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Abstract

Swedish children's film has established an outstanding reputation all around the world, especially since the 1940s when many quality films for young audiences came into production. In this context, Swedish children's film scholars often set its beginning in the mid-1940s. However, some films were already referred to as such in the 1920s and even before that. Nevertheless, little research on the very first Swedish children's films has conducted yet. This project, built primarily on archival research, aims to reveal how the contemporaries conceptualised the generic identity of children’s film from 1914 to 1923 – that is, from the recurring appearance of the term in daily papers to the first children’s film cluster – and thereby to offer a new perspective to Swedish children’s film history.
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1. Introduction and Background: The Definitions of Swedish Children’s Films

Swedish children’s film has established an outstanding reputation all around the world, especially since the 1940s when many "quality" films for young audiences came into production, and importantly, Astrid Lindgren released an all-time masterpiece, *Pippi Longstocking* (*Pippi långstrump*, Astrid Lindgren, 1945), which was later adapted for film, theatre, and TV and distributed to all around the world. Undoubtedly, representing the idyllic “Swedishness” both in the film and literature, she became one of the most significant contributors who disseminated Swedish children’s film culture worldwide.

However, the first Swedish feature film that depicts a life of a boy prankster, titled *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie* (*Anderssonskans Kalle*, Sigurd Wallén, 1922), was produced in 1922, and even before that, some films had, in fact, already been referred to as children's films (*barnfilm*). For all that, Swedish children's film scholars and critics often set its beginning in the mid-1940s. Then, could it be said that children’s films did not exist before the 1940s? And did contemporary audiences never have the concept of them?

The present research, built primarily on archival research, aims to reveal how contemporaries conceptualised the generic identity of children’s film from 1914 to 1923 – that is, from the emergence of the term in daily papers to that of the first children’s film cluster – and thereby to offer an alternate perspective to the hitherto narrated Swedish children’s film history.

Although the consistent objective is set out in this way, this thesis consists of three main topics. Firstly, I would trace the emergence of the term ‘children's film.’ By examining films that were referred to as such at the time, this part aims to reveal the contemporaneous identity of the genre. Secondly, I would examine how *Mrs Andersson's Charlie* was actually conceived in the context of its time, and then, analyse whether the series of so-called children's films that followed the success of that film mutually reinforced the meaning or concept of children's film. The final part discusses *The Dragonfly* (*Trollsländan*, Pauline Brunius, 1920), a Swedish short film with aspects of contemporaneous children's films that I stumbled upon during a series of archival research. Built on the first-hand materials, I would trace how this short film, which is rarely mentioned in the context of Swedish children's film history, established its genre identity at that time. In the first place, however, what is a
children’s film?

1.1. What is a Children’s Film?

The children’s film is generally considered a kind of films that are specifically addressed for child audiences. Although many film scholars, defining the meaning by establishing their own criteria, have been arguing which film should be called so, it seems that the sufficient definition has not been suggested yet.

Such difficulty stems partly from the fact that the term ‘children’s film’ itself implies two incompatible aspects. Namely, ‘children’ is often associated with pedagogy, while ‘film’ is discussed in conjunction with the commercial context, which is prevalently recognised to degrade the educational value that the film might possess. In the early discussion of the film from a pedagogical perspective: e.g. the negative influence on children’s behaviour, mental and physical health etc., the commercial implication of the medium, in many cases, was the first target of pedagogues’ criticism, therefore resulting in introducing the institutional practice of censorship not only in Sweden, but in many countries, which eventually excluded “harmful” films from the cinema.¹

Comparing American children’s films to European ones, Cary Bazalgette and Terry Staples explore the film’s intention, which is somewhat analogous to the mode of address, for child audiences embedded in so-called children’s films.² The significance of this study is that they reveal how children’s films represent children’s point of view by analysing not only narrative patterns and motifs, which is a prevalent method developed firstly in children’s literature field, but also production, marketing strategies, and mise-en-scène: e.g. slow editing, camera angle from lower positions, casting for “ordinary” children, dialogue from children’s

¹ The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future Possibilities, one of the first documents in the world to consider children and cinema in a moral concern, was published by the National Council on Public Order and Morals in Britain. According to this document, the debate on film censorship in Britain began around 1908, when questions deriving from the excessive expression of imported German films were raised, with Redford becoming an advisor in November of 1911 and going into practice in the following year. While there is no claim in the document that censorship itself began to be enforced for the psychological safety of children, it does raise questions such as the fatigue caused by the light of the projector, the imitation of crimes in films by child audiences, and the lack of moral character in cinemas. See, National Council of Public Morals, The Cinema: Its Present Position and Future Possibilities Being the Report of and Chief Evidence Taken by the Cinema Commission of Inquiry Instituted by the National Council of Public Morals (London: William and Norgate, 1917), 213. Also, Ikeda Yoshinobu, who was a vice-chairman of Japan’s film ethics committee, said, “as the years went by and the times changed, the reason for the control of films was first of all the negative impact on children, which led to public opinion and the rise of the police.” In August 1917, the Metropolitan Police Department’s “Regulations for the Exhibition of Motion Pictures” led to the introduction of Class Kou (甲) films, which were not to be seen by children under the age of 15. In America, around the time when the research sponsored by Payne Fund of New York City began in 1929, the assumption that film had the negative influence on children was gradually gaining the popularity and the discussion heated up in the 30s.

² Cary Balzagette and Telly Staples, “Unshrinkling Kids; Children’s Cinema and The Family Film”, in In Front of The Children, eds. Cary Balzagette and David Buckingham (Rondon: British Film Institute, 1995), 92-108.
perspective and so on. Such an intention is often associated with an educational viewpoint, as opposed to the commercialism rooted in American children’s films. Therefore, they term the former as ‘children's cinema,’ while the latter is called ‘family film’. Although being a typical structuralist approach, their research undoubtedly paved the way for the study of children's films as a serious subject matter.

On the other hand, Ian Wojcik-Andrews argues that it is almost impossible to establish the uniform concept of children’s film since “any attempt to universalise children’s cinema, a children’s film, or the nature of the child viewer, only reveals more closely the contradictions.” Therefore, he analyses it from four perspectives, that is, history, ideology, pedagogy and theory. However, as Noel Brown points out, addressing any film that involves child depictions as a children’s film, his monograph ends up being research on “representation of childhood,” which had previously been conducted by many other scholars within the sociological milieu. Presumably, such a broad list of children’s films does emanate from Wojcik-Andrews’s personal experiences in the interaction with his children, in which he realised that “there are films aimed at children, films about childhood, and films children see regardless of whether or not they are children’s film.” Likewise, M. Keith Booker, not emphasising its definition, simply regards “the films that have interested [him] primarily as potential viewing matter for [his] sons” as children’s films. As such, they are at times closely associated with personal experiences. In this respect, children’s films, or the definition of them, are rooted deeply in not only child experiences, but adult experiences with children as well.

As described in the introduction of Family Films in Global Cinema: The World beyond Disney, those loose definitions usually blur the demarcation line between children’s film and child film. The former is, as Brown and Bruce Babington account, “a production both suitable for and potentially appealing to children,” while the latter in many cases addresses an adult-oriented theme, or includes representations not suitable for children, which, therefore, leads to excluding child audiences, albeit including childhood depictions.
At the same time, however, it is also of great possibility that a certain *child film* used to be recognised as a *children’s film* in a different time period, or rather, is still called as such in a different country from its production. John Hartley well-summarises the attribute of genre relating to this point as follows.

> The set of genres in play at a particular historical moment will determine how each one is understood, and how each individual text will fit the available categories. So much so, in fact, that one and the same text can belong to different genres in different countries or times.\(^\text{10}\)

In analogous to this, *family films*, which Bazalgette and Staples delineate, might possibly be recognised as *children’s cinema* in the different context, and settled as such a genre.

### 1.2. The Real (*riktig*) Children’s Films in the 1940s?

In Swedish children’s film context, as mentioned at the outset, a large number of discourses presuppose the 1940s as the “burgeoning” period, or, in other words, “beginning” of Swedish children’s films, predicated on the assumption that there were many “quality” children’s films released at that time.

Indeed, Margareta Norlin mentions in *Svensk filmografi* that the 1940s is deemed a pioneering era (*pionjärtid*) of Swedish children’s films when nearly half of the scripts were newly written for the film, consequently leading to more than doubling the production of children and youth films.\(^\text{11}\) A total of nine children’s films before that, according to her account, lacked the distinctive originality on the ground that most of them were a prank comedy (*pojkstreck*), with Sigurd Wallén assigned as a director and the manuscripts based on the novels written by either Kar de Mumma [Erik Zetterström] or Emil Norlander. The commercial success of *The Children from Frostmo Mountain* (*Barnen från frostmofjället*, Rolf Husberg, 1945), however, helped pave the way for the investment in children’s films that followed in the late-1940s, despite that the film producers had yet been reluctant to make films addressed explicitly for child audiences even at the time.\(^\text{12}\)

Anders Åberg maintains that *Guttersnipes* (*Rännstensungar*, Ragnar Frisk, 1944), a film


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 425-426.
telling a story about an orphaned girl in a wheelchair, is often considered the first Swedish children’s film since it is this film that reacted to the social demand for “quality” children’s films, which was provoked by the lively “people’s home (folkhem)” discussion starting in the 1930s. Similarly, there is a brief account in Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian Cinema, stating that “[c]hildren’s film proper […] began in Sweden in the mid-1940s, with the première of Ragnar Frisk’s [Guttersnipes].”

In a similar vein, Belinda Graham also regards this film as the “first great children’s film,” which, according to her definition, places children as a leading role in the story with a more serious theme, rather than simple slapstick or prank comedy (bussstreck) that is often seen in the earlier films. For all her acknowledgement that there were several “children’s films” in the 1920s and 30s, she articulates that in those films, “on the whole it was unusual that children, their problems, and their life situation drove the story of the film forward,” thereby concluding that they are not real children’s films.

Certainly, the plot of Guttersnipes goes along with the main character named Ninni, who is adopted by an obscure painter, and the main friendship takes place between Ninni and a guttersnipe called Murre, who lives in the same poor district of her. However, should Graham’s definition be sensible to define the children’s film, one of the most famous children’s novels, titled The Wonderful Adventures of Nils (Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige, Selma Lagerlöf, 1906-7) could not be called children’s literature only because it is a story about the relationship between a boy and animals? Otherwise, does her definition only apply to the children’s film (even though it seems to be employed universally to various children’s literature as long as they involve narratives, such as children’s novels, theaters, picture books, etc.?)?

15 She suggests more detailed criteria for children’s films as follows: 1) The major roles are played by children. 2) One of the main relationships, and the great friendship narrative in the film, is between two children. 3) There are discussions between children where they discuss other than the adults. 4) What drives the plot and involvement forward is how it will go for the children. 5) A mystery in the film is solved by one (or more) children. 6) In addition: the message in the film has to do with children’s well-being. See Belinda Graham, “FILM: Rännstensungar (1944) - Sveriges första stora barnfilm,” Tidningen Kulturvinden (Aug 12, 2017), accessed July 30, 2020, http://tidningenkulturvinden.blogspot.com/2017/08/film-rannstensungar-1944-sveriges.html.
16 Ibid.
17 Mike Cadden describes that character construction in the children’s literature often entails anthropomorphism, or personification, which, therefore, functions as a code for children’s book. Mike Cadden, “Children’s Stories (Narratives Written for Children)”, in Routledge encyclopedia of narrative theory, eds. David Herman, et al. (London: Routledge, 2005), 59-60.
These statements are presupposed the general definition of children’s films: those for children. Indeed, Åberg, drawing on Bazalgette and Staples’s theorisation, describes that the 1920s’ Swedish children’s films are so much like ‘family films’ than ‘children’s cinema’ on account of “no discernible effort to promote the point of view of the child.” By the same token, Tommy Gustafsson, despite admitting that several films featuring child actors were released in the 1920s, affirms that there was no children’s film at that time.

Similarly, though with a slightly different perspective, Malena Janson, a leading Swedish children’s film scholar, takes it for granted in her dissertation that The Children from Frostmo Mountain is the first real Swedish children’s film since it was “the first film specifically made for children,” and “such films have been created with the intention of ‘benefiting’ the young audience.” She argues that Swedish children’s films have represented contemporary attitudes towards children, thus should be regarded as one of the discourses that established the concept of childhood in the formation of the ideal nation. Of particular interesting is that, analysing the difference between Laura Fittinghoff’s original novel published in 1907 and the film adaptation, she reveals that the modification of the dialogue from the adult’s point of view into the children’s one well-represents the subjectivity of children, thereby conferring “competence” on them as subjects handling the difficulty that they face. In the process of constructing the ideal welfare state, such a type of competence, namely, “a subjective position, initiative power and genuineness,” was disseminated through the radio, newspapers, and popular novels in the mid-1940s, derived from the idea that education should be implemented on the basis of children’s needs and encourage their growth without any torture or coercion, which eventually made people recognise children’s responsibility and freedom as primarily important.

In this current, children’s films gained popularity and had been largely accepted in
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18 Balzagette and Staples, 92-108.
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24 E.g. Anne-Li Lindgren analyses that the child-oriented radio program in the 30s helped permeate the concept of folkhemmet into Swedish society. See. Anne-Li Lindgren, “Att ha barn med är en god sak: Barn, medier och medborgarskap under 1930-talet” (Linköping: Linköpings Universitet, 1999) Also, Per Plov Qvist illustrates how the film had visualized the concept of “People’s home (folkhemmet)” in the 30s. See, Per Olov Qvist, Folkhemmets bilder: mentalitet, modernitet och motstånd i 30-talets: Svensk modernisering motstånd och mentalitet i den svenska 30-talsfilmen (Lund: Förlag Arkiv förlag, 1995).
25 Janson, 42, 44.
Swedish media discourse. When *Guttersnipes* was released in 1944,\textsuperscript{26} many articles seemed to mention it as a children’s film. For example, S. Almqvist appreciates that this film was not able to avoid the exaggeration of sentimental expression that was often deemed shortcomings of so-called children’s films at that time, but becomes a preliminary step to show the possibility of the production of high-quality children's films.\textsuperscript{27}

It comes no surprise that Janson argues *The Children from Frostmo Mountain*, which came just after *Guttersnipes*, functioned as a tool for educating children, namely, how to make them a citizen of Sweden as a welfare state.\textsuperscript{28} Representing amalgamation of competence and vulnerability, which represents the purity of children, Ante, one of the protagonists in the film, embodies an ideal citizen under people’s home (*folkhem*) policy, in which guaranteed is everyone’s right to become happy, and togetherness, citizenship and diligence were deemed to overcome economic and geographical conflicts between them, as she concludes in the first analysis.\textsuperscript{29}

1.3. The Certification of Children’s Films in the 1940s: Children’s Film Commission (*Barnfilmkommittén*)

As such, some research attributes the emergence of “real” children’s film in the 1940s to the initiation of ‘people’s home’ discussion. Admittedly, from around the mid-1940s, there is a drastic increase of the term, children's film (*barnfilm*), in the article of daily papers. In parallel with this current, this term first appeared in 9th edition of Swedish Academy’s Glossary (*Svenska Akademiens ordlista*) within the category of “child (*barn*)” in 1950.\textsuperscript{30} Although the previous edition was published in 1923, it was not listed there.\textsuperscript{31} Therefore, this fact confirms that children's films, branded during the 1940s, had been firmly established as a cultural convention, namely, at this point, ‘children’s film’ was registered as a somewhat legitimate generic signifier to films for children. However, I would also point out here that in terms of the drastic increase of appearance of the term in daily papers from the mid-1940s, the first and foremost factor of this increase could be described by the establishment of Children’s Film

---
\textsuperscript{26} The Swedish premier of this film is 1944-12-18, but this opening was only at the cinema in Malmö since this film was produced by a Malmö based film company. The Stockholm premier is 1945-01-22 (then followed by local cinemas), therefore many papers and film magazines began to take up this film in their article approximately at the beginning of 1945.

\textsuperscript{27} S. Almqvist, “Aveny, Lorry, Söderbio: Rännstensungar,” *Aftonåldningen*, 1945-01-23.

\textsuperscript{28} Janson, 59.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 58.


Commission (*Barnfilmkommittén*).

Different from children’s film reforms in Finland and Denmark, voluntary organizations took an initiative for the children’s film movement in Sweden.\(^{32}\) As World War 2 was getting more and more vehement, the discussion of children’s film problem was put aside for a while. It heated up again after the War among several women’s groups, which would eventually involve the censorship authority and gain the governmental support.\(^{33}\)

As Åberg elucidates on the background of the burgeoning of Swedish children’s film at that time, the relationship between children and cinema began to be scrutinised more systematically from the 1930s, which coincides with the introduction and discussion of new psychological and pedagogical findings in Sweden.\(^{34}\) Cinema was of course involved in this trend, and the major result brought by those discussions was the establishment of Children’s Film Commission, which officially formed in 1948. Children’s Film Commission’s activity was implemented on the basis of two central philosophy; one is marked by a practical and experimental activity, which had Children’s Film Jury (*Barnfilmjuryn*) as its working body; the other involves an enlightenment activity, which was expected to evoke parental opinions and propel reforms in children’s film issues.\(^{35}\)

At the early stage, representatives from the women’s groups commenced discussion in order to examine “bad” programs of matinees, and contacted film companies, distributors and cinema owners.\(^{36}\) It should be worth mentioning that during this process, as Etti Widhe recalls, from representatives of film industry born was the phrase “children’s film aunts (*barnfilmtanter*)” as a designation of an “idealistic but probably so uncomfortable and slightly annoying children's film interest.”\(^{37}\) This clearly illustrates reluctant attitudes of the film industry for an attempt to tackle children’s film production issues and alludes to the despised status of films precisely addressed for child audiences.

Indeed, for all that Schamyl Bauman, a producer of *Children from Frostmo Mountains* and several children’s films in the 1940s, showed his expectation to produce at least one children’s film a year, he stated that producers did not dare to take a responsibility for an

---


\(^{33}\) Ibid., 5-8.

\(^{34}\) Anders Åberg, “Ett viktigt bidrag till ungdomens fostran: Barn och film i Sverige 1905-1950,” *Rapporterien Centrum för kulturforskning* 2, (2014): 68-69. According to his accounts, Alexander S. Neill’s *The Problem Child* was published in Swedish in 1931, and many other books concerning psychological and pedagogical issues, such as Alfred Adler, Sigmund Freud, and Heinrich Hanselmann’s works, were translated into Swedish during the 1930s. Child psychology was also vigorously discussed by such a figure as Stina Palmborg.

\(^{35}\) Widhe, 8.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 8-9.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 8.
entire feature film directed by an untrained director, and therefore suggested that a shorter format of children’s films could give the significant opportunity to both young actors and directors to be trained. As such, although film industry probably began to acknowledge the surge of needs for children’s films, it seems that the business model of children’s film had not swiped away the financial risk for film industry even in the 1940s.

This point was also designated in the report of Swedish Government Official Reports (Statens offentliga utredningar, SOU) on the issue of children and film. This investigation was implemented at the request of Children’s Film Commission.

It appears [...] that the production of children's films is a difficult undertaking and entails greater risks than film production considers itself able to take, especially in its current crisis.

Therefore, “children’s films,” according to the report, had often been provided with rather a large attraction as "family films" and thereby attracting adult audiences as well. Children’s Film Commission emphasises the importance of the production of films especially for children, and in order to support and control them, they suggested granting refunds of entertainment tax and production loans to producers of good children’s films. This was executed in 1957, with Children’s Film Commission as a tax-exempt organisation.

