and the New Education," 8.

[6] Frank Parker Hulette, "An Interview with Thomas A. Edison," *Moving Picture World* (22 July 1911): 104-105.

[7] Winthrop D. Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid: Has He Invented a Moving Stairway to Learning?" *Survey* (6 September 1913): 681.

[8] Edison had a son that would have been around this age, but I am unaware if he is speaking truthfully about his actual son.

[9] Allen L. Benson, "Edison's Substitute for Schoolbooks," *World To-Day* (March 1912): 1925.

[10] Mary Master Needham, "Going to School at the 'Movies': An Interview with Thomas A. Edison," *Saturday Evening Post* (30 November 1912): 16.

[11] "Education by Films," *Motography* (August 1911): 57.

[12] Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 682.

[13] Henry W. Thurston, "Dangers of Short Circuits," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 692.

[14] R. R. Reeder, "Words, Words, the Besetting Sin," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 686.

Beyond the Screen: Institutions, Networks and Publics of Early Cinema, (2012): pg. 117-125. Publisher Link.

[15] Leonard P. Ayres, "Ladling Learning into Children," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 687.

[16] Marietta L. Johnson, "Insincere Work the Root of Evil," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 689.

[17] Henry H. Goddard, "Pedagogy Plus Science Needed," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 688.

[18] John Dewey, "Cut-and-Try School Methods," in Lane, "Edison vs. Euclid," 691.

[19] Inglis, "Edison and the New Education," 8.

[20] E. B. Lockwood, "Motography as a Medium of Education," *Motography* (May 1912): 225.

[21] Benson, "Edison's Substitute for Schoolbooks," 1927.

[22] Henry W. Lanier, "The Educational Future of the Moving Picture," *The American Review of Reviews* (December 1914): 729.

[23] Thomas M. Todd, "Love, Science and Social Justice: Voices and Conversations from the Urban Community Movement Before the Great War," diss., University of Minnesota, 1981, 287; Robert B. Fisher, "The People's Institute of New York City 1897-1934: Culture, Progressive Democracy and the People," diss., New York University, 1974, 290.

[24] Collier, *From Every Zenith*, 71; Collier, "Cheap Amusement Shows in Manhattan," 2.

[25] Collier, "Cheap Amusement Shows in Manhattan," 3.

[26] Collier, "Cheap Amusement Shows in Manhattan," 3.

[27] John Collier, "Cheap Amusements," *Charities and the Commons* (11 April 1908): 74.

[28] Collier, "Cheap Amusements," 74.

[29] Collier, "Cheap Amusements," 75.

[30] Collier, "Cheap Amusements," 75.

[31] "National Censorship of Motion Pictures," *The Survey* (1 July 1911): 469.

[32] "John Collier," *Moving Picture World* (16 October 1909): 524.

[33] Lee Grieveson, *Policing Cinema: Movies and Censorship in Early-Twentieth Century America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 101.

[34] Collier, *From Every Zenith*, 71-72.

[35] "Censorship for Moving Pictures," *The Survey* (3 April 1909): 9; Vashal Lindsay, *The Art of the Moving Picture* (New York: Liveright Publishing, 1970), 233.

[36] Graham Romeyn Taylor, "City Neighbors at Play," *Survey* (2 July 1910): 564.

[37] John Collier, "The People's Institute," *Independent* (30 May 1912): 1147.

[38] Collier, "The People's Institute," 1147.

[39] Collier, "The People's Institute," 1147.

[40] John Collier, "Moving Pictures: Their Function and Proper Regulation," *Playground* (October 1910): 239.

[41] Collier, "The People's Institute," 1147.

[42] Fredrick Dunbar, "Scientific and Educational Films," *Nickelodeon* (15 April 1910): 200.

[43] Dunbar 200.

[44] "Superintendent of New York Schools Favors the Picture," *Moving Picture World* (12 March 1910): 375-76.

[45] Collier, "The People's Institute," 1146.

[46] Collier, "The People's Institute," 1147.

[47] "Collier Advocates Moving Picture Instruction," *Nickelodeon* (11 March 1911): 282.

[48] "Collier Advocates Moving Picture Instruction," 282.

[49] "Wants City to Run Movies and Dance Halls for Poor," *New York Times* (27 April 1913): SM7.

[50] John Collier, "Back of Our Footlights: The Half-Forgotten Social Functions of the Drama," *Survey* (5 June 1915): 213.

[51] "Editorials," *The Survey* (5 June 1915): 229.

[52] Ben Singer, "Early Home Cinema and the Edison Home Projecting Kinetoscope," *Film History* (1988): 56. See also Singer 56-63.

[53] See Amanda Keeler, "Sugar Coat the Educational Pill: The Educational Aspirations of Film, Radio, and Television," diss., Indiana University, 2011. Chapter One discusses the discursive promotion of the educational uses of film during the 1910s.