In terms of the practical side, their activity included the inspection of various matinée programs for young audiences. Indeed, through the observation of film’s contents and children’s reaction during the screening, and the immediate interaction with them, Children's Film Jury, a practical body within Children’s Film Commission constituted of experts of psychology and pedagogy, established their own judgement criteria. With this, they put the certification on “quality” children’s films, and the results of their survey had been periodically published in daily papers after the inspection.

Consequently, Swedish children’s films began to be systematically characterised during the pioneering era. In other words, Åberg affirms, such a normative activity had forged the children's film genre on the basis of a codified value. “Quality” was guaranteed by such an institutional body to meet the requirement of adults, which parallels the establishment of the censorship in one way or another. The difference is that the former is restriction, while the

---

39 Barn och film, SOU 1952:51, 35.
40 Ibid.
41 Åberg, “Ett viktigt bidrag till ungdomens fostran”, 71.
42 “Barn och bio”, Svenska Dagbladet, 1949-01-09. The films are listed with a suitable age range as follows: Miracle on 34th Street (all ages), Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves (for 9 – 14), We Pranksters (for 8 and older), Röde hingsten (for older children), The Dragonfly (for 13-15).
latter is certification, which means public attitudes toward films became softened. Or, they gave up perfectly controlling them due to the exponentially increasing popularity of cinema.

However, the critical reception of those films was not always favorable. Take a look at one film directed by Margaretha Rosencrantz, an individual woman filmmaker and activist, who was contributed to augmenting the conception of children’s film at once by creating a series of short films for school children and propagating the idea of “children’s film” through her lectures at many schools.

Her primary interest lied in the film’s potential in teaching as an education tool, and some of her films were distributed not only to ordinary cinemas, but many schools as well.44 *Cock-a-doodle-doo* (*Kuckelikaka*, Margaretha Rosencrantz, 1949) is one of the most famous films, a 35-minute short film released in 1949, which depicts siblings that lost their eggs during the errand, and help their aunt to make up for the eggs. This film was advertised as a children’s film in many daily papers,45 and a poster includes three comments from daily papers, one of which describes this film as “a real children's film (*en riktig barnfilm*).”46 However, Colomba [Eva von Zweigbergk] from *Dagens Nyheter* comments that

> [t]his is a series of idyllic bright films of blond children with kind thoughts and good will, with smiling parents and aunts in the background and with jolly jobs in the hen house and kitchen. [...] People hope that this is only a beginning of a Swedish, yes Nordic, children's film era, and are therefore inclined to evaluate very mildly the deficiency that *Cock-a-doodle-doo* is afflicted with. Namely, the lack of artistic intention, accomplished originality, in short, artistic acting and direction.47

As such, while the emergence of real children’s film was highly welcomed in Swedish society, at the same time, its aesthetic “quality” was cast doubt on, as similar to the reception of *Guttersnipes*, which says it could not avoid exaggerated sentimentality and thereby becoming indecisive and awkward.48 This is also the case of *Aunt Green, Aunt Brown and Aunt Lavender* (*Tant Grön, Tant Brun och Tant Gredelin*, Rune Lindström, 1947), which was approved by Children's Film Jury,49 as Robin Hood, starting by stating that people expected more, appreciates this film as completely ineffective in its use of colour and therefore becoming trivial.50

---

46 *Kuckelikaka*, Poster, Svenska Filminstitutet.
47 *Colomba, Dagens Nyheter*, 1949-4-10.
It is quite interesting that in the critical discourse community, the term children’s film functions as if it conceals the lack of such a quality, and as a pretext that it is the first attempt for young audiences. This way, Swedish children’s films, emancipating from the precarious condition surrounding their generic identity, were articulated as the “first” by the branding strategy. With this regard, Åberg’s summarisation of the development of children’s film, though yet involving an abstraction, does make sense; that is,

- Children’s film hardly arises as a result of free market production.
- The children's film genre is originally regulated, partly created, as a societal commodity.
- Therefore, the children's film genre is originally located in the tension between film producers' interest (or lack of interest) in reaching a certain audience segment, children's interest in film experiences, and society's interest [...]51

1.4. The 1920s: The First Children’s Film?

Of course, if the epithet “real” signals “as a genre”, Swedish children’s films were firmly established as a genre through the branding process during the 1940s, as has been discussed by many scholars and critics. Nevertheless, it could not be neglected the fact that some contemporary critics and cinema owners had used the term ‘children’s film’ in their articles and advertisements even before the 1940s.

In regard to this, rebuffing the definition of children’s film that Janson and others suggest, namely, the concept of real children’s film, Margareta Rönnberg insists that the children’s film should be defined and evaluated by children, chastising various critics who exclude Mrs Andersson's Charlie from the children’s film category merely because its “story was not serious.”52 Furthermore, she contends that Janson does not elucidate in depth the reason why the first version of Mrs Andersson's Charlie is categorised as a family film, which, Janson considers, is highly inappropriate for children, predicated on some critics, who appreciated one of the humouristic scenes as violent and crude. With this regard, Rönnberg points out that Janson affirms as such without referring to the whole text of the review in Arbetaren, which says that the destructive scene in Mrs Andersson's Charlie is considered as extenuating circumstances,53 and claims that its aesthetic appeal is therefore for child audiences as well.

53 Eva, Arbetaren, 1922-09-04.
thus it being the very first Swedish children’s film.\textsuperscript{54} Then, impugning Janson’s definition of the children’s film, that is to say, “a film which is, through its aesthetic and thematic descriptions, aimed at child audiences,”\textsuperscript{55} Rönberg argues that her analysis focuses more on the film form rather than child audiences.

She proposes her own definition of the children’s film; that is, “a film deliberately made with children in mind, intended to get them interested, and be understandable for children under the age of 10, which also succeeds in doing so.”\textsuperscript{56} Therefore, as long as representing children’s mutual relationships and their own experiences, children’s films do not necessarily entail a child actor as the central role; thus they possibly star animals, dolls or indefinable animated creatures instead,\textsuperscript{57} which, though not wholly opposite, does not fit Graham’s criteria mentioned above.

She continues elaborating that the filmmakers’ intention does not matter unless a person concerned can make a success of his/her efforts. Therefore, it is not until child audiences make the decision of which film is the actual children’s film, or which film is good or bad as a children’s film that filmmaker’s intention is taken into consideration. In short, her definition of the children’s film is contingent on whether it thematises children’s experiences (barnerfarenheter), putting focus on child audiences as real people.\textsuperscript{58} She discloses that some characteristics in Janson’s analysis of The Children from Frostmo Mountain had already appeared in the 1920s’ children’s films, and therefore, neither been peculiar nor new to the 1940s’ children’s films.\textsuperscript{59}

While her challenge to the definition issue of children’s films seems to be well-grounded at first glance, it is still problematic that she exclusively refers to the reviews from daily papers, and does not sufficiently offers how the 1920s’ children’s films thematised children’s experiences. In fact, it is almost impossible only by examining journalistic reviews on certain films to grasp, or to disclose film’s appeal to young audiences in consonance with her definition – that is, “a film deliberately made with children in mind, intended to get them interested, and be understandable for children under the age of 10, which also succeeds in doing so.”\textsuperscript{60} Moreover, despite her investigation of contemporary reviews on The Children

\textsuperscript{54} Rönberg, “Svensk barnfilm fyller snart 100 år”.
\textsuperscript{55} Janson, 11.
\textsuperscript{56} Margareta Rönberg, “Nya medier” – men samma gamla barnkultur? Om det tredje könets lek, lärande och motstånd via TV, video och datorspel (Uppsala: Filmförlaget, 2006), 179.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibíd., 180.
\textsuperscript{58} Margareta Rönberg, Vänstervridna? Pedagogiska? Av högre kvalitet?: 70-talets barnteveprogram och barnfilmer kontra dagens (Visby: Filmförlaget, 2012), 94.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibíd., 127.
\textsuperscript{60} Rönberg, Nya medier, 179.
from Frostmo Mountain, in which she reveals that only a few critics called it a children’s film upon its initial release, she does not mention if children’s films from the 1920s were actually referred to as such, although the term ‘children’s film’ itself had already emerged in the mid-1910s.

In reality, I believe there are few child audiences, who preferably choose to see “children’s films” based on their expectation linked to the generic label of children's film, or distinguish them from others. Children, of course, prefer some films to others. However, those films are not necessarily children’s films. Therefore, categorisation of some films as ‘children’s films’ is, after all, for their parents, guardians, or those taking care of them. It actually functions to meet adult’s expectation for “better” education, or avoiding negative influence according to contemporaneous codes for “good” for the young. Therefore, the mode of address that is disclosed by examining the usage of the term ‘children’s film’ is, after all, for adult audiences. However, it should also be noted that behind them are children who are recommended by their parents or teachers to see it instead of accessing the "bad" cinema programs. Therefore, their appeal lies in the duality, but it is often imbricated, going back and forth between them.

1.5. The Defining Regime

Thus far, it could be said that whether or not a certain film should be called a children’s film, beyond the simple binary between the commercial and educational, depends heavily on the varying defining regime – that is, how they situate ‘children’ in their defining strategy. Certainly, children are neither the monolithic existence, nor have the same taste of adults. In addition, even within the category of ‘children’, there are several phases, as seen in Piaget's theory of cognitive development, and Rousseau's Emile in an older case. Furthermore, what children experience in urban areas and rural ones had possibly been significantly different especially before the nationwide educational system was established. Therefore, children being considerably diverse, depending on the ideology that constitutes the concept of childhood and attitudes toward them, it is quite difficult to examine children's films from a perspective of the simple binary between children and adults.

Nevertheless, when it comes down to conducting research concerning them, scholars need to narrow them down as a subject matter for their specific scheme. As Karen Coats describes,
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61 E.g. Svenska Dagbladet introduces Children from Frostmo Mountain, with a title “finally, a Swedish children’s film (Äntligen en svensk barnfilm)” and celebrated that with this film, the film company finally took a risk for producing a film for child audiences and confronted the lack of children’s films. See Svenska Dagbladet, 1944-07-16.
62 Rönnberg, “Svensk barnfilm fyller snart 100 år.”
the difficulty of naming of childhood and children’s studies lies in an important distinction and disciplinary bias. That is, for example, some disciplines address children as “real people” or “clients,” whereas others view them as “socially constructed ideological subjects.”

Herein lies a different and never compatible standpoint between Janson and Rönnberg, that is, form versus audience; the former has a lot to do with adult experiences, while the latter focus more on child experiences.

Speaking of the definition of Swedish children’s film, I would admittedly agree in part that although they contributed more or less to the construction of epistemological framework at that time, neither The Children from Frostmo Mountain nor Guttersnipes are the first Swedish children’s film, and the 1940s is not the beginning – though there is no such a thing as “beginning.”

Leger Grindon explains that, going beyond the narrow context, with its formula thereby imitated by other film companies, a particular genre evolves from a cycle that is often associated with a particular film company or series (e.g. RKO horror, James Bond series). In contrast, some genre films, which could not establish a stable status, are deemed a cluster.

In this sense, there was a cluster-like “children’s film” boom in 1923 after the success of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie. Therefore, this dissertation aims to reveal what kind of film was actually referred to as children’s films, especially around when the term ‘children’s film (barnfilm)’ began to be used in Swedish general discourse, that is, from 1914 to 1923.

* In this project, I would not intend to offer a clear-cut definition of children’s film, rather examine how the children’s film was described within the several sets of discursive communities, functioned, and related to the perceived textual elements, situating it within genre studies. Thereby, I would conclude that children’s film is a precarious genre; therefore, it is almost impossible to narrow it down by an essentialist approach, and it is, after all, indistinguishable from family films. Admittedly, this might merely become rephrasing of Åberg’s short conclusion, and of the general statement that there was no children’s film

63 Karen S. Coats, “Keepin’ It Plural: Children’s Studies in the Academy”, *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly* 26, no.3 (Fall 2001): 140. She also suggests the “bravely showy list,” which describes the presupposed children’s conception in each area. (e.g. Education’s child is a project, Law’s child is a client, Social work’s child is a problem to be solved and a placement to be made, etc.), though admitting that the list involves the somewhat caricature side of portraiture.


before the 1940s. However, I would investigate in more detail the generic identity of films that used to be conceived as children’s-film-like especially upon the emergence of the term.

Hence, in the following chapter, at first, the brief history of genre studies and its association with children's film studies is to be discussed. Secondly, I would investigate the emergence of the term to closely look at the first recurring appearance of the term ‘children’s film’ in Swedish daily papers and the cinema discourse, both in trade journals and fan magazines. The agenda of this part is as follows; which films were actually referred as children’s film upon the emergence of the term in the articles? Indeed, did any consensus of children’s film really exist before the 1940s, the beginning of “real” Swedish children’s film? If any, what determinants confirmed this consensus? Then, the discussion moves onto Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, which Rönnberg regards as the very first Swedish children's film: Was this film actually referred to as a children’s film? If not, why? In this part also addressed is the first children’s film cluster in 1923; did the emergence of the term ‘children’s film’ facilitate the children’s genre? In the process of conducting archival research, I serendipitously found a film called The Dragonfly, which seems to typify the generic identity of children's film in a contemporaneous sense. Therefore, the final chapter would take it up and examine how it is mentioned in various discourse communities and scrutinise its textual aspect, which symbolises the generic status of children’s film at that time. It should be noted that I would not declare here that this is the first children's film in Sweden. Rather, I am convinced that this film signals the possibility of the open-endedness of Swedish children's film history, beyond the debate about whether the beginning is the 1940s or the 1920s.

Although I set up the scope of the present research, from 1914 to 1923, I will not chronologically examine each period. Rather, each chapter is constituted as more topic-based. However, the consistent and overall aim of this thesis is to pursue contemporaneous conception of "children's films," which is strongly associated with the term, and the possibility of finding the "new" perspective to Swedish children's film history.
2. The Children’s Film As a Genre?

[A] text cannot belong to no genre, it cannot be without or less a
genre. Every text participates in one or several genres, there is
no genreless text […]

Jacques Derrida, The Law of Genre

As Robert C. Allen puts it, “[f]or most of its 2,000 years, genre study has been primarily
nominological and typological in function. That is to say, it has taken as its principal task the
decision of the world of literature into types and the naming of those types – much as the
botanist divides the realm of flora into varieties of plants.”

The aim of such an approach is merely to apply the present knowledge of a certain genre
to the one as such in the past, and thereby argue that they are of the same kind or origin,
incorporating it into a specific generic system. However, is it possible to employ the present
epistemological framework to define the children's film to the past? This is just as no one can
convincingly talk about the existence of oxygen in a time when phlogiston was thought to
burn.

By this token, to classify Mrs Andersson’s Charlie as a family film in accordance with
Bazalgette and Staples’s theorisation can no more escape from the traditional nominological
and typological perspective than eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European biologists were
merely the recorders of “ontological distinctions in the living world.” In that case, however,
how could we avoid such a tradition? And, indeed, should we do so?

I believe that tracing the history of a genre begins not so much with giving a name to a
group of texts, but rather with investigating how a genre with certain textual characteristics
was perceived in the contemporaneous discourse. This chapter looks at the brief history of
genre studies, and then discusses how such a framework could be applied to this research.

2.1. The Genre Studies and Empiricist Dilemma

Genre study has a long history and perhaps dates back to Aristotle’s classification of literature,
by simply saying that, poetry in Poetics, are divided into tragedy, epic, lyric and so forth.

---
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Indeed, academic discourses in film studies have forged genre theory as study of such a classification, with a particular genre considered to be inherited to a significant extent from classical literary genres. It is natural that in the early period, film studies depended heavily on academically rigorous research fields, as it had not yet established the prestigious status in academia. Thus, cinematic genre theory emerged and flourished in the effort that film critics and theorists made in the early-1970s in order to usher film studies as a serious subject into scholarly disciplines, therefore drawing on methodologies from semiotics, psychoanalysis and Marxist studies.70

Rick Altman, one of the most influential film genre theorists, suggested his method to analyse a film genre, called a semantic/syntactic approach. Employing linguistic methodology to genre studies, he divides up film’s textual elements into two dimensions – that is, the semantics and syntax. The former belongs to the micro-dimension (e.g. characters, settings, costumes, etc.), while the latter pertains to the macro-dimension (e.g. the relationship between characters, etc.).71 When the semantic units are successfully integrated into the syntactic structures through a recurring appearance of the same syntax, the generic meaning will be consolidated, thereby becoming a widely acknowledged “genre” such as musical, horror, comedy, crime suspense and so forth.72

However, this type of genre analysis, what we deem ‘textual analysis’ in a broad sense, is potentially to engender what he calls the exclusive list, which occurs “in connection with attempts to arrive at the overall meaning or structure of a genre.”73 Thus, such a list, excluding more tangential films, forces film critics and genre theorists to pick up the same well-known films that “faithfully” fit the genre criteria that they established.74 Consequently, genre theorists, be they consciously, or rather purposefully or not, tend to arbitrarily address the genre films in favour of their own classification. In other words, films, which do not meet their requirements in the syntax of the western genre, for example, would never be western, thus often excluded from their discussion of the western film.

This way of analysis seems to have been justified in many cases by prototype theory. That is, when conceiving of an object, we think of the most salient figure in the same type, which
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72 E.g. the science-fiction film involves its own semantic elements, such as spaceships, computers and space itself. It develops through the recurring release of similar kind, borrowing the syntax of horror at first, then western, thereby establishing its own generic status. Now we conceive of Star Wars series as such, even though they include “western” syntax in their plot.
74 Ibid.
is called prototype. And if the object does not fit the prototype, or is quite different from it, we do not consider it to be of the same kind, or at least, it takes us much time to fall it into the same category.\textsuperscript{75} In any case, such an approach has certainly eliminated the diversity of genre recognition.

However, if critics and theorists are not allowed to build a corpus by analysing some film texts, then in what way is ‘genre’ determined? Or, who can conceptualise a specific genre as distinct from others? All these questions allude for the impasse of film genre studies, as Edward Boscombe holds that “if we want to know what a western is, we must look at certain kinds of films. However, how do we know which films to look at until we know what a western is?”\textsuperscript{76} Similarly, Andrew Tudor had already noted such a matter, that “genres cannot be analysed without first isolating a constitutive corpus of texts; but it is impossible to isolate a corpus of texts without having identified the key elements constituting the genre,”\textsuperscript{77} mentioning it as an “empiricist dilemma.”\textsuperscript{78} Importantly, he puts it further that one possible solution is to “lean on cultural consensus as to what constitutes [a particular genre].”\textsuperscript{79}

2.2. Institutional/Journalistic Discourses to Create Cultural Consensus?

Later exploring American musical films in his book, Altman regards a generic corpus established through institutional and journalistic discourses as \textit{prima facie}. That is why, for all his conceding its usefulness to found “a hypothesis about the presence of meaningful activity”, he articulates such a term “does not necessarily contribute a definition or delimitation of the genre in question.”\textsuperscript{80} He concludes that “[t]exts which correspond to a particular understanding of the genre, that is which provide ample material for a given method of analysis”\textsuperscript{81} should be regarded as overriding determinants in establishing a generic corpus, with film critics and theorists, therefore, being as a gatekeeper in the milieu of genre studies.

Steve Neale, opposing Altman’s restriction of institutional and journalistic discourses to “the first step of genre analysis,”\textsuperscript{82} contends that they are essential elements, which constitute

---

\textsuperscript{75} Grindon, “Cycles and Clusters”, 43.
\textsuperscript{77} Brown, “The “Family” Film,” 24.
\textsuperscript{78} Andrew Tudor, “Genre”, in \textit{Film Genre Reader IV}, ed. Barry Keith Grant (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), 5.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 14.
what audiences expect to see at the cinema and chiefly function in determining a specific genre.\textsuperscript{83} He emphasises to reconsider the notion of inter-textual relay,\textsuperscript{84} which Gregory Lukow and Steven Ricci suggest. Casting doubt on the single-text-centred analysis and passive audience (monolithic spectator), which had been prevalent in the 1970s to 80s’ film theory, they affirm that an audience becomes engaged in the creation of a particular genre through such a relay.\textsuperscript{85}

Drawing on this concept, Noel Brown asserts in his recent research that the children’s film is “one produced and widely received as such.”\textsuperscript{86} Pointing out the impossibility of determining the children’s film according to what child (or adult) audiences actually consume, he suggests examining the intention for child audiences, which, be it consciously or not, was considered to be inscribed on such institutional/journalistic discourses and concludes that it is thereby possible to define the children’s film.\textsuperscript{87}

As Thomas Schatz maintains, film genres, as distinct from literary genre studies, “are not organized or discovered by analysts but are the result of the material conditions of commercial filmmaking itself,”\textsuperscript{88} the reason being that they need to recoup a production cost, or make a profit for the studios. Therefore, "to discuss the Western genre is to address neither a single Western film nor even all Westerns, but rather that system of conventions which identifies Western films as such."\textsuperscript{89} This system of conventions is undeniably buttressed by the inter-textual relay, thereby building a consensus through reciprocal relationships. By the same token, it could be said that to discuss children's film as a genre requires investigating the conventional system that identifies some films as such.

Children's film is, of course, a cultural product influenced by social attitudes towards children, and above all, created by the film industry as well as genre theorists and critics. Thus, in order to untangle the intention in so-called children's films, Brown suggests exploring them from five crucial aspects: They are 1. Marketing and Distribution Strategies, 2. Censorship and Suitability Ratings, 3. Critical Reception, 4. Merchandising and 5.

\textsuperscript{83} Neale, “Questions of Genre,” 48–56.
\textsuperscript{84} A particular (film) genre is established through the inter-textual relay, which is the idea that audiences’ expectation is formed through various discourses rather than a single (film) text, such as “advertising campaigns, participatory publicity gimmicks, consumer tie-ins, posters, fan magazines, and popular reviews to the modes of address found in theatre architectures, marquees, trailers, newsreels, cartoons, and even titles and opening credit sequences.” Gregory Lukow and Steven Ricci, “The “Audience” Goes “Public”: Inter-Textuality, Genre, and the Responsibilities of Film Literacy,” On Film, no.12 (Spring, 1984): 29.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{86} Brown, The Children’s Film, 2.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
Exhibition Strategies, through which, the identity label of children’s film is generated.

While emphasising the importance of the analysis of such discourses, he does not entirely disregard Altman’s semantic/syntactic approach, or rather incorporates it in order to reveal the negotiated identity of children’s film. Although he insists that audiences’ conceptualisation of children’s films might be established solely through contextual discourses, in order for children’s films to be widely recognised as such, the textual aspect of them must meet the expectations regarding what the children’s film is.

Relating to this, referring to Peter Krämer’s research, which reveals the generic identity shift of 2001: A Space Odyssey (Stanley Kubrick, 1968), Brown asserts that an initial generic label attached by distributors and disseminated through industrial discourses could be revised by textual elements, regarded as not child-friendly by contemporary audiences and rating organisations. Therefore, “children’s cinema”, as he goes on, “must possess a set of textual and associative significations that differentiates it from cinema intended primarily for adult audiences.”

In the process of his research, Brown found the overarching convention and proposes the five recurring cliches of the children’s film: 1. The reaffirmation of family, kinship and community, 2. The foregrounding of child, adolescent and teenage figures and their experiences, 3. The exclusion and/or eventual defeat of disruptive social elements, 4. The minimisation of “adult” representational elements, 5. [The] endings are predominantly upbeat, emotionally uplifting, morally unambiguous and supportive of the social status quo.

These are all considered what Altman calls syntactic elements, which are less changeable, comparing to semantic objects that are strongly dependent on local contexts. Certainly, genre is an imitation of other films. As Sobchack concludes that “[t]he genre film is a classical mode in which imitation not of life but of conventions is of paramount
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90 Noel Brown, The Children’s Film, 5-10.
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93 Peter Krämer, “‘A film specially suitable for children: The Marketing and Reception of 2001: A Space Odyssey (1968)’, in Family Films in Global Cinema: The World Beyond Disney, eds. Noel Brown and Bruce Babington (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 37-52. In this work, Krämer reveals the generic identity of 2001: Space Odyssey, which was initially targeted for audiences from all the ages. However, in UK, it was released as A rating, which means, the film was shown to those over the age of 16, or accompanied by adults. But later, after earnest imploration, the rating was changed by BBFC from A to U, which means, allowing for all the audiences including children.
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importance,”98 the children's film has also been developing by imitating the conventional forms in one way or another, including the shared plot structure, characters, and settings.

However, if we take the position that the identity of a genre is strongly influenced by contextual factors, and then we have to argue that the same textual elements are grasped differently in different times, and the conception of genre changes accordingly. What I would stress here is that they should be corroborated with a "cultural consensus", namely, borrowing Tudor’s words, what they collectively believe children’s films to be.99 And this consensus is confirmed by the meaning of ‘children’s film’, in other words, the usage of the term. Therefore, I would argue here that contextual understanding of a genre should precede textual analysis.

Therefore, I would utilise the five elements that Brown suggests in order to grasp the contemporaneous conception of them, rather than establishing a children's film system by presenting the similarities between children's films of the present and the past. As just reiterated, this paper will historically explore how the very early children's films had been discussed in Swedish discourse. It should be noted again that the purpose of this paper is to clarify how early Swedish children's films were conceived within the context of the term "children's film" and the relationships surrounding it.

98 Sobchack, “Genre Film”, 132.
3. Returning to the Emergence of the Term “Children’s Film (Barnfilm)”

As mentioned in the first chapter, through lively discussion of the relation between children and cinema under the agenda of people’s home and Children’s Film Commission’s branding strategy, Swedish children’s films as a genre were more or less established. Children's films of this era have been called true children's films because they involve serious and melodramatic stories and portray vulnerable but independent children who overcome the struggle as a symbol of ideal citizen. Nevertheless, there are some films that were referred to as such even before that. Though this concept did never turn into a solid genre, it is also true that some commonality is also found in those films. This means different conception of the children’s film before the 1940s existed.

Åberg argues that outlining the criteria an individual film must meet in order to be included in the children's film as a genre is not a viable option because its conceptual meaning depends heavily on how it is examined. Indeed, the statement that there are few children’s films before the 1930s can be differently understood, depending on whether the focus is on the child audience or on the producer. Should we take the former standpoint for the definition of children’s film, it might be more broadly applied to matinée practices. In fact, there were several children’s screenings already in the 1900s, in which several theatres offered child audiences a reduced price of their programs. By 1905, children’s screening became one of the exhibition strategies. However, when the term children’s film first appeared in Swedish discourse, did it actually refer to films that had been shown at such a screening?

3.1. The Language Confirms the Consensus?

As Schatz argues, "a film genre is both a static and a dynamic system." The syntactic is relatively static, whereas contextual determinants often refine any film genre, with its nature thereby being "continually evolving." Consequently, the concept of a particular genre, as seen in Krämer’s research, is changeable with the times and varies depending on the rating
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system of each country, which confirms genre’s potential to change itself as process-like.\textsuperscript{106}

In short, the generic identity shift is inevitable for almost all the genres.

Importantly, at the same time that the identity of a particular genre changes like a process, the lexical entry applied to such a genre is also transformative time after time, and one cultural context or another. Therefore, what we now consider as a children's film will possibly not be as such in the future. From this point of view, looking at the classification, which is offered in some cinema platforms – such as Internet Movie Database (IMDb), Netflix, and Amazon, etc. – only discloses today’s sense of children’s film, even if it is based on the previous classification system.

The linguistic system entails an attribute of retronym that retrospectively generates the meaning. For example, the term “silent film” is a term that could not have existed when film did not yet have sound. It is not until “sound film” was invented that such a term emerged as a signifier to a film that did not have a sound as distinct of sound films. Namely, there is always an epistemological gap between contemporary audiences and us toward a particular genre. That is why it is problematic to define “children’s cinema” or “family films” from the present perspective and thereby adding excessive meanings that audiences in the past may not have come up with. After all, exploring the origin or history of a genre within genre studies is nothing more than an act of retroactively labeling based on the present epistemological framework. To the extent that we try to find the "children's film-like thing" in history, it is prone to analyze children's matinees, iconography in children's novels and plays, animals, children, and mysterious creatures that frequently appear in children's literature, and argue that certain works are the origin of children's films.

However, both culture- and time-specific syntax and semantic elements exist in any genre, therefore it is necessary to grasp the definition of contemporaneous children's films. With this, I would stress that resting on the emergence of the term children’s film (\textit{barnfilm}) is of crucial importance. For it somewhat helped people realise that there was such a genre. Perhaps, this pertains to the idea of the articulation, in which, as Saussure describes, it is not until given a name that a thing or phenomenon comes into being.\textsuperscript{107} To determine what is a children's film does not define what was a children's film. This is where an irreconcilable gap between the theoretical attempt to systematically define children's films and the historical exploration of them.

\textsuperscript{106} Neale, “Questions of Genre,” 56-58.
Niibori 24

Neale mentions in *Genre and Hollywood* that Eric Partridge’s *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* and the researchers of Jean-Louis Leutrat reveal that the first colloquial use of the term “western” as a generic noun dates back to around 1910 and fully established in the 1920s. This fact implies that *The Great Train Robbery* (Edwin S. Porter, 1903), a film often discussed in the context of the “western” genre, “is unlikely [...] to have been perceived as a western at the time the film was made,” and therefore, “retrospectively hailed as an early example of the western.”

Above all, however, Neale points out that nevertheless, having already been well-acclimated to the western genre through “dime novels, Wild West show, paintings, illustration, short stories and the like,” the contemporaneous audiences “would have drawn on the paradigms they provided in understanding and locating the film.” He touches upon Charles Musser’s rebuttal of that case, which reveals that the popularity of *The Great Train Robbery* was not merely due to the trait of western genre, but its “ability to incorporate so many trends, genres and strategies fundamental to the institution of cinema at that time.” In either case, both studies are definitely important, especially in terms of disclosing the media’s potential to internalise a particular genre *avant la lettre*.

What counts in Neale’s reflection here, I believe, is that he emphasises *some* significance always lies in the emergence and use of the term, especially the distinction of generic label between the retrospective definition suggested by critics and theorists, and industrial discourses on the film’s initial release. As John Swales mentions that “a discourse community’s nomenclature for genres is an important source of insight,” there are always tacit rules, which articulate the generic delineation according to their own codes. Thus, be the concept of a particular genre internalised or not, the advent of the term could be a crucial point, with which we should always start. Although Schatz argues that film genres are not discoveries of analysts, in so much as those discoveries permeate into the general discourse, they would be more or less contributed to forging the concept of a certain genre.

I believe that the concept does exist before the language, but there is no way to confirm this, especially in historical research on a genre in the public discourse. This is because
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applying the generic conception of a certain genre, which were referred to as such a term when it emerged, to films that predate it is in the end nothing more than talking about past genres from today's perspective. Therefore, this chapter sets out with the exploration of the term “children’s film”, especially its emergence in the 1910, in order to clear what contemporaries believed the children’s film should be, and then describes what commonalities and chaos were contained within, rather than setting up the criteria.

3.2. The 1910s: The Emergence of the Term and Duality of Address

In major Swedish daily papers, the recurring appearance of the term, “children’s film”, began approximately in 1914, as the Kungliga biblioteket’s newspaper article search service shows.\(^{116}\) *Aftonbladet* reported in 1914 that Röda Kvarn, a theatre in Stockholm, had been offering a children’s film program every afternoon at a reduced price. At one program of which screened were a war drama, *Tyrolean Rebellion (Tyrolens frihetskamp*, Carl Froelich, 1913) and a small adorable children’s film, titled *Jimmy’s Mother (Jimmis mamma*, Teff Johnson, 1914).\(^ {117}\) Inferred from information of the censorship card and the synopsis in *Vitagraph Life Portrayals,\(^ {118}\) *Jimmis mamma* is presumably Vitagraph’s short comedy series that featured Bobby Connelly – that is, *Sonny Jim* series produced during the period from 1914 to 1915 – and the original title is *Sonny Jim in Search of a Mother*.\(^ {119}\) Interestingly enough, despite that the title written on the censorship card was *A Mother in the Tree (En moder i trädet)*, – this is because Sonny Jim, an orphaned protagonist, believes a mother grows up in the tree in the story – it was possibly changed into *Jimmis mamma* upon the commercial release. Although this might not immediately link to the appeal to young audiences, such an alteration of the title signals the fact that a child character was uplifted to the surface on the title.

As time went by, the term, *children’s film*, in the articles of newspapers slightly increased since 1917 when several American “children’s films” – a series of films featuring such young
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\(^{116}\) *Svenska dagstidningar*, accessed August 26, 2020, https://tidningar.kb.se/?q=barnfilm. Admittedly, this way involves some problems since the result only shows the digitised materials, and they probably use OCR (Optical Character Recognition) to convert the printed texts into the digital ones, which are sometimes erroneously outputted due to the deterioration of the printed materials. However, still efficient to grasp the trend.


\(^{118}\) “Sonny Jim in Search of a Mother,” *Vitagraph Life Portrayals V*, vol.3, 1914:12 (Feb.), 22.

\(^{119}\) *En moder i trädet*, Censorship Card [11159], Riksarkivet. The title on the censorship card is *En moder i trädet* (A mother in the tree). However, this film was presumably distributed in the title *Jimmys mamma* (sometimes, misspelled *Jimmis mamma*). Given that the first appearance of the advertisement of this film in the daily paper and the date on the card is both at the end of September, 1914, it could be inferred that these titles were the same.
stars as Virginia Lee Corbin, Mary Miles Minter, Zoe Rae, Marie Osborne and so on – also began to appear on the screen of Swedish theaters.

For instance, *Aftonbladet* took up in 1917 *Jack and the Beanstalk* (Chester & Sidney Franklin, 1917), with the heading saying, “The Story on the Silver Screen: The First Children’s Film *Jack and the Beanstalk*: Played only by Children for Children”. Preceding the premiere of this film, *Svenska Dagbladet* published an article, in which, Elmer H. Carlson, who was in charge of marketing of American films in Scandinavian countries, describes how difficult it had been to sell them in Sweden due to the price and censorship issue. In this article, introducing aforementioned *Jack and the Beanstalk*, he also explains that in America, Fox had started a completely new genre, *children’s films*, which were mostly played by children, but could be *enjoyed by both children and adults* at the same time. Fox Company intended to produce every year twelve children’s films, *with child actors as main role*, and they were picked up from theaters and schools throughout America and received high salaries as well, he continues.

As Babington and Brown explain, there are three basic forms of address related to children’s films; that is, single address, targeted to one specific demographic audience group; dual or double address, to both children and adults; and undifferentiated address, to both, but as single entity. Therefore, children’s films at that time were considered something to entail the representation of children, and dual address, which probably pertains to the generic identity of family film today. Indeed, *Filmkonsten* published in 1919 a full-page spread article, which includes the following anonymous quote about the increasing number of films with child actors at the time, and what contemporary audiences expected for them.

> Children captivate other children through everything they do and get to experience. But in adults, they evoke feelings of less volatile (lingering) interest. The men smiled at them, a crumb stirring deepest inside. The women's eyes are filled [...] with clear tears - the mothers among them see their own children in the prodigy on the screen and love this again when they come home. And those among them, who have no children, think with pain-mixed certainty of victory: so, just my own child would have been!

As such, for all signaling the generic identity of the family film today, child representations in
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the film offered both children and adults a vicarious experience, which bespeaks aesthetics of the very children’s film at that time. Of equal importance, however, is that such aesthetics of duality was consolidated by commercial implication. For, when Treasure Island (Chester and Sidney Franklin, 1918) was premiered at Odéon, Œdons Filmnyheter, citing exactly the same text in Filmkonsten, affirms that the film “testifies to a particularly high degree to the truth of what has been stated above.” Thus, cinema owners, or film industry at large, had expected children’s film to reach as wide an audience as possible, naturally because they had to recuperate the production cost, as also mentioned in SOU report. Thus, the term "children's film" seems to be used in both the critical and industrial discourse community mainly to refer to American films, and it could be understood that the appeal of children's films at that time was a dual attraction to both adults and children.

3.3. Sanitisation and Optimisation

It is also worth mentioning that Gloriana (E. Mason Hopper, 1916), a film starring Zoe Rae, was recognised widely as a children’s film in various avenues. This film tells a story of Gloriana, a young girl, who was adopted and cherished by Dr Manning. However, his wife does not care Gloriana that much, as she is dedicated to the charity for the destitute. One day, inspired by Mrs Manning’s philosophy about the charity, Gloriana steals her money to give it to her needy governess, which is eventually found out by Mrs Manning. However, hearing Gloriana confessing, she becomes aware of the poverty surrounding her, then starts to dedicate herself more to solve it. Svenska Dagbladet published some critical receptions to the film from various newspapers as follows.

Stockholms Dagblad: Among the cinemas’ news this week, the praise is taken from Odéon’s children’s film Gloriana. Not only is it filmed by the cutest little ones, who are surprisingly natural in front of the camera, but it also has a plot that is both entertaining and morally instructive. The film is, from beginning to end, filled with a happy and good mood, where humour is not lacking, and extraordinarily suitable to be shown to child audiences…

Stockholms-Tidningen: This week, the Odéon cinema presents a children’s film, “Gloriana”, […] with a five-year-old girl, Zoe Rae, in the title role. The little lady is a full-fledged actress whose mimetic means of expression border on the phenomenal. She should share the praise with a couple of colleagues of the same age...

Dagens Nyheter: This week, Odéon offers a drama, which bears the resounding title “Gloriana”. It is also the name of a little girl, who plays the leading role in the drama and who of course has many curious fates and adventures before everything ends happily and well. Gloriana is played by a little girl at the age of 5, who has considered belonging to the better film children. She is […] always graceful and pretty. A little boy, Gloriana’s foster brother, is chipper and jaunty and above all, natural. The action is entertaining, and the drama is excellent as a *children’s program*.

Aftonbladet: This week, the Odéon cinema has a Trans-Atlantic film, “Gloriana”, whose biggest attraction is a 5-year-old girl, Zoe Rae, who plays the lead role. She is a full-fledged actress with exceptional qualifications to entertain and enchant the audience. She is also happily seconded by a couple of girls of the same age. It is an excellent *children’s film*, played by and available to children.  

As seen in these reviews, many critics mentioned this film as either a *children’s film* or *children’s program*. As far as the plot is concerned, the film is not a simple prank comedy, but instead contains a more serious theme, which Graham considers primarily necessary for a “real” children’s film.

For all that, however, it seems that *Gloriana* was scarcely referred to as a children’s film in American media discourse, despite its clear address for children and women, as given in the article of *The Moving Picture World*, that representations of many children would “appeal particularly to women and children,” and therefore become “the greatest matinee attractions of recent times.” This is probably because the children’s film movement already set in motion around 1915 in America, during which financial supports for providing good children’s shows were realised in various areas. As designated in an authorized list of films chosen by National Board of Censors for Children’s Motion Picture Shows, “children’s films” ranged from short or actuality forms to feature films, all of which, however, were adaptations of folktales. That is probably why *Gloriana*, neither being an adaptation of folktale nor actuality form, was not recognised as a children’s film in American newspapers.
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However, transported into Sweden, its generic identity was somehow revised. In that sense, the children’s film is nothing but a result of the optimisation in consonant with educational codes that are contemporaneously consented in a particular cultural context. This is also the case of children’s literature, as, for instance, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, despite a harsh criticism toward fairy tales for children by educators and clergy about its lack of explicit morals, publishers released a variety of fairy tales throughout Europe, by “adding Christian sentiments and cleansing narratives of their erotic, cruel, or bawdy passages.”\(^{135}\) Such a sanitisation task, especially in terms of films, varies depending on each country’s ideological view on childhood, and was in practice taken charge of the censorship board in Sweden at that time.

As has already been explained by many,\(^ {136}\) in Sweden, the discussion of censorship began around 1905. It is a school teacher and activist, named Maria Louise Gagner from Pedagogiska Sällskapet in Stockholm, who started to give a series of lectures, which made those discussions really take off. Despite her lifelong commitment to a variety of educational activities and her vigorous promotion of children’s literature and popular culture, she was sceptical about the impact of film on children, believing that a “film offers them too specific and mediocre melodrama, which constricts the imaginary world that is supposed to be supreme for children.”\(^ {137}\) In 1907, for all admitting that children have the right to experience anything that they are interested in, she had tacitly advocated in *Idun* for the protection of children from “harmful” films, castigating the popular cinema programs for their unsuitable contents for young audiences.\(^ {138}\) The following year she gave a lecture entitled “Children and Film Screenings,” which, published in the magazine *Verdandi*, and this, as a pamphlet, had later been presented repeatedly, with slight modifications, until censorship was abolished.

As the social climate shifted in the direction of rethinking the relationship between film and children, together with Charles Magnusson, a president of Svensk bio, which was one of Sweden’s largest film companies at the time, and Per Cronwall, an advocate general, she led an investigation into the censorship system. Afterwards, Gagner became one of the founding


censors at the National Board of Film Censors (Statens biografbyrå), which was established in December 1911. This body set up an age limit of 15 years old and each film was tagged with a card coloured in red, allowed for all ages; yellow, for those at the age of 15 and older; and white, forbidden to be shown. As such, in the Swedish film context, children were kept mentally safe under the film censorship, which originated from the “detrimental effect” hypothesis of film, advocated during the period of the intense debate by educators. Preceding the establishment of this institution, The Ordinance on Cinema Performances (biografförordningen) was issued on 22 June 1911 (No. 71), which declared in section 6 the principle for censorship as follows.

A censor must not approve films, whose image would conflict with general law or proper morals, or otherwise could appear to be brutalizing, inflammatory, or misleading to the concepts of law. Thus, films, which depict horror scenes, suicides or serious crimes in such a manner or in such a context as to possibly causing such an action, must not be approved.

In terms of such a screening, to which children under the age of 15 are given access, films which are liable to harmfully upset children's imagination, or otherwise negatively affect their mental development and health, must not be approved either.

In fact, it is clear from the censorship card that Gloriana was also involved in the sanitisation process in Sweden, the reason being that some scenes judged as “harmful” were cut by a censor. According to the censorship card of this film, for example, in the act four deleted was the last text that says “there are probably always places where people want to have little girls to help,” and the whole Gloriana’s description of fictional burglary and menacing with a knife as well as the scene in which Gloriana commits the theft. Thus, to cut “unnecessary parts” and react to this sanitisation, and thereby calling it as a children’s film in the critical discourse implies the optimisation according to contemporaneous cultural codes.

However, this trend, that is, calling American films as children’s film, was later questioned in Svenska Dagbladet, which puts forward Eva’s opinion from Aftonbladet, and well-represents the ambiguous generic status, or we should say, the differently narrated philosophy and expectation of children’s films in this period. It opens with the particularly significant sub-heading stating “America’s so called children's films inappropriate according to Swedish concepts.” According to the article, American children's films were elaborately
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made and therefore just as expensive as adult ones, but in order for them to hold the significance as children's films, the ticket price should be set low, therefore, it was necessary to gain as much public interest as possible. Furthermore, pointing out that the slapstick genre drew much attention from children, it goes on explaining that they wanted entertaining in the film, nevertheless, some of the detail in such films were removed only to provide incoherent and alternating scenes remained there.\textsuperscript{143} It reported that although its experiment with children’s film screening during that season failed, Röda Kvarn was willing to resume the children's programs “that would satisfy not only the instructive side of the fun, but also the understanding the youth seek - as well as the adults!”\textsuperscript{144}

While clearly stating that the concept of American children's films, made with big budgets, is different from that of Sweden, their conclusion seems to reach a similar point. In other words, it is a duality of address that marks the children's films of the same era. However, the statement in \textit{Svenska Dagbladet} focuses more on child audiences, whereas \textit{Filmkonsten}'s quotation devotes more on how children in the film captivate adults mind. In this sense, film industry, or critics on their side, stressed more of appeal to adults, while critics with pedagogical perspectives attempted to reinforce children’s appeal. Thus, the term "children's film," derived from a tagline for American films, was subject to subtle differences in conception.

\section*{3.4. Conception of Children as Pure and Natural, and Small Children}

In addition, it should also be noted that some of the reviewers on \textit{Gloriana} appreciate child actors’ naturalness of acting. Such naturalness was also one of the requirements of children’s film in those days, as the article of \textit{Filmkonsten} mentioned above continues that

\begin{quote}
[t]he children's significance for the film, let us here say the good film, is clear enough through this quote without further explanation. And when this is linked to the concept of "good film", this does not only mean a reference to the content of the film. The children also technically contribute to successful results here, because they are excellent actors. And this, of course, is because they "act" their role less - they "experience" it. In this respect, they differ significantly from aunts and uncles on the theater stage or in front of the film camera, it all seems natural, undaunted and little crafted.\textsuperscript{145}
\end{quote}

As emphasised here, different from adult actors, children experience a life in the film, which
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leads to the naturalness of them. As Anne Higonnet puts it, “[a]t every stage in its modern history, visual representations have made childhood look natural.”\textsuperscript{146} Therefore, in many cases, the child's image is linked to their naturalness and thereby “both creates conceptual meanings and carries a powerful emotional charge.”\textsuperscript{147} She argues that though children's literature, paintings and illustrations to some degree represented romantic childhood in a persuasive way, such a romanticised child “needed a medium whose claims to natural innocence and spontaneity were as its own.”\textsuperscript{148} What made it possible at first, as she goes on, was photography.\textsuperscript{149} With this, naturalness of children as innocent, cute and pure rooted in Romanticism could be captured more clearly.\textsuperscript{150} Undoubtedly, in addition to photographs, films also became one of the tools to fix such a romanticised childhood.

Perhaps, this desire for romanticised children rooted in a change in conception of childhood at the end of sixteenth and particularly in seventeenth century. According to Philippe Aries, this change was characterised by the two concepts of childhood, or attitudes towards children. One is marked by coddling, which was evoked by loveliness of children and inside the family circle “in the company of little children.”\textsuperscript{151} The other was brought by moralists in a robe or from the church, who regarded children as “fragile creatures of God,”\textsuperscript{152} therefore needed to be at once protected and educated.

In American visual culture, however, such a natural child was developed in a slightly different way from Europe, associated with the concept of naughty. Jadviga M. Da Costa Nunes points out that during the first half of the nineteenth century, a naughty child in visual art was one of the popular subjects to foster the national identity of Americans.\textsuperscript{153} Around that time, despite its politically independent status, America had still been deemed a subclass of Europe. Therefore, in order to break this view and make America stand out, the image of ‘natural’ emerged as a key concept that child could relate to.\textsuperscript{154} Indeed, in parallel with the cultural tendency to glorify unique American values, there was also a tendency to actively
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tolerate and greatly affirm such a trait of children as a way of looking at people that was appropriate for the socioeconomic American system. In this current, away from physically controlling children, the demand for freedom and equality had begun to permeate into the family relationship, which evoked optimistic and ideal attitudes toward children. Consequently, it led to the emergence of naughty children, – they are, in many cases, boys – which “could not be imitated in 19th century European genre paintings.”

Around the turn of the century, when cinema was invented, visualisation of those two traits had conflated, probably because children were being reconstructed as having characteristics specific to their age through the development of schooling system, skepticism about child labor and corporal punishment of children, and new child psychology practices such as those of Stanley Hall, not only in America but throughout Europe. In this process, children began to be considered to have the right to be naughty. With this in mind, it is no coincidence that in the very early films such as Watering the Gardener and Baby's Dinner, “innocent” and “naughty” children emerged in the same year.

In Swedish cinematic discourse, however, it sought a romanticized naturalness based on cuteness and loveliness for representations of children, while at the same time it tried to suppress the other naturalness that originated in mischievousness in the child audience. It represented the optimisation to cultural codes by sanitizing representations that probably tainted purity of children. It could be said that through institutional constraints, Swedish film society embodied the very disciplinary model that children should be educated by discipline at that time. This is also what lies in the duality of children’s film in this period.

It is also worth noting that when it comes to taglines of children’s films at that time, there is an implication of romantic view on children, that is, cuteness and purity, which is not yet tarnished by the society. Indeed, it is often the case that the epithets, “adorable,” “little,” and “pretty” were attached to the term ‘children’s film’ and sometimes to child actors in the advertisements and reviews.

For example, Bobbys goda hjärta (Vitagraph, 1917?), another series of Bobby Connelly films released during 1917, was referred to as a “small adorable children’s film” in some newspaper advertisements, wherein Bobby Connelly was also introduced as a “little
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Furthermore, in the advertisement in Svenska Dagbladet mentioned is *The Innocence of Lizette* (James Kirkwood, 1916) as “an adorable children’s film (en förtjusande barnfilm),” which is a story about Lizette, an orphaned girl, who hopes to have her child, and one day, finds a baby on the doorstep. This is true about the poster of this film, which emphasises Mary Miles Minter, and explains her as “beautiful and lovely.”

I believe therein also lies the very important implication of conception of “children” in children’s film. Although some children’s film scholars set up children’s age when examining children’s films, the delimitation of children's age fluctuates and is recognised differently in each discourse community. Aries argues that the drastic increasing of schools in the seventeenth century as the consequence of the current, in which moralists made parents recognise their responsibility for sending children to the school, made their family and school detach the child from adult society. At this point, children became children as a subject to be educated and distinct from adults. Therefore, I would argue that schooling system has a lot to do with the construction of general concept of children, although it also seems that it was slightly different from what the cinematic discourse conceived of.

Looking briefly at the history of Swedish school system, the Swedish Parliament passed in 1842 a bill called *The Elementary School Statute* (*Folkskolestadgan*), which introduced a universal elementary school education. According to this bill, every parish (socken) had to set up at least one permanent school, which was generally known as *Folkskola*, and required to assign a qualified teacher. However, in reality, for peasantry family, children were still regarded as responsible for house chores. On the other hand, in terms of wealthy family, they afforded to hire a private tutor at home. Therefore, both of them paid little attention to sending their children to school. Consequently, in 1847, five years after the acceptance of the bill, only about half of all school-aged children studied at *Folkskola*. In 1878, *Folkskola* was assigned the first national curriculum that it took children six years to complete. Four years after that, the school reform turned *Folkskola* into a compulsory school, by which it became obligatory for children to attend school. In 1919 issued was the national educational guideline, called Education Plan (*Utbildningsplan*), in which, for the first time on
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a nationwide level, the number of compulsory schooling years was declared to six years, and the minimum age to leave school was therefore 13.\textsuperscript{168}

From the 1920s to 40s, most students only finished primary or lower secondary education.\textsuperscript{169} According to the report from The Institute for Evaluation of Labour Market and Education Policy, in 1930, 92.8 percent of the adult population completed that level, while only 0.6 percent of them did upper secondary education.\textsuperscript{170} Therefore, for most of adult citizen in Sweden at that time, the graduation of at least lower secondary school was equal to that of the period of childhood and meant entering into adult world. In reality, compulsory schooling in Sweden became seven years in 1937, eight years in the 1950s, and nine years in 1962. That is, children in a contemporaneous sense are younger than we think today. This is also evident in some program sheets and posters before the censorship, in which stated is that the discounted price was offered to children under the age of 12.\textsuperscript{171} Introducing censorship system more or less changed this delimitation, that is, from 12 to 15, however, when the critical discourse referred to some films as children’s films, the concept of children was still younger than such an institutional body conceived of. In 1917, in the educational milieu introduced were some voices that asked for the raise of the age limit from 15 to 18.\textsuperscript{172} The reason why it was not practically enforced may be due to such a convention.

More examples prove this. For example, \textit{Film Nyheter}, one of the earliest Swedish film journals, reported that “film children or children’s films are something that in high degree interests Americans,”\textsuperscript{173} and young people establish their status in the film industry. One of them is Georgie Stone from Triangle Film Studio, who was 9 at the time. Moreover, in the article titled “Two Child Film Stars (Två barnfilmstjärnor)”\textsuperscript{174} in \textit{Filmen}, the writer recalls when s/he interviewed with Marie Osborne and Virginia Lee Corbin in their houses. In addition, Greta Holmgren, comparing Swedish films to American children’s films, especially Marie Osborne films, in \textit{Filmjournalen}, bemoaned the lack of suitable Swedish children’s films, pointing out that there were no child stars as well as children’s films in Sweden because
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filmmakers did not at all take advantage of quality children’s literature and the beauty of the nature and landscape of Sweden. Both Marie Osborne and Virginia Lee Corbin were around 9 or so when their films were shown in Swedish cinemas.

Furthermore, in 1922, *Filmjournalen*, in collaboration with the production company Biografernas Filmdepôt, announced in their article that they would call for amateur film actors, whose photographs were requested to be sent. In this event, there were eight categories, based on which they competed with other participants. Among others were two important groups relevant to children’s film discussion, that is, Boy (pojke) and Girl (flickan). Especially in the category of Girl, they explains that child-like actors are just like Bessie Love or Juwel Carmen, who *acted* children in the film, so children *at the ages of not more than 8 to 10* were asked to enter into this category.

Of course, there are much younger children’s depictions as well, as an article of *Svenska Dagbladet* announced that *Lilly and Teddy on Summer Enjoyment* (*Lilly och Teddy på sommnarnöje*, Pathé, 1917), which, referred to as a children’s film, would be screened at Brunkebergsteatern. It was evaluated as pretty and amusing, and the landscape from Värmland was considered beautiful in particular. It was a recently discovered film restored by Norwegian film archives at National Library of Norway (*Nasjonalbiblioteket*). In the catalogue of Le Giornate del Cinema Muto in 2015, Tina Anckarman notes that:

This Pathé production, depicting the activities of two toddlers at the beach, with the Norwegian title *Lilly og Teddy […]* We know it was screened in Norwegian cinemas; it has a censorship stamp, and the newspaper ads in the Oslo area, which called it *Lilly og Teddy paa sommerferie* (*Lilly and Teddy on Summer Vacation*), tell us that it was shown as part of a children’s programme. The programme lasted approximately an hour, and contained 6 different titles with themes appropriate for kids, including comedies, shots of gardens, etc.

Interestingly enough, *Lilly och Teddy på sommnarnöje*, as an actuality film mainly depicting two *toddlers* playing at the beach, was also shown as part of children’s program in Norway [Fig.1]. Given this context, children’s film had been referring to films that featured children at
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the age of around eight to ten, or less. Admittedly, Mary Miles Minter was already fourteen when acting Lizette in The Innocence of Lizette, but there are also some depictions of collective children, which therefore helped audiences conceptualise this film as such.

[Fig. 1] *Lilly och Teddy på sommarnöje*

3.5. Summary

As a conclusion of this chapter, I would like to summarize the following two important points about the emergence of the term. Although Swedish children’s films were established as a genre and a legitimate signifier through systematic labeling in the 1940s, the earlier conception of children's films, especially just after the emergence of the term, contained some ambiguities.

First, ‘children’s film’, derived from the term referring to American films in which child stars played essential roles, emerged in Swedish general discourse in the mid-1910s. In those reviews, children in American film were often regarded as natural, and above all, appealing to both adult and child audiences. Thus, children’s film at that time was marked by the duality of appeal, which is probably characterised as family films in the present perspective. However, such a trait is the very requirement of the 1920s’ children’s film. Given that the continuous appearance of the term, *familjefilm* or *familjfilm*, started from the mid-1930s, calling those films as family film is after all retrospective labelling. We find herein that it had signified ambivalence between film for children and about childhood. Indeed, there is one funny advertisement in *Göteborgs Dagblad*, which took up *Children and Summer Sun* (*Barn och sommarsol*, Adrian Bjurman, 1922), an actuality film shot by
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183 *Göteborgs Dagblad*, 1922-01-09.
Adrian Bjurman, who would later be a cameraman for *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie*. Despite that it is mentioned as “A Small Adorable Swedish Children’s film” there, the notice following right below the title says that children are not allowed (due to the title co-screened) [Fig.2]. Such an ambiguity stemmed from the difference between the conception of children’s film in the industrial discourse community and educational one. The former emphasises more adult appeal, while the latter attempted to provoke more public interest and thereby to give child audiences a good program. And in this period, the adult appeal was more explicit. Thus, it was often the case that children could not see children’s films at that time.

Secondly, even if naturalness is considered a characteristic unique to children, how it has been portrayed in the visual arts has also varied depending on the national context and time period. In Swedish film discourse, there was a subtle conceptual gap between “children” in the film and as an audience, which also contributed to the duality that characterized children's films of the period.

Although Åberg argues that children’s films have long been synonymous with child-allowed (*barntillåten*) films, and are identified more with a form of screening than with features that characterize a genre, I would argue there used to be conceptual demarcation – even though not that much clear – between children’s films and others even within the
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category of child-allowed films, especially after the emergence of the term.

Interestingly enough, the duality of children’s films at the time was similar to the dual attitude towards children marked by ‘coddling’ and discipline, which developed in the family in the eighteenth century with a new idea, namely, “concern about hygiene and physical health.” The concept of children’s film originally as matinee programs for young audiences became more elusive with the emergence of the term that was associated with the characteristic of American films, in which children were represented as main roles. Perhaps both the idea of children as the future assets of the nation and the desire for children as something to satisfy the emotional charge of adults by their purity was fallen into the term “children's film.”
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[Tab.1] The List of Films Referred to As Children’s Film in Several Swedish Papers until 1922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish Title (Release Year in Sweden)</th>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Starring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimmis mamma (1914)</td>
<td>Sonny Jim in search for a Mother</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Bobby Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En läxa för livet (1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptun dotter (1915)</td>
<td>Neptune's Daughter</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Annette Kellermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensam i världen (1915)</td>
<td>The Lonesome Heart</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Margerita Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle och kammarjungfrun (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommys födelsedag (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldatgossens dröm (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den lilla Tonios stora brott (1916)</td>
<td>Le grand crime du petit Tonio</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Pierre Bressol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den lilla solstrålen (1916)</td>
<td>Little Mary Sunshine</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Marie Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djurvärlden (1916)</td>
<td>The Animal World Series</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solstrålen (1916)</td>
<td>The Fairy and the Waif</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mary Miles Minter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleens Äfventyr (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillan som trädgårdsmästare (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tvillingsystrarna (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helens småättingar (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I drömlandet (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det moderlösas lilla mor (1917)</td>
<td>Let Katie Do It</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Jane Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloriana (1917)</td>
<td>Gloriana</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Zoe Rae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilly och Teddy på sommarnöje (1917)</td>
<td>Lily et Teddy aux bains de mer</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Documentary/Pathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandalen i Sackville (1917)</td>
<td>The Little School Ma'am</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Dorothy Gish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I morn och solsken (1917)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack och den klängande jättebönan (1917)</td>
<td>Jack and the Beanstalk</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Francis Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I kapten Kidds kompani (1918)</td>
<td>The Little Pirate</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Zoe Rae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbys goda hjärta (1918)</td>
<td>The Helping Hand</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Bobby Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilla grevinnan (1919)</td>
<td>The Little Duchess</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Madge Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanct Göran och draken (1919)</td>
<td>Joy and the Dragon</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Marie Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aladdins underbara lampa (1919)</td>
<td>Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Virginia Lee Corbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fågel blå</td>
<td>The Blue Bird</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Tula Belle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En liten sjörövare (1919)</td>
<td>The Love Net</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Robin MacDougall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madge Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omslagstitel (år)</td>
<td>Filmtitel</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoll och Knort, Björnäventyr (1919)</td>
<td>The Katzenjammer Kids</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De sju svanorna (1919)</td>
<td>The Seven Swans</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Marguerite Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byx Betty (1920)</td>
<td>Pants</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mary McAllister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marys miljoner (1920)</td>
<td>The Little Princess</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mary Pickford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skattkammarön (1920)</td>
<td>Treasure Island (1918)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Francis Carpenter Virginia Lee Corbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den käraste sagan (1921)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det stora äventyret (1921)</td>
<td>The Big Adventure</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Reeves Eason Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havets söner (1921)</td>
<td>Face à l'océan</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Dir. René Leprince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn och sommarsol (1922)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Photo. A. Bjurman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Mrs Andersson’s Charlie and the First Children’s Film Cluster in 1923: The Beginning of Swedish Children’s Film?

Although Rönberg affirms that the contemporaries already regarded Mrs Andersson’s Charlie as a children’s film in the 1920s, is it actually the case? If so, in what way could it be proved?

This chapter examines how Mrs Andersson’s Charlie was advertised and became popular among contemporary audiences, and how the successive “children’s films” and visualisation of them cemented the concept of children’s film and refined the meaning of the term.

4.1. The Language Cemented the Concept?

The establishment of a certain genre in public discourses no less demands a conceptualisation process than do our thoughts. With this, it does make sense that some genre theorists, such as Altman and Grindon, often draw on theoretical frameworks for their genre theory from linguistics.

In the human world, when we recognise something, our sensory nerves receive information of its contour, color, texture, etc., and then our brain categorises it according to the previous knowledge, and thereby we conceive it. Conceptualisation is therefore categorisation of an object that is putatively considered to exist either in the outer or inner world based on the information gained through our perception. Verbalisation is the most universal strategy to symbolize this concept, and when a certain concept is verbalised, terms, words, or phrases, which can be applied to that concept, will be generated, thereby the meaning produced.

There are some arguments about the priority between the natural language and concept. Even though someone lacks a single word for a certain object, as Gary Lupyan explains, s/he can describe it through circumlocutions, which can activate the concept in the recipient,

---
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even without a lexical entry – a word as a label – as long as both the sender and recipient have the same concept about the object.\textsuperscript{190} Steven Pinker, referring to several experimental studies on conceptualisation process of babies, asserts that humans have concepts prior to acquiring any word for an object.\textsuperscript{191} And, by attaching words to those concepts, as he goes on, it would be possible to “share one's hard-won discoveries and insights about the world with the less experienced or the less observant.”\textsuperscript{192} This parallels Kurt Goldstein’s speculation in his examination of aphasic patients that “[l]anguage is not only a means to communicate thinking; it is also a means to support it, to fixate it.”\textsuperscript{193}

As such, the language is something to assemble our abstract conceptions and thereby articulates the meaning of an object that entails several sets of shared features. At the same time, however, it also helps people conceptualise an object. Through several sets of experiments, Lupyan substantiates this idea, concluding that words facilitate the conceptual processing, which he calls a \textit{language augmented thought} model.\textsuperscript{194} Furthermore, Tokumi Kodama reveals that “the process of human thought in discourses [...] is not predicated on a network of concepts, rather on the meaning of verbalised words.”\textsuperscript{195} Neither does this merely mean a nominalist approach, nor linguistic determinism, but seems to be based more on the weak form of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis – generally known as linguistic relativity – which assumes that the verbalised words and the human thoughts and behaviour affect each other reciprocally. Although this hypothesis describes the individual cognitive process, it seems that it can be employed to a broader context.\textsuperscript{196}

In that case, was \textit{Mrs Andersson's Charlie} categorised as a children's film in Swedish general discourse? In addition, did the term, which emerged in the 1910s to refer to American films, reinforce the concept of children’s film? Furthermore, did the first children’s film cluster in 1923 put additional meanings to the term?

\section*{4.2. Advertisement Strategies: \textit{Mrs Andersson’s Charlie} As a Children’s Film?}

\textit{Mrs Andersson’s Charlie} is a film based on Emil Norlander’s novel published in 1901 and
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remade several times over the years. The first three versions were directed by Sigurd Wallén, who had already appeared in several films before making his debut as a director with this film.

The story is as follows: Kalle (Charlie) is a naughty boy who plays tricks on his neighbours every day. However, one day, he changes because he falls in love with a girl, named Ann-Mari, who is a daughter of wealthy Mr Graham living in a magnificent villa down at the lake. In the final sequence, when enjoying drifting on a boat, Kalle sees Ann-Mari fall into the water. He immediately rescues her, but not getting used to being given appreciation, he runs away home. After a while, since Ann-Mari knew who saved her, her parents and she go to Kalle’s house by an elegant car and give their gratitude to him.

As Gustafsson discloses, the original script of this film did not include the final scene (act six), where Kalle rescues Ann-Mari. However, under the instruction of censorship authority, the reel 3, where Kalle gets dynamite to play prank with Mrs Boberg, was forced to be entirely cut. Instead, the whole new act six was added, which was more or less considered as an optimisation for the cinematic convention at that time, namely, a happy ending.

Despite that the sanitisation process occurred to some extent as such, there are in fact not any articles and advertisements that were referring to this film as a children’s film during its initial theatrical run. However, in 1924, clearly referring to it as a children’s film, Marfa [Elsa Danielsson] from Dagens Nyheter gave an account that Swedish film industry hitherto did not establish occupational child actors like those in America, such as Jackie Coogan, Baby Peggy, but the trend that film directors often used children in their films had begun with Mrs Andersson’s Charlie. Therefore, it could be assumed that the contemporaries, though faintly, held a somewhat children’s film-like conception for this film as far as inferred from the critical discourse.

What counts is that Gösta Alexandersson was already seventeen years old when acting Kalle, although the exact age of Kalle was not mentioned in the film, (not in the book

---

197 There are six versions in total (1922, 1923, 1934, 1950, 1972 and 1973). The first two versions do no longer exist, but the others are still available today.

198 Anderssønskans Kalle, Manuscript, Svenska Filminstitutet.


200 E.g. there is no reference of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie as a children’s film in ads. of Mose Bäcke Bio, Odéon, Imperial (Svenska Dagbladet, 1922-09-06), Gamla Strix (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-09-10), Nya Teatern (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-08-28), Victoria (Göteborgs Dagbladet, 1922-09-15), S:t Erik (i.e. Gnisan) (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-09-23), Ericksberg Teatern (Svenska Dagbladet, 1922-09-24), Nytorgs Teatern (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-09-27), Scala (Göteborgs Dagbladet, 1922-09-27), Piccadilly (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-09-28), Norra Kvarn (Svenska Dagbladet, 1922-10-02), Birka Teatern, Oriental, Fenix (Dagens Nyheter, 1922-10-12).

201 Marfa [Elsa Danniełsson], Dagens Nyheter, 1924-10-19.
either). Marfa, pointing out in the same article that all the boys become adults at the age of fifteen to sixteen, describes that he could not meet the expectation to be like American child stars, the reason being that “at his debut he was more than twice as old as the little American prodigy.” Given this, ‘children’ in the ‘children’s film’ at that time, as examined in the previous chapter, referred to younger children than Gösta’s Kalle. Therefore, film companies, distributors, and cinema owners did not use the term ‘children’s film’ to describe this film, neither did film critics in 1922. Even if the concept itself existed, it may have been difficult to immediately apply a generic signifier to a new film that deviated even slightly from the convention. This is also true even in Biografrevyn, the publisher of which is Fredrik Anderson, who had the distribution right of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie in 1922.

In the first place, however, the term ‘children’s film’ itself was not so beneficial for film production and distribution companies and cinema owners, and therefore, scarcely appeared referring to this film as such in the industrial discourse. That is, rather than employing the advertising phrase ‘children’s film,’ it might be more advantageous to use the names of those who were already well known, which had thereby incited audiences’ interest for Swedish comedy.

For instance, Sölvesborgs Tidningen briefly mentions that a new company started up to produce a film based on Emil Norlander’s novel, with Sigurd Wallén assigned as a director for its very first project, and regards him as suitable to depict “Swedish Wesley Barry” in the film. Besides, Svenska Dagbladet, not mentioning it as a children’s film, also took it up with the heading saying “Mrs Andersson’s Charlie: A Funny Stockholm Film” and a photograph of Stina Berg and Dagmar Ebbesen, both of whom had already been popular among cinema-goers at the time. As the same of the former case, therein also mentioned is Gösta Alexandersson as potentially being competitive for Wesley Barry. It should also be noted that in the advertisement of Metropol primarily emphasised is Emil Norlander as the author of the film, followed by the description that “Starring: Dagmar Ebbesen, Stina Berg …”, without any reference to Gösta Alexandersson.

Birger Wahlström, a producer of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, recalls that when receiving a

---
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manuscript of this film from Emil Norlander at first, he did not want to be involved in such a venture, thus returned it. However, with Sigurd Wallén signing a contract for a filming right and Fredrik Anderson for the distribution, he eventually took over the entire contract.\footnote{208} Therefore, it could be evident from here that there were some risks involved in producing this film and how much he was counting on the name of prominent figures in order to recuperate the production cost.

It is also worth noting that while many articles, which mention and trace Mrs Andersson’s Charlie’s success, were published in Biografrevyn, it was scarcely taken up in the articles of Filmnyheter, – though its advertisement was there – presumably because its publisher is Svensk Filminindustri. As Mark Crispin Miller points out, people live in a “contracting media cosmos,”\footnote{209} where huge corporations hold a great deal of power behind the scenes by controlling the broadcasting and publishing rights belonging to their umbrella corporations. One way to fight back this situation, according to him, is “to create industry specific maps”\footnote{210} to illustrate the relation between these corporations. Though the film industry at that time was not so much complex than today, the relation between film magazines, distribution and advertisement strategies can also be described in this manner.

Therefore, in terms of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, it is natural that Biografrevyn vigorously promoted this film because its publisher had the right to distribute it. Indeed, the cover of its very first issue is the picture of Gösta Alexandersson in Mrs Andersson’s Charlie with the heading saying “Sweden’s largest audience success (Sveriges största publiksuccés),” and constantly reported how this film was popular among people in various areas in Sweden in the following issues. Though it seems that Fredrik Anderson did not intend to distribute this film abroad,\footnote{212} his philosophy for film advertisements is apparent from the opening statement for publishment of this magazine, in which he states “[f]or the film, the advertisement has been the condition of life, the voice that awakens the audience! The advertisement has fixed the eyes of the films and led the audience to the cinemas; the advertising has aroused and maintained interest.”\footnote{213} This way, Mrs Andersson’s Charlie was advertised in various avenues, and accordingly besides Biografrevyn, was shed light on in many film journals, alongside child film stars in the U.S.\footnote{214}
Nevertheless, it is curious that not a single article in *Filmnyheter* took up this film at all. Among so-called children’s films in the 1920s, only *Anna-Clara and her Brothers* (*Anna-Clara och hennes bröder*, Per Lindberg, 1923) was taken up in their issues several times, – which is presumably because it was released from a newly launched film branch of Bonnier group, the largest publishing company in Sweden.215 Alexandersson was at times appearing by being pushed in full force, and other times hidden behind the famous names of professional actors and advertising strategies of distribution company.

In any case, *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie* became very popular, which is confirmed by the fact, for instance, that though not listed in the 1922’s best ten films of the popularity poll in *Filmjournalen*, it was mentioned as proxime accessit, which received 200-300 votes from the readers.216 Therefore, through the advertisement strategy and combined with the popularity of Emil Norlander’s original novel, *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie*, as Wallén recalls, became a record-breaking hit in the comedy genre, earning almost fourteen times its production costs at the box office.217

4.3. The Popularity among Children and Comedy Genre

Such popularity among adult audiences is obvious, but above all, among children is worth noting. It is quite challenging to trace the contemporary reviews from child audiences, and therefore, practically impossible to scrutinise them, but still possible to grasp how popular it was among them. Herein, as Rönnberg argues, we could glance at their experience.

For example, *Veckorevy*, an advertising film, illustrates the popularity of the film. It opens with the text saying, “Mrs Andersson’s “Charlie” has become a public film as shown in the

same year that Birger Wahlström has bought the filming rights to “AnderssomsKalle” from Emil Norlander and the actor Sigurd Wallén was assigned as director. As the ladies, some ready-known actress, such as Stina Berg, Stassa Wahlgren and Lia Norée were cast. Finally, they put it: “the recording will begin shortly when some winter scenes would be recorded […] will be fully finished on 15 Aug.” (“De nya svenska inspelningsplanern,” *Biografbladet*, 1922: 2, 51.) Similarly, *Filmjournalen* reported early in the year that after the test-filming of many Stockholm boys, Gösta Alexandersson was appointed to act as Kalle. (*Filmjournalen*, 1922: 2, 48.)


following image”, followed by several sequences, in which theatre staff stands among a child audience waiting for the door open in front of Victoria theatre. No sooner has the entrance door opened than they rush into the foyer one after another, despite that the staff tries to stop and calm them down. The crowd outside the cinema consists of almost children. This way, this advertisement film shows how it was popular among them.218

Furthermore, in Biografbladet, a writer signed Biocrates reported the popularity of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie at school, recounting one occasion at home as follows.

Every other dinner I get a report from my own girls that now there are very few students in their class, who have not seen “Mrs Andersson’s Charlie”. And now the day before yesterday it turned out that my three warbling girls are the alone in the whole school, who have not visited “Kalle”.219

As seen in this description, Mrs Andersson’s Charlie was undoubtedly popular among school children alongside the reputation of the original novel,220 even though there are no contemporaneous reviews or comments on it from child viewers.

Though not limited to this film, the popularity of comedy films among children was relatively higher than other genres. Indeed, Svensk Läraretidning published an excerpt from G. Brandell’s survey submitted to Social Tidskrift. Casting doubt on the contemporaneous criticism of the negative influence of cinema on children, he conducted an empirical research for their taste and cinema visit.221 This study aimed to find out, how often the primary school children in Södertälje visited the cinema and which passage appealed to the children the most, and whether these passages could be assumed to stimulate to a great extent the children’s imagination and thereby giving rise to a more intense empathy in the conditions they produced.222

In this survey, the teachers in the third and fourth grade and secondary school were asked to have their student write their impression anonymously on the spot so that their opinions could not be influenced by each other. It included 161 boys and 119 girls, a majority of whom are quite eager cinema visitors – 82% of the boys and 74% of the girls answered they frequently visited the cinema – and the result of research on their favorite genre is as follows.

218 Veckorevy 1922-09-18, (Göteborg) Reklam för filmen “Andersssonskans Kalle”.
220 One advertisement also describes that “everyone has read his (Kalle’s) bravado” and “the book “Andersssonskans Kalle” has been mandatory on the shelves of all true Swedish boys.” See, Biografbladet, 1922: 7, 304-305.
222 Ibid., 343.
Although the subjects of survey mentioned above were students in Södertälje, which is an industrial area located in southern part of Stockholm County, the similar data of Landskrona was gained as follows.

[Tab.2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Södertälje</th>
<th>Boys (%)</th>
<th>Girls (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comedy (Sequences)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Dramas</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective and Crime Dramas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Affairs and Tragedies</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Animal Images, and Other Images from a Life</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Pictures and War Dramas</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Dramas</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erotic Motif</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Pictures</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic and Moral Motif</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saga Motif</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

223 The reason the percentages in total exceed 100 is due to the fact that some children mentioned characteristics that belong to two or more categories.

[Tab.3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Landskrona</th>
<th>Boys (%)</th>
<th>Girls (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Visited the Cinema</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Couple of Times a Year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Every Two Months,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or Twice a Month,</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Week,</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or More a Week.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Tab.4]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Landskrona</th>
<th>Boys (%)</th>
<th>Girls (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Picture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective Picture</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funny Picture</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these investigations, it could be said that contemporary child audiences liked the comedy genre despite varying degrees. However, I believe that much of their cinema experience associated with this comedy genre before Mrs Andersson’s Charlie – or even after that – was by virtue of American films. In other words, at the very least, it benefited from the popularity of the comedy genre that American cinema had carried before this film.

Indeed, American stars (not only children in this case, though) were mentioned at the production level, as Tommy Gustafsson reveals that the screenplay of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie contains Wallén’s handwriting, which says that “Kalle poses as Chaplin, then switches to Douglas Fairbanks.”

Furthermore, Annandagens filmnyheter introduces one of the cinema-goers’ voices from a twelve-year-old boy, named Pelle Holmqvist, in which he says that he was impressed by Douglas Fairbanks’s Robin Hood (Allan Dwan, 1922), and comedy is one of his favorite genres. However, when asked of Swedish films, he wondered why Stiller, Sjöström, and the others couldn’t make films that are allowed for children, like those produced by both Douglas and Chaplin and Harold Lloyd. Therefore, children might have been waiting for Swedish comedy films that they could at once enjoy and identify with.

4.4. Contemporaneous Critiques

Due to such popularity and exclusive policy towards “harmful films”, contemporary critics castigated Mrs Andersson’s Charlie for including unfavourable representations to child audiences, especially in the sequence of Mrs Boberg’s moving where, by playing a prank with the horse that pulls a cart, Kalle crushes all the porcelain that she collected over the years.

Stockholms tidningen comments there might be so many people who opposed to the film, and the scene mentioned above as grotesque humour, therefore six shots should have been cut from this sequence.

Svenska Dagbladet reported that they had received a critical comment on this film from Professor Anders Rosborg, who considered it as if glorifying crudeness, outrage and destructiveness without conciliatory moments. He goes on elaborating that the exaggerations used in acting dispel any sense of humour and instead instil a sense of disgust.

224 Gustafsson, Masculinity, 50.
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and ends with the following reflection: “Think what a role model, for the younger, then their fathers, mothers, and others in the children’s society, is with greatly affectionate laugh corruptly at these ribald crudities. I spend a hard time wondering how they laugh when their saplings follow this example, recommended by the film censor and their own parents.”

In response to this criticism, Svenska Dagbladet asked some other specialists to consider the film and share their impression. Among them was Karl Nordlund, who characterises this film as “so grotesque and so exaggerated that it cannot be regarded as something that young audiences should immediately imitate.” Besides, Mrs Gurli Linder, while admitting that the acting was excellent, comments that the content is a mixture of good-natured and inoffensive jokes, and stupidity and sentimentality and the moving-out scene is exclusively stupid, crude and too protracted. Although her standpoint is more neutral than Nordlund, she articulates that “the pranks are too exaggerated and unnatural.”

On the other hand, Eva from Arbetaren had still expected the future development of such a kind of children’s comedy genre. For, despite that she concedes that this film should not be child-allowed (barntillåten) from the pedagogical perspective due to anti-social representations, and states that it would be more obnoxious than humorous for those who do neither desire for seeing nor manage to cope with such scenes, she concludes that witty pranks, not crude and anti-social, are worth immortalising in the film and expected that it would be successful and future audiences would not be so critical as hitherto discussed.

It could be inferred here that naturalness rooted in mischievous was not so welcomed in Swedish educational discourse, because it was considered to evoke such an action of child audience. Therefore, this film was never mentioned as a children’s film in such a community.

4.5. 1922-23: The First Children’s Film Cluster, Buspojke Cluster

Despite such a harsh criticism from pedagogues, film companies, attempting to make a profit, seemed to follow Mrs Andersson’s Charlie model particularly because of its unprecedented success. In fact, about the same time of the success of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, Bonnier company launched a scenario section, which took responsibility for helping the authors reach an agreement with the major foreign or domestic film company for the adaptation of their books, and released the first three films in the following year. Among them was Anna-Clara

228 “Ridderligheten och “Anderssonskans Kalle”,” Biografbladet, 1922: 19, 726.
229 Ibid., 727.
230 Ibid. My emphasis.
231 Eva, Arbetaren, 1922-09-04.
and her Brothers, which was considered to be comparable to Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, but more attractive to those from the bourgeois class.\footnote{Bonners börja filminspelning: Elin Wägners Norrtullsslagen, Hasse Z:s Anna-Clara och hennes bröder och Hemsalvinnor de tre första filmerna,” Biografbladet, 1923: 1, 6.}

Of course, it might be said that what facilitates this venture was an attempt to create child stars those like American ones. As argued in the previous chapter, many American children’s films were advertised in various avenues, which resulted in channeling much more attention to children represented in the film.

In terms of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie and its sequel, Gustafsson reveals child actors were used for publicity purposes such as the greetings from the stage, and recurring appearances in various media.\footnote{Gustafsson, Masculinity in the Golden Age of Swedish Cinema, 51.} Indeed, in Biografrevyn, Gösta Alexandersson is introduced as “the idol of all Swedish boys.”\footnote{“Svenska filmare,” Biografrevyn, 1922: 1, 5.} In this way, the presence of children in Swedish films had been strengthened through advertising strategies.

Certainly, Chaplin’s The Kid (Charlie Chaplin, 1921) is probably one of the most important reasons for that as well. However, at least, Charlie showed the possibility that Swedish film industry could make children’s films just so did Americans. I would argue that although any advertisement did not refer to Mrs Andersson’s Charlie as a children’s film upon its premiere, the successive films featuring children in the following year made the concept of children’s film cemented.

As mentioned above, among other so-called children’s films, Anna-Clara and her Brothers was from scratch referred to as such in Swedish media discourse.\footnote{Aftonbladet, 1918-12-27. Ad. of Röda Kvarn’s Jul program.} Indeed, in Biografbladet mentioned is that in this film was “the natural and cheerful atmosphere, which is the main prerequisite for children’s films.”\footnote{“Nya svenska filmer: Bonnier=filmen Anna-Clara och hennes bröder,” Biografbladet, 1923: 23, 1047.} Furthermore, Filmnyheter stated that Ann-Britt Ohlson was given an independent role in this film, as distinct from girl precedessors who played a supporting role in the films as a relief to their mothers.\footnote{Ibid.} Herein, Anna-Clara is deemed “obviously a children’s film (ju en barnfilm)” and was predicted to be popular among school children.\footnote{Ibid.} Marfa also insists that Ann-Britt Ohlson, who played Anna-Clara in this film, could have become a Swedish Baby Peggy, at least for a few years to come in the aforementioned article about children’s films.\footnote{Dagens Nyheter, 1924-10-19.} Biografbladet published a comment from Gäfle Posten, which says “the film is child-allowed and we recommend
parents to bring their little ones with them.”  

In addition, such an intention to create a children’s film is present at the production level, as Per Lindberg, a director of _Anna-Clara and her Brothers_, recalls in the interview of _Dagens Nyheter_ that to work with little children is at once interesting and exhausting for him and was required to talk, joke and play with them during the shooting. In addition, though not the case for _Anna-Clara_, he also admits that generally, “a children's film requires more film (reels) than a regular film, and it cannot be helped that people have to remake more.”

Looking into the casting process of this film, the author Hazze Z. [Hans Zetterström] and Lindberg were vigorously looking for a girl protagonist, whom “people gladly want to, or can see in the film.” Admittedly, it is the precisely the same as that of American family films, for which the producers appointed child actors who were, they expected, to become popular with, or rather attractive to all the generations. To reiterate, as Rönningen argues, the contemporaries at least conceived such a film as a children’s film rather than a family film. 

As the director had expected, the film became popular, and Ann-Britt Ohlson, who played the leading role, was discussed in many articles about her commonality to American child stars. In addition, naturalness of her acting is highly appreciated, as similar to other American films that were referred to as children’s films. Marfa writes in _Dagens Nyheter_ that

[a]mong the actors, Miss Anna Clara must be mentioned first. She is played by a six-year-old girl, Ann-Britt Ohlson, who can successfully take up the competition with the American film children. She is _Baby Peggy_ in the Swedish version, blond and chubby, with brilliant eyes, a real little one who is heart-grabbing, jaunty, precocious and unabashed. And completely natural all the time.

As we have been discussing, the children’s film is a concept derived from American films. Therefore, it makes sense that contemporary critics might well evaluate Swedish children in the film by the extent to which they are far from or similar to Americans. In terms of _Janne Modig_ (Bror Abelli, 1923) as well, referring to Ture Ottoson as “Swedish Wesley Barry”, one article in _Biografbladet_ states that “not only does he have freckles, redhead by nature and rampant behaviour, but he is also a gymnast and does not shy away from the occasional somersault.” As it goes on, “[w]hat is the most important, however, is that he has
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241 _Dagens Nyheter_, 1924-10-19.
242 _Anna-Clara och hennes bröder_, PR Material, Svensk Filminstitutet, 8.
243 Balzagette and Staples, 95.
244 Rönningen, “Svensk barnfilm fyller snart 100 år.”
imagination and humour in his comical body,” which typifies the expectation of the common semantic elements in the first half of twentieth century’s visual culture, that is, to portray children as active and engaged.

4.6. Pranksters as Physical Spectacle

Although Graham and Norlin consider that the lack of originality lies in the slapstick characteristic often found in children’s films in this period, this notion can be recognised as one element which consolidated to some extent the concept of children’s film at the time, linking to such a portrayal of active children as a physical spectacle. As Marfa referred to *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie* and its followers as a children’s film in 1924, their popularity undoubtedly buttressed such a concept. In that context, there is one more evidence to prove the conceptualisation of children’s film.

From 23 September 1923, *Aftonbladet* began to publish every Sunday the cartoon that imitated filmstrip, titled *A. B:s Barnbiograf* (*Aftonbladet’s Children’s cinema*), which is on the page for young readers. Each cartoon consists of 24 frames and always opens and ends with the words, ‘children’s film (*barnfilm*)’ [Fig.3] [Fig.4]. In the previous Sunday issue, “AB-Films” is used as a closing-phrase of this section, but it was changed into “children’s film (*barnfilm*)” in this issue. I believe that it is not coincident that the children’s film section began to be published shortly after the premiere of *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie and New Pranks* (*Anderssonskans Kalle på nya upptåg*, Sigurd Wallén, 1923) and Janne Modig at the end of August in 1923.
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248 Hörfeldt, 78.
249 *Aftonbladet*, 1923-09-23. In addition to the cartoon, it also includes puzzles and quizzes etc. for child readers.
250 *Aftonbladet*, 1923-09-16.
Richard Abel argues that the main function of American newspapers at the turn of the last century was "to offer menus" to grasp the complexity of modern urban life and systematize their own daily lives. Comparing this to a large department store, he affirms that "papers departmentalize their pages into sections" and in Sunday edition, various other sections come to appear such as sports, amusements, arts and so on.\(^{251}\)

I would argue that this can be applied to Swedish papers, and the page for young readers is somewhat analogous to the children’s section of the mall. What counts here is that the term became linked to the mode of address for children. Undoubtedly, what made pedagogues feel disgusted in the first version of Charlie was one constitution of children's films at that time. And at least, such an element began to link to its specific appeal to children here.

### 4.7. The Ephemeral Trend Ends with the Advent of the New Comedy Genre; Or Spirit Away of Children

It appears that for all that the conceptualisation of children’s film began to be firm, this boom did not continue to the next decade. One of the reasons for this, as I argue elsewhere,\(^ {252}\) is the emergence of new comic genre called *pilsner film* in the 1930s, where the directors and producers would often require professional actors, hoping that “the charisma of the actors, which had worked in the outdoor theatre, would work on the film as well.”\(^ {253}\)

Sweden was no exception to the effects of the depression that started with the crush of the New York stock market in 1929, and its economic situation became impoverished at the time, which triggered a change in people’s view of entertainment and an inevitable change in the marketing policies of the film companies.\(^ {254}\) In fact, several film companies merged in 1929, and according to Svensk filmografi, only six feature films were produced in Sweden during this year.\(^ {255}\) This was symbolised by the fact that Ivar Kruger, who had become a prominent Swedish capitalist with the success of his match company and owned various companies in Sweden, committed suicide by shooting himself in the fall of 1932, which is commonly referred to as the Kruger shock.

\(^{251}\) Richard Abel, “Reading Newspapers and Writing American Silent Cinema History”, in *The Routledge Companion to New Cinema History*, eds. Daniël Biltereyst, et al. (London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2019), 68-69. For example, in American papers, as he goes on, a new section devoted to automobiles was introduced when its industry had rapidly been growing.


Naturally, film companies did not dare to take a risk in such a situation, instead, produced popular mass films, which were, due to the lavish consumption of beer and the representation of the crude masses in them, hated by contemporary critics, who considered such a kind of film to be entertainment for those lower in the social hierarchy.

As such, due to the economic condition and the advent of a new genre triggered by that, the children’s film boom in 1923 did not evolve to establish its own generic status. Correspondingly, the appearance of the term children’s film was decreasing in the newspaper articles, especially in the period from 1930 to 34. Despite the attempt to build up child stars in the early-1920s, Swedish children appearing in several films in the 1920s, or should we say, film children (*filmbarn*) worked for the film industry only temporarily. For example, according to Svensk Filmdatabas, Bengt Linström appeared in only two films in 1920 and 1921. Aino Schärlund-Gille also played roles only in two versions of *Anderssons kans Kalle*, and sadly died in 1932 at the age of 18. Likewise, other child actors rarely continued their career as actors or actresses, which also typifies the ephemeral children’s film boom and represents the fact that they failed in being integrated into the generic syntax of children’s film.

While Marfa points out the presence of these professional child actors who did not last long, and is not sure the reason for this, she gives several possible reasons: the lack of children's ability as an actor, the lack of parent's interest in the film industry, the children's fatigue to play a role, and the desire to keep them in a private life rather than taking unpredictable risks. The children's film must have been of greater risk than benefit. In that sense, reinforcing the duality of the address may have been, in a sense, the essential way that kept children's films in the film industry.

### 4.8. Summary

Upon the initial theatrical run, *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie* was not advertised and appreciated as a children’s film in both industrial and critical discourse community. This is because the

---


259 E.g. Ture Ottoson appeared only in *Janne Modig*, and Ann-Britt Ohlsson did so in *Anna-Clara och hennes bröder* (1923). Also, Gösta Alexandersson’s final film appearance was *Skeppargatan 40* (Gustaf Edgren, 1925). Concerning Elsa Wallin, though this is a little bit complex since when she played a 13-year-old girl in *A Prankster* (*En ruckarunge*, Fredrik Anderson, 1923), she had already been 23, even she finished her career in 1930, with a film titled *The Dangerous Game* (*Den farliga leken*, Gustaf Bergman, 1930).

advertisement strategy was more predicated on famous actor’s names and American child stars, and Gösta’s Kalle was slightly over-aged for conventional children in children’s films. However, the contemporaries held a faint conception of such for this film, and it emerged at first in the critical discourse officially in 1924. In this sense, thanks to a series of “children’s films” released in the following year, such as *Anne-Clara and her Brothers*, *Janne Modig, A Prankster*, *Mrs Andersson’s Charlie and New Pranks*, and the films featuring children, such as *Mälaren Pirates* (*Mälarpirater*, Gustaf Molander, 1923) and *Boman at the Exhibition* (*Boman på utställningen*, Karin Swanström, 1923), the meaning of children’s film became broader, thereby *Andersssonskans Kalle* being located in the context of children’s films in 1924.
5. Pauline Brunius, the Founding Mother of Swedish Children’s Film? : Or the Ambiguity of Generic Identity in The Dragonfly (1920)

The archives bring forward details that disabuse, derail, and straightforwardly break any hope of linearity or positivism. This eruption of words and actions shatters established models, broadens the norm, displaces conventional wisdom once and for all, and often adds a certain confusion to things that had been previously considered simple.²⁶¹

Arlette Farge, The Allure of the Archives

Given the discussion in the previous chapters, children's films in the very first period, though the duality of its address was more or less a commonality, entailed so elusive generic identity. For, pedagogues, film critics, and film industry, holding a particular concept of the children's film in their mind upon the emergence of the term, did not always imply the same intention. While the children's film was, for educators, a kind of films that at once entertain them and cultivate their imagination, the film industry referred more universally to films that used child actors and gained much attention from not only children but adults as well. In terms of semantics and syntax, I believe that there was not a strict rule, however, it was often the case that the representation of a smaller child helped some films immediately link to the concept of children's film.

5.1. The Serendipitous Finding and Alternative Narratives

As mentioned in the introduction, in conducting the archival research to explore the generic identity of the very early Swedish children’s films, I serendipitously found a film, which was advertised like a children’s film in a contemporaneous context, titled The Dragonfly. Although Norlin explains that most of the children’s films before the 1940s were made by

Sigurd Wallén as a director and based on the novels of Kar de Mumma or Norlander, this film seemed to be promoted with child actors to the forefront, at a time when many American child stars were being featured in Swedish cinematic discourse.

In suggesting the methodological framework on the historical studies of women agency in film industry, Eirik Frisvold Hanssen elaborates on the terms referring to the two binary, that is, “presence-absence” and “visible-invisible”; the former is concerned with the existence, while the latter means the condition, or quality of being visible or not, therefore presupposing presence.

Of course, the director of The Dragonfly, Pauline Brunius, had already been quite famous in the milieu of film and theatre arts at the time, and as is she now. In that sense, she is not invisible at all. However, in the context of Swedish children's films, her name has not been mentioned at all, despite that she often used children in a series of short films, including The Dragonfly. Furthermore, Rönnberg, insisting that Mrs Andersson's Charlie is the very first Swedish children's film, writes in parentheses that “if we only count feature films.” However, why does not she count short films, despite that there are, more or less, short films that were referred to as children’s film in the 1910s to 20s, those like Bobby Connelly series.

Admittedly, an archive itself is not an authentic source to expose the “fact” since it is selective. Both the holdings of the archive, as well as access to these holdings, are the result of choices, which again are fundamentally informed by the relationship between knowledge and power. However, archival research is something to excavate unknown events, which otherwise, sink deep down and is buried under the bottom of a male-led, or already-narrated historical fact, and to re-configure them within the existing narratives of a particular history. Perhaps, breaking any hope of linearity, this “adds a certain confusion to” the simple binary between whether the beginning of Swedish children's film is the 1920s or 40s. It is precisely by “taking the preexisting forms and readjusting them in different ways to make possible a different narration of reality” that this excavation itself exposes the open-endedness of history and takes knowledge to a new phase.

264 Rönnberg, “Svensk barnfilm fyller snart 100 år”.
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Therefore, this chapter examines how The Dragonfly was recognised in the Swedish cinematic discourse, and its textual aspect symbolises the contemporaneous concept of children’s film around the 1920s, thereby hopefully putting an alternative perspective in Swedish children's film history.

5.2. Pauline Brunius and The Dragonfly

As examined earlier, the term children’s film, starting with American films, was later applied to Swedish films. Before the success of Mrs Andersson’s Charlie, however, the generic identity of such a film had already been included in some films created by Pauline Brunius, a Swedish female director, who is one of the earliest woman directors and the first and practically considered the only one that directed Swedish short films with a dramatic story.269

Her career started as a lead ballerina at Operan. After ten years of dedication there, she finally became an actress that she was dreaming of and succeeded immediately after her debut at Östermalmsteatern in 1902.270 She got married to John W. Brunius, whose reputation in Swedish film history, despite his prolificacy of popular films, was overshadowed by the immeasurable admiration for Mauritz Stiller and Victor Sjöström. She made a debut as a film actress under the direction of her husband and many critics praised for her acting a protagonist in Thora van Deken (John W. Brunius, 1920).271

She later directed a series of short films in 1920-21, such as Switching Roles (Ombytta roller, Pauline Brunius, 1920), Live Your Life Smiling (Lev livet leende, Pauline Brunius, 1921), Lumbago (Ryggskott, Pauline Brunius, 1921), where she used child “actors” as leading or crucial roles in the story. In her films, it is The Dragonfly that could have been a children’s film in a contemporaneous sense, I would argue. It is a short film, the reel length of which is 428m, and the running time is therefore approximately 21 minutes. It mainly tells a story of Mr Winner’s daughter, who happens to break her mother’s dragonfly-shaped brooch and tries to catch a dragonfly for the replacement of that. During the hunting, she falls into the water and is drowning but rescued by a fisherman and everything ends happily.272

When this project was launched, Swedish major papers confirmed by interviewing her

269 John Törnequist, “Filmskådespelerskan”, in Boken om Pauline Brunius (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1941), 56. This discussion is still controversial since from 1911 to 1912, Anna Hofman-Uddgren had already directed some films based on some plays, which therefore involves narratives. However, it should be worth mentioning in the context of the female director in Sweden and the one “earliest” female director.
271 Nya Dagligt Allehanda, 1920-03-05, Stockholms-Tidningen, 1920-03-05, etc.
that she made a contract as a director with Skandia and would start shooting after her theatrical tour to Norway,\textsuperscript{273} which represents how much expectation people had for the emergence of the “first” woman director in Sweden.\textsuperscript{274} What counts, however, is that although *The Dragonfly* was not mentioned as a children’s film upon its initial release, Brunius had clearly stated in this interview her intention to make a couple of short films including “a really proper and entertaining boy-film (*en riktig rejäl och rolig pojkfilm)*,”\textsuperscript{275} and above all, Gustaf Berg, by writing a manuscript for some of them, was involved in this project.\textsuperscript{276} She also said in *Filmjournalen* that there was no influence of American filmmakers on her works,\textsuperscript{277} and she intended to be bold enough to go her own way.\textsuperscript{278} Furthermore, she insists that “the film needs the originality, and if people have one to come with, [she thinks] it would be a shame not to use it.”\textsuperscript{279}

Admittedly, it is uncertain which film she implied by ‘boy-film’ since she used children several times in a series of her short films released at that moment, and which one is based on Berg’s story.\textsuperscript{280} However, it is *The Dragonfly* that includes the originality, which had never been seen in the previous Swedish films; that is, children as a core of the story, who drive the narrative forward.\textsuperscript{281} With this regard, most of the critics admired Pauline Brunius’s skill as a director. Indeed, *Filmnyheter* appreciates that she is adept at capturing children’s expressions and a lovely atmosphere flowed in the little family life, stating that

it goes without saying that no one except a woman director would be capable of bringing the


\textsuperscript{274} The expectation for her debut as a film director is evident also in the fact that several magazines and newspapers featured her in their articles on her directorial debut. See *Filmjournalen*, 1920:3, 89. and *Filmen*, 1920: 3, 13. etc.

\textsuperscript{275} Quelq’une, *Svenska Dagbladet*, 1920-03-03.

\textsuperscript{276} rf, “Pauline Brunius till Skandia som regissör,” *Dagens Nyheter*, 1920-03-03.

\textsuperscript{277} Though she states as such, considering a series of her films, she seemed to be inspired by many American stars since, especially in *Live Your Life Smiling*, where she utilises Douglas Fairbanks’ autobiography of the same title, in which the wife attempts to appease her moody husband named Winner, asking him to endure unpleasant things with a smile. Also, she had succeeded in incorporating the essence of children’s films in the first sequence of this film, which opens with the morning scene where Winner is trying to tie a tie. Then, a son, Putte, comes to him and plays a prank with a hair comb, which made Winner angry and chase after him. This is only the five-minute short sequence but entails a prank comedy trait, which was indeed included in children’s films in the first cluster.

\textsuperscript{278} *Filmjournalen*, 1920: 3, 89.

\textsuperscript{279} Ibid., 89.

\textsuperscript{280} In fact, Berg’s name is nowhere in a series of films directed by P. Brunius in the information of Svensk Filmdatabas.

\textsuperscript{281} Admittedly, *A Boy in the Conflict of Life* (*En pojke i livets strid*, Mauritz Stiller, 1913) was produced before *Trollsländan*. However, According to *Svensk Filmografi*, this film was never distributed, and not emerged in any advertisement in newspapers. Therefore, its generic identity did not fully develop to the extent that it contributed to the conception of children’s film. Nevertheless, it is of course worth examining in future research. Lars Åhlander, *Svensk filmografi 1, 1897-1919* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1986), 226.
atmosphere and the right points nicely in a small living family life film, which *The Dragonfly* intends to be. Moreover, especially when it comes to bringing out the children’s expression of their feelings, who could do this better than the one who is herself a mother and who in addition is also gifted with a keen eye and humour sense? Mrs Brunius is thus the right person, - no, again, right woman to handle such a task, which, though seems to be easy, is not without its difficulties.\(^{282}\)

Furthermore, *Filmjournalen* also praises her sensitive touch to depict children, and expected more of this type of films.

> Let's have more comedy of this kind, Mrs Brunius! They really fill up a need for valuable second-program. And they are a thousand times better than the American little farces we have had to go through for years.\(^{283}\)

It is noteworthy that the originality of this depiction of the subtleties of children is highly regarded as something that can be attributed to her qualities as at once a mother and woman, and above all, as distinct from American comedy films. Of equal importance, indeed, is that as if reacting to this textual implication, film magazines, including trade journals, had been featuring this film in a somewhat different way before; they put more emphasis on two child actors.

### 5.3. Advertisements and Exhibition

One main role is acted by Palle Brunius, who, born as a son between Pauline and John Brunius, had already appeared in some films before *The Dragonfly*, such as *Puss in Boots* (*Mästerkatten i stövlar*, John W. Brunius, 1918), *The Gyurkovics Boys* (*Gyurkovicsarna*, John W. Brunius, 1920) and so on. When he played a role in *Synnøve Solbakken* (John W. Brunius, 1919), he was advertised in *Filmen* in the same way of other film stars.\(^{284}\) Erik Zetterström, recalling the moment when he participated in the film shooting of *The Dragonfly*, describes in the interview of *Aftonbladet* that Palle had already been so popular that he had to walk in the backstreet to and from school.\(^{285}\) Moreover, even in the northern area of Sweden, his name seemed popular, as *Norrskensflamman* mentions him as “famous Palle Brunius” in the advertisement of *The Dragonfly*.\(^{286}\)

The other is Eyvor Lindberg, who acted Lillan in *The Dragonfly* and was also pushed in

\(^{282}\) *Filmnyheter*, 1920: 1, 2. My translation.


\(^{284}\) *Filmen*, 1919: 16, 2.

\(^{285}\) *Aftonbladet*, 1920-12-10.

\(^{286}\) *Norrskensflamman*, 1920-12-24.
full force in film magazines. Indeed, Filmjournalen appreciates that Lindberg, alongside Palle Brunius, became a driving force of the story, and predicted that they would continue the film career. Likewise, Göteborgs Dagbladet also appreciated these two children as main characters of this film, writing that

\[
\text{[a]ctually, it's two young people who take a charge of the driving force, and they do it in an adorable and skilful way. The film is actually a kind of warning to all heedless young women and thoughtless parents, and anyway, it's entertaining.}
\]

In terms of exhibition strategies, however, The Dragonfly, made as a short film, was at times screened together with films which were not allowed to be shown to child audiences, wherein lies the ambiguity of generic identity.

Indeed, especially on its initial release at Röda Kvarn on 4th October 1920, The Dragonfly was included in the same program of Arizona (Albert Park & Douglas Fairbanks, 1918), which was tagged with yellow, namely, not allowed for children under the age of 15. The same was true at Biograf Palatset and Vinterpalatset. Furthermore, in terms of the screening at London, although not so rigidly restricted, children were not allowed to take part in it unless they were accompanied by their parents. Although there was a slight difference in the films that were co-screened, it seems that some of the movie theaters did not show this film as part of programs appropriate for young audiences.

On the other hand, at Victoria (Malmö), Sibyllan, and Chicago, children could gain access to the screening without being accompanied by parents. When it comes to the premiere at Teaterbiografen in Gellivare (Gällivare) on the Boxing Day, the main program was not for children due to the screening together with The Lesson (Charles Giblyn, 1917), but they held an extra large children’s screening of The Dragonfly at 3 pm on the same day.

As such, this film was sometimes chosen as a small film for children and family film
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288 Filmjournalen, 1920: 11, 346.
290 Dagens Nyheter, 1920-10-04.
291 Biograf Palatset [Aftonbladet, 1920-10-11], Vinterpalatset [Aftonbladet, 1920-10-18].
294 At Victoria, screened with The Rescuing Angel (Walter Edwards, 1919). At Sibyllan, screened with The Heart of Youth (Robert G. Vignola, 1919) [Dagens Nyheter, 1920-10-11, and Svenska Dagbladet, 1920-10-11. Both are the same ad. and mistakenly credited Cecil B. DeMille as a director.] At Chicago, screened with Sand! (Lambert Hillyer, 1920) [Dagens Nyheter, 1920-11-15.]
screenings (Barn- och Familjeföreställningar). It should be worth noting that for the screenings to which forbade children’s admission, the advertisement highlights only the director Pauline Brunius, (and Mr and Mrs Winnerstrand if there was enough space), but never mentions child actors. In contrast, for ones that allowed for children, in addition to Mr and Mrs Winnerstrand, the advertisement emphasizes the names of two child protagonists, Palle and Eyvor, sometimes in bold letters. Therefore, despite that cinema owners did not use the term “children’s film” for making profits, they slightly differentiated their advertisement strategy for the screening, depending on whether it was only for adults, or both adults and children. Such a duality of address in advertisements is undoubtedly derived from American children’s films beginning to increase from the mid-1910s, as seen in the article of Filmkonsten mentioned earlier, which says children in the film captivate both child and adult audiences at the same time. It is this duality that bespeaks aesthetics of the very children’s film of this time.

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning one important screening, at which Röda Kvarn showed The Dragonfly as part of children’s program with the accompanying lecture of Sago Greta, namely, Greta Holmgren, a famous pedagogue at that time, who devoted her career to promoting children’s culture. In Filmnyheter, this screening was referred to as ‘children’s screening.’

Regarding this screening, though commending the lecture of Sago-Greta and Röda Kvarn’s attempt to involve pedagogues in the film screening, G. Halfdan Liander shows in Biografen relatively negative attitudes toward the constitution of the program. Indeed, he casts doubt on the contents of the two titles screened there; that is, The Dragonfly and Dolly’s Vacation (William Bertram, 1918), because the negligent mothers and somewhat sympathetic types of women represented in those films, according to him, “were not appropriate to strengthen in young people’s mind the respect and love for their parents and home.” Furthermore, he suggests that the children’s film screening should be taken place in consultation with teachers or school authorities, which can draw attention from both children and adults, eventually leading to the upbringing of both audiences taste and cinema owners’
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profits. As such, the critical reception of this film was also ambiguous, which well-represents the idea that film, in the very early period, was considered an ambivalent medium, which could be an educational tool on the one hand, and negatively affected children’s behaviour, on the other.

Even in 1921 and 1922, one to two years after the initial release, some theaters screened The Dragonfly on the Boxing Day, which, therefore, could become as part of the Christmas program. Despite that any article did not clearly refer to it as a children’s film, the Christmas screening is a similar exhibition (and distribution) strategy to other children’s films, such as Guttersnipes and Mrs Andersson’s Charlie. Furthermore, not only does this custom apply to children’s film, but was inherited from that of children’s books as well, just as Svensk Lärraretidnings Förlagsaktiebolag published a new children’s book for Christmas already in 1900.

As Gustafsson reveals, Christmas week’s premier is over century-old tradition in Swedish cinema. Furthermore, as early as 1916, Karl Lundegård already recommended in Filmbladet that Swedish cinema owners should cultivate the Christmas Day program, stating that "during Christmas week […] the audience is much more eager and Boxing Day and the following days are generally considered by the cinema owners to be the sweetest days of the year to cash in on." Judged by this, it is assumed that outing to the cinema during Christmas week had undeniably been Swedish families’ affair as a holiday celebration at that time. Therefore, even though it was not their premieres, some films included in the Boxing Day program could have been seen by many audiences, raging from the elderly to young.

Although rarely discussed, the function of children’s film should also be taken into consideration when it comes to analysing it. As Thomas Shatz, referring to Bazin’s famous phrase, argues, cinema's existence itself precedes what cinema involves. Therefore, be it commercial or art cinema, he goes on, it should be determined by its function, namely, how it works for society, which, in analogous to myth and language, “represents a set of rules of
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construction that are utilized to accomplish a specific communicative function.”

And those rules are often represented by the plots, characters, and iconographies.

Here, I would not declare that the children’s film should be determined by its function, as it is merely to become a naming strategy. However, it could be said that The Dragonfly could offer an opportunity for families to share their times at cinema, namely, a ritual to re-affirm the family, kinship, and community somehow. Furthermore, it illustrates the conventional theme of children’s fiction, that is, taken away by an animal creature, eventual return to home, and family reunion. Above all, the representation of small children is nothing but the iconography of the contemporaneous children’s films.

5.4. Branding and Refining the Generic Identity

Alongside these exhibition strategies, the generic identity of The Dragonfly, branded as a school film (skolfilm), was refined into more “suitable” for children, and at the very point, the implication of the initial involvement of Gustaf Berg in this project, though not named in the eventual output, becomes crucial, as he branded some of the yellow (adult) films adapted after famous literature as a school film. This typifies Berg’s believing in the power of literature and his stress that the literary film should be taken advantage of for the elementary literature teaching, which he believes helps children express themselves easier and clearer on the ground that the moving images constantly evoke new linguistic expressions of the world viewed.

In practice, Svensk Filmindustriföretag (SF), a vertically integrated leading film company in Sweden, inaugurated the school film department in 1921, with Gustaf Berg appointed as a supervisor, in pursuit of utilising the film’s potential to educate the audiences. He argues in Filmen och folkundervisningen that the criticism over the influence of film those days was concerned with the moral value in most cases, and articulates that as the time goes by, the worldview, on which the invention of cinematography had influenced, would be proven to be more intuitive and comprehensible than even the printing press. On the basis of his philosophy, SF’s school film section classified some yellow films into school films in later years.

For example, though not an apparent children’s film, The Phantom Carriage (Körkarlen, 310
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Victor Sjöström, 1921), a canonical work of Victor Sjöström, gives us a profound insight into the generic identity shift of a film for children. According to the censorship card of this film, even though which was classified as yellow on its initial release, it was re-circulated as a school film several times [Tab. 5].

[Tab.5] The Phantom Carriage, Censorship Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reel Length</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920/12/15</td>
<td>2112m: 353, 447, 427, 416, 469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932/12/21</td>
<td>1897m: 330, 407, 363, 378, 419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951/12/11</td>
<td>718m: 415, 303</td>
<td>smalfilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952/3/14</td>
<td>721m: 125, 157, 135, 148, 156</td>
<td>smalfilm, skolfilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953/5/29</td>
<td>1795m: 445, 260, 335, 365, 390</td>
<td>Expo. o Imp. Eng. rubrik o eng. texter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955/8/19</td>
<td>1835m: 455, 265, 345, 375, 395</td>
<td>skolfilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957/3/22</td>
<td>718m</td>
<td>skolfilm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the second earliest inspection was taken place in 1932, Bildningsfilmer Catalogue No.3 (1923-24) lists up this film as a school film under the category of “Literary and Entertainment Films (Litterära och underhållnings filmer)” with a concise description: “after Selma Lagerlöf,” which emphasises that this film is an adaptation of the canonical work of the prestigious Swedish author.

Gustafsson argues that a school cinema initiative showcased to some degree responsibility for educating its audiences, by endorsing them as “educational” in order to salvage the reputation of the film industry, which eventually leads to the recuperation of the expenses that involved the production cost. Although he mainly refers to educational films, in analogous to the documentary genre, as the school film, there seemed to be narrative films as well in the list of school films that SF had issued, as seen in the case of The Phantom Carriage. While being regarded as not child-friendly on its initial release, some films retrospectively became a film for child audiences as a school film that was supposed to be exclusively seen by children.
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What lies in this shift was the effort to restore the film’s educational values, borrowing the fame of literature. Although it is not certain how often The Phantom Carriage was actually shown to school children, according to Jan Olsson, Borgarskolan held several screenings of those “Literary Films” from 1921 and on.\(^{319}\)

The most significant fact is that The Dragonfly, together with Live Your Life Smiling, Switching Roles, and Lumbago, is also listed up in this catalogue.\(^{320}\) Certainly, The Dragonfly is not originally a yellow film. However, it is also the fact that there were several co-screenings with yellow films. Indeed, the first issue of the catalogue does not include it.\(^{321}\)

Thus, through the branding, it became more specifically child-oriented film, which means, refining its generic identity. It is highly probable that children could see this film as part of the school screening. As such, The Dragonfly symbolizes such a mixture in itself. The instability of this identity, which is at times seen only by adults and other time screened for children, is similar to Mrs Andersson's Charlie, and American films that were referred to as a children's film.

5.5. Textual Aspect: Sovereignty, Transgression, and Depicting the Family

In that context, it probably makes sense that The Dragonfly had shown the generic identity of children's film at that time. This film does no longer exist, but the manuscript that Svenska filminstitutet holds\(^ {322}\) offers some inspiration for the textual aspect of children's film. Filmjournalen comments on this film that

\[
\text{the story is so simple that people are struck by, but precisely in this simplicity lies its charm - it is a small everyday intermezzo, one that can happen to all of us and that is why it is so interesting.} \quad \text{323}
\]

As seen in this review, this film was considered to depict an ordinary life, perhaps with a little bit of boredness. However, what counts here is that The Dragonfly symbolises the children's point of view, which means that they can alter an ordinary life into a fantasy, which, as Gagner considered, is supposed to be supreme to children.\(^{324}\) Indeed, once Lillan finds a dragonfly, the world surrounding her turns into fantasy in a similar way that Alice, finding a

\(^{319}\) Olsson, “Platforms for Learning”, 30.
\(^{320}\) Bildnings filmer tillgängliga för skolor, föreläsningsföreningar, social upplysningsverksamhet m.m.: säsongen 1923-24, katalog no.3, 63-64.
\(^{321}\) Katalog över skolfilmer, no.1. In this issue, even the category of “Literary and Entertainment Films” does not exist.
\(^{322}\) See Appendix.
\(^{324}\) Olsson, "Marie Louise Gagner".
rabbit, strays into the wonderland. Thus, she chases after the dragonfly in frenzy without thinking anything concerning a real life and future. Above all, however, Brunius illustrates such a situation in a nonchalant way without any wonderous creature.

In fact, this trait of childhood can be described by what Georges Bataille calls sovereignty, which is one of the themes that he had addressed in his later years. He describes that refusing to subordinate to the future, the sovereign moment derives when certain expectations are dissolved into nothing. It is impossible to perceive such a sovereign moment and, according to Bataille, it can only be captured by un-knowing. Usually, when perceiving it, we recognise an object presented just before the dissolution of the expectation occurs. Admittedly, he uses sovereignty in a figurative sense, as something lied inside adults. However, I would argue that this very characteristic of sovereignty symbolises children’s experiences, and therefore, permeates not only in children’s films, but children’s fiction at large.

Indeed, he sporadically addressed this theme as relevant to “childhood,” which in his anthology appears in the words such as enfant, enfance, enfantillage, mineur, infantile, enfantin, puéril, and so on. Sharon Hunter argues that he does not regard a child as human, rather as animal-becoming-human, situating “the notion of childishness as an adult construct propaedeutic to the state of reason: it denotes a relational state of becoming.” Therefore, “grown-ups,” as she continues, “induct newcomers into the characteristically human system and over time children become human.”

The essential concern that Bataille holds, though not restricted to the discussion represented by the term ‘child,’ is in what way, and to what extent “a child”, subverting the social order that is established in consonance with the adult way of thinking, discloses the state of life, relation between people, and interaction between people and the world, which is otherwise disguised or suppressed. And above all, a child does so freewheelingly, and sometimes does not.

Bataille later argues in Literature and Evil that childhood is evil relating to this sovereignty. In his essay of Emily Bronte’s Wuthering Heights, he accounts for the love
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between Heathcliff and Catherine in their childhood as follows.

The two children spent their time racing wildly on the heath. They abandoned themselves, untrammelled by any restraint or convention other than a taboo on games of sensuality. However, in their innocence, they placed their indestructible love for one another on another level, and indeed perhaps this love can be reduced to the refusal to give up an infantile freedom which had not been amended by the laws of society or of conventional politeness.\textsuperscript{331}

He deems this childhood as the sovereign moment and appreciates that Bronte well-illustrates the presence of a rational that would eventually confront Catherine and Heathcliff. That can be evil because society “could not survive if these childish instincts, which bound the children in a feeling of complicity, were allowed to triumph”.\textsuperscript{332} Therefore, as children grow up, they are required “to give up their innocent sovereignty; it would have required them to comply with those reasonable adult conventions which are advantageous to the community.”\textsuperscript{333} Thus, that children, not being worried about future, are captured in a supreme moment illuminated within the fantasy world they establish is the very characteristic of childhood, or rather, children’s point of view of the world.

It should be kept in mind that he neither discusses the mere binary between “good” and “evil” here, nor attempts to formulate the hierarchical structure of evil versus good; rather, he underscores hyper-moral, stating in the preface of \textit{Literature and Evil} that

I believe that the Evil – an acute form of Evil – which it expresses, has a sovereign value for us. But this concept does not exclude morality: on the contrary, it demands a ‘hypermorality’.\textsuperscript{334}

‘Morality’ is set up by people, the identity of whom is cast into a particular ideological convention. Just as Catherine in \textit{Wuthering Heights} defies the law of a community founded by Christianity in accordance between "primitive religious taboos, holiness and reason,”\textsuperscript{335} so Swedish young rascals (\textit{Busunge}) in the film transgress this moral setting that was especially established by the discipline model: the young should be raised through discipline, which was prevalent attitudes toward them at that time\textsuperscript{336} and was well-represented in Elsa Beskow’s literary world.

Comparing Beskow’s children to Pippi, Vivi Edström elucidates on the change in a view
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\item \textsuperscript{336} Berggren, \textit{Seklets ungdom}, 27-33.
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of children in Sweden, which occurred during the twentieth century.\(^{337}\) In terms of the former, “everything is neat and tidy, and ruled by adults.”\(^{338}\) In contrast, there is chaos in Pippi’s house, or should we say, it is orderly arranged “on terms dictated by the child.”\(^{339}\) I would argue that Elsa Beskow’s literary world was a dominant mode of children’s novel at that time, which is also illustrated by *Jultomten*, a periodical including short stories with illustrations and paintings, and published for child readers annually in the Christmas season from 1891 to 1935. She contributed several stories to this magazine with her own illustrations that in many cases include well-disciplined children, who are thereby allowed to enter the fantasy world.\(^{340}\) *Jultomten* symbolises and above all, *visualises* what adults wanted children to be; that is, diligent and well-behave children, who are at times represented as gender codified characters [fig.5].\(^{341}\) With this regards, it does make sense that in *Gloriana*, a film often referred to as a children’s film, some scenes, where Gloriana makes misconducts, were cut by the censorship board, according to the principle of The Ordinance on Cinema Performances No. 71.\(^{342}\)

Brunius’s children rather be more natural, which was in a sense in common with American rascals, who already appeared in Swedish cinemas even before *The Dragonfly*, and above all, are also seen in the first Swedish children’s film cluster. She depicts more problem-provoking children in her films. Indeed, in *Live Your Life Smiling*, she depicts a son, who, standing on a desk, playing with a sword and wearing a crown, is uncontrollable for his mother. Furthermore, in *Switching Roles*, where a divorce lawyer called Vinner and his wife switch their roles; Vinner does house chores, while Mrs Vinner works at the lawyer’s office,\(^{343}\) she represents their children as unruly, and therefore beyond Vinner’s capacity to take care of them. And in *The Dragonfly*, unexpected behaviour of children, which is represented both by Lillan and Puttte, causes the suspense.

This image of the child may also be characterized by the liberal ideas about children that Ellen Kay brought to the table. That is, as Henrik Berggren summarises, it was not primarily that children and young people were in a state of innocence; it was that, for better or worse, this stage of life was more alive and more authentic than the hardened, conventional adult life. Evil, unless it was "historical atavism or perversity," was as essential as good, and therefore,

---


\(^{338}\) Ibid., 90.

\(^{339}\) Ibid.

\(^{340}\) Ibid.

\(^{341}\) *Jultomten*, 1907, 4-5. *Jultomten*, 1911, 20-21. *Jultomten*, 1917, 20-21. Especially in *Jultomten* in 1907:4-5, all the boys and girls are lined up in a neat row. The boys hold a model of ship or horse, while the girls hold a doll.

\(^{342}\) Filmcensuren, SOU (1951:16), 81-82.

\(^{343}\) Ombytta roller, Manuscript, Svenska Filminstitutet.
children have the right to be naughty.\footnote{Henrik Berggren, \textit{Seklets ungdom: Retorik, politik och modernitet 1900-1939} (Stocholm: Tidens förlag, 1995), 42.}

\[\text{Fig.5} \] \textit{Jultomten}, 1907, 1911.

Of particular significance, however, is that at once following the conventional view of children and including unexpected characteristics associated with naturalness, Lillan embodies in-betweeness, which symbolises its position between the surge of American children’s films, and the first children’s film cluster in Sweden. Indeed, the ambiguity – both diligent and naughty therefore natural children – is embedded in her. For example, she is depicted in the opening scene as an uncontrollable creature, who unconsciously makes her mother’s dress dirty by touching it out of curiosity.\footnote{See l. 5 in Appendix.} However, when she finds a dragonfly in the garden, she tries her best to catch it for her mother (albeit for a brooch she broke herself). The way she goes diligently to achieve their goals, even when her clothes are dirty or wet,\footnote{See l. 59 in Appendix.} is exactly the kind of image often depicted in \textit{Jultomten}. On the other hand, Putte is depicted as a neglected brother. At the same time, however, he is sometimes mean, and other times a good brother who cares for his younger sister. Brunius well portrays the whimsicality of children as such. The image of a free spirited child, untrammelled by a rational, symbolizes
freedom and equality, and can be a kind of ideal for adults.

Takeshi Sakai points out that childhood recovered (enfance retrouvée) in Bataille’s texts is originally from The Painter of the Modern Life (Le peintre de la vie moderne) by Charles Baudelaire.\textsuperscript{347} For Baudelaire, enfance retrouvée represents the duality, in which a child-like instinct and adult-like rational conflate. According to his account, genius rearrange images that are collected by the child-like instinct, and at once analysed and categorised by the adult-like rational. For Baudelaire, the child-like instinct is an ability to grasp objects existing in the world with innocent curiosity, which is otherwise boring for adults.\textsuperscript{348} Baudelaire writes in The Painter of the Modern Life as follows.

\begin{quote}
Genius is nothing more nor less than childhood recovered at will – a childhood now equipped for self-expression with manhood’s capacities and a power of analysis which enables it to order the mass of raw material which it has involuntarily accumulated.\textsuperscript{349}
\end{quote}

Bataille refers to this enfance retrouvée, but in a slightly different way. He is concerned more deeply with childhood. This childhood, as opposed to the era of Baudelaire, was more difficult to be retrieved in Bataille’s era, since the rational, as constructed in the modern era, which was deeply associated with the action (l’action) or the work (le travail), became the dominant mode of ideology for the contemporaries. Such a rational categorises and exploits objects existing in the world in a way that was useful to humans and their future.\textsuperscript{350} This adult rational parallels well-disciplined children in Beskow’s world. Therefore, Bataille’s child is one that has been submerged deep within the system, however, at the same time, their whimsicality could expose the complex relationships of that system.

Brunius said in the aforementioned interview that she participated in her husband's entire filmmaking process, including developing the film, to learn how to make the film.\textsuperscript{351} As a film actress and wife of a popular film director, she went inside the system and made a unique film as a director, which is precisely the aesthetic that is embodied by the Benjamin's flaneur,\textsuperscript{352} or Camus’s stranger.\textsuperscript{353} And in the Swedish society of that time, probably influenced by Ellen Kay's philosophy strongly, home must have been considered the most
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important social place for children to develop their social skills.\textsuperscript{354} In this sense, children, in a system of the family created by adult conventions, show us what is important to the family in their relationships. This image of the child coincides with Brunius’s position in the film industry. \textit{The Dragonfly}, placing children in the context of family relationships and therefore appreciated as “a kind of warning to all heedless young women and thoughtless parents,”\textsuperscript{355} is indicative of the potential of family films, or rather children's films at the time.

That is why worthy of special mention is not only her delicate way of depicting childhood, but the way to contrast it to the worldview of adults, which thereby illustrating the duality of children’s film aesthetics. For example, in \textit{The Dragonfly}, Mr. and Mrs. Winner often argue with each other, but in front of other guests, they pretend to be friendly out of concern for social manner. This is undoubtedly an act of anticipation of future consequences. On the contrary, Lillan, not caring much about what Putte says to her when she tries to catch the dragonfly,\textsuperscript{356} keeps chasing it, following her instinctive curiosity, even if it ends up causing an unexpected consequence. This is also true of Putte, who examines his father's pipe, which makes his father’s gloves dirty, and therefore being scolded.\textsuperscript{357} They behave on instinct, and their desire to explore the inner world, which allows them to close in on it. And of course, as has been discussed so far, these depictions could be characterised by Bataille’s sovereignty and childhood. This way, differentiating the world that children experience from that of adults, Brunius re-constellated the components of the children's literature in her films.

Herein also lies significance of her depiction of adults as childish. Though Mr and Mrs Winnerstrand in the film pretend to be rational on the cruiser, they at times cannot control their feelings, which therefore causes laughter. This is not only for this film, but \textit{Switching Roles} as well, for instance. There, by changing roles of a mother and father, she discloses that they cannot handle the matter in each other’s situation, thereby exposing the insufficiency of them. As Bataille puts it, “laughter is born of unevenness, of sudden depressions.”\textsuperscript{358}

I would argue that Brunius’s depiction of somewhat upper class people (as represented by \textit{The Dragonfly}, \textit{Switching Roles}, as well as \textit{Live your Life Smiling}) – this is as opposed to would-later-be children’s films by Sigurd Wallén – facilitates such a sudden depression. Bataille writes
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laughter does not only reach the peripheral region of existence, it is not only about fools or children (those who came empty or still are); by a necessary overthrow, it returns from the child to the father, from the periphery to the center in each time the father or the center exposes their insufficiency.\textsuperscript{359}

This exposition of insufficiency was unwelcomed in Swedish contemporaneous educational discourse community, where \textit{The Dragonfly} was evaluated as “not appropriate to strengthen in young people’s mind the respect and love for their parents and home.”\textsuperscript{360} This negation of hierarchical structure by creating derision of adults has been circumvented in children’s literature, which places children as an orphan,\textsuperscript{361} thereby excluding adult representations as much as possible. This exactly pertains to the impossibility of children’s fiction, wherein lies the power imbalance between adults and children, which is derived from an adult yearning for keeping this imbalance to discipline children.

As Jacqueline Rose argues, in children’s literature, “any question of who is talking to whom, and why, is totally erased.”\textsuperscript{362} Therefore, children enjoy the story as if experiencing themselves, thereby being easily invested in it. Representing as few adult characters as possible, authors of the children’s novel has attempted to make didactic intention “absorbed into the story and, apparently, rendered invisible.”\textsuperscript{363} However, Brunius, placing children as part of the family member, rather compares children to adults, thereby revealing the relation between them, especially in \textit{The Dragonfly}.

Still, it must be noted that the power imbalance is embedded. In fact, in the manuscript, the name of cruiser, where the story of Mr and Mrs Winnerstrand mainly unfolds, was Sharpness (\textit{Skarpsyntheten}).\textsuperscript{364} However, in the dialog list, it was changed into Masculinity (\textit{Manligheten}).\textsuperscript{365} It is uncertain who revised it, but the fact that the cruiser was codified as masculine as if alludes both that the adult world was dominated by men, but at the same time that the children were free from being bound by it.

\subsection*{5.6. Summary}
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As such, very early on, Pauline Brunius had embarked on an attempt to make effective use of children in her films and the journalistic and industrial discourses seemed to respond to that attempt with the publicity that brought child actors to the fore. As Henrik Berggren describes, Ellen Key was an advocate of new viewpoint of children and youth, which arrived at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{366} The recurring theme of her essays is that if women were the ancestors and educators of the new age, it was the task of the youth to bring humanity into the new and higher form of civilization that was now within reach.\textsuperscript{367} With this, Brunius embodies the public expectation for children and women in her films.

Through the case study of this film, neither do I intend to argue that \textit{The Dragonfly} is the very first children’s film in Sweden, nor that it was a masterpiece at that time (rather there is possibility that it was not memorable for most of the contemporary audience.) But I would suggest that there is a woman agency in history of the early Swedish children’s film, which is otherwise characterised by the works of Sigurd Wallén, Erik Zetterström, and Emil Norlander. This way, it makes Swedish children’s film history more open-ended, with the possibility of new discoveries.

\textsuperscript{366} Berggren, 40.
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6. Conclusion

With the primary importance put on general discourses that formed the concept of children’s film, this project aimed to reveal the contemporaneous consensus of children's films from the emergence of the term to the first children’s film cluster. In order to approach such a consensus, I examined three topics in this thesis. First of all, however, I would like to point out that the consensus was not always clear, and conceptions varied depending on which discourse community such a genre was discussed in.

At first, the term ‘children’s film’ itself referred to American films when it emerged in general discourses for the first time. Although Swedish children's films were firmly established as a genre to signify Swedish films for children through the systematic labeling and lively discussion of ‘people’s home’ in the 1940s, the earlier conception of children's films, especially just after the emergence of the term, was often associated with American child actors. When American children's films began to be shown in Swedish cinemas one after another, their adorable and natural images of small children were especially appreciated as appealing to adult audiences. It seems that some of the films had been sanitized by the censors to fit into the Swedish pedagogical code, however, critics with an educational perspective did not necessarily equate such American films, which were produced with huge budgets, with Swedish ones.

The second part examined Mrs Andersson’s Charlie and the first children’s film cluster. The term was not immediately applied to this very first Swedish children's film, but cemented the concept of them by being used for a series of the films featuring children released in the following year. Chaos caused by naughty nature, which were deemed to degrade the aesthetic and educational value that the film might possess, had indeed functioned to consolidate the concept of children's film and showed the audience what it was, regardless of the harsh criticism from contemporaneous pedagogues. Children preferred to the comedy genre with a physical spectacle in the film. In addition, slapstick children's "films" also appeared in Swedish daily papers. Therefore, films, which are now considered family films in a retrospective sense, used to be regarded as children's films. This fact symbolises the film's ambiguous status in the early period.

In the final part, I took up The Dragonfly and Pauline Brunius, and discussed how they symbolised the generic identity of children’s film at that time, and at the same time, embodied the in-betweenness of the discipline model and liberal attitude toward children. In this film, Brunius depicts children’s point of view and at the same time, contrast their world to adult
one, thereby revealing how freely and actively children behave. They were emblematic of Brunius to create something unique while remaining within the system.

Genres change their identity like a process, but so do the terms that refer to them. By examining how terms are used and exploring the identity of a genre with a sense of contemporaneity, we can reconstruct the history of a genre and show the open-endedness of history.
Appendix


0. There will be a deck party on the cruiser Sharpness which was at anchor outside Dalarö ... 
1. The deck of the cruiser. Equipment for the party. “... and among the summer guests, who were honored to be invited, was also the Winner family.” 
2. Room No. 1 in Winner’s villa. The image fade-in. Close-up of Mrs. Winner, who turns around and shows off her elegant dress with a smile. 
3. Room 1. Close-up of Winner, who admires his wife and applauds her in a joking way. 
4. Room 1. Close-up of Lillan, who admires her mother with radiant eyes. 
5. Room1. Full Picture (Long-Shot). Winner goes up to Mrs. Winner, arranges an appetizer or something. Both are happy and satisfied. Lillan also admires, but carelessly touches the dress. Being careful with her outfit, Mrs. Winner, somewhat annoyed, but not unkindly drives Lillan out to the next room. Lillan runs laughing. 
6. Room 2. In the foreground, Putte at the table, on which, among other things, there are Winner’s intact white gloves and jewelry in the form of a dragonfly. Putte is busy checking Winner's smoke pipe, which he digs in, sucks on, etc. He grimaces at the nasty taste but his interest in the pipe keeps going on. Lillan approaches and asks to join. Putte dismisses. He has no time with her. Lillan does not take his unkindness badly, especially because she gets to see the dragonfly jewelry now, which she fondly grabs and starts playing with. 
7. Room 1. Winner and Mrs. Winner finish checking the dress and move to Room 2 to take their outerwear and go. Winner sees something, gets dissatisfied, quickly go out of the picture. 
8. Room 2. Close-up of the table. During his checking of the pipe, Putte has accidentally tarnished the white gloves with pipe grease. Winner comes behind, sees the devastation, gets angry, pinches Putte’s ear and talks angrily about the spoiled gloves. Putte screams. Lillan steps back, taking the jewelry with her. Mrs. Winner comes and asks, what is it about? Winner explains, the wife feels compassion with his resentment, takes the gloves, and checks whether they can be cleaned. 
9. Room 2. Close-up of Lillan, who sneaks away, sits on the floor and plays with the jewelry. 
10. Room 2. At the table. Mrs. Winner has got the gloves clean (found a pair of others, respectively). Winner takes them and mutters thanks, and ends the punishment of Putte
with pinching his ear, which does not become too hard, hence Putte immediately dodges. Winner starts trying on one glove.

11. Room 2. Close-up of Putte in a corner. He sobs, more from anger than overwhelmed.

12. Room 2. Close-up of Lillan. She looks up Putte, feels pity on him, gets up and walks out of the picture, accidentally (possibly in special Close-up) stepping on the jewelry, which is crushed.


14. Room 2. Winner and Mrs. Winner. They have not really overcome their bad mood. Now shall we go then? - Yes. Mrs. Winner is once again convinced that her dress is all right, then thinking of a piece of jewelry that she is missing. Gets in a better mood (luckily she remembered that) goes out of the picture.

15. Full picture. In the foreground are the children. Behind that, Mrs. Winner is looking for the jewelry on a couple of different tables, in drawers, etc. She is not yet annoyed that it does not exist, merely because she thinks that she cannot find where she puts it. Then she turns around, and gets to see:

16. Room 2. Close-up of the crushed jewelry on the floor.

17. Room 2. Close-up of Mrs. Winner, when she sees the ruined jewelry. At first she becomes just upset, then angry.

18. Room 2. In the foreground are the children. Mrs. Winner approaches to them, fiercely. Putte sees her coming, gets scared and wants to get going, is stopped by the mother, who strictly (uncontrollably) asks, who did this with the jewelry. Putte denies. Lillan has no intention of denying, even though she, being scared, understands that it might end badly. Mrs. Winner scolds her fiercely. Lillan falls into tears.

19. Room 1. Close-up of Winner hears the scream, and gets dissatisfied: what in the name of the Lord is it then? Goes out of the picture.

20. Room 2. Mrs. Winner scolds and shakes the crying Lillan. Winner frames in the picture and asks what's going on. There is never any peace in this house: Mrs. Winner talks in a high pitch about the jewelry, being mad at Lillan. Winner also gets angry, but as a direct reaction to his wife's lack of control, he becomes more frustrated. He takes the girl: do you see now what you did? Are you a naughty girl? Shame on you. Lillan cries and asks for forgiveness, which irritates Winner, so that he also becomes disfavor to Lillan.

22. Room 2. Close-up of Winners and Mrs. Winner's punishment of the miserable Lillan. Winner and Mrs Winner are now also getting annoyed at each other due to different views on the most appropriate method of punishment. They interrupt each other in the common argument on Lillan and: shut up, I'm taking care of this.

23. Beach. A smaller shuttle boat from the cruiser. Ladies and gentlemen embark on it. A high-pitched signal (bell, horn?)

24. Room 2. Winner hears the signal, looks at the clock and says they have to go. They get ready to go in a lingering bad mood and anger towards Lillan and each other. When they are gone, Putte walks up to Lillan, looks at the rubbles of the jewelry, which Mrs. Winner has put on the table, tries to comfort Lillan clumsily, but does not succeed. Putte becomes completely desperate about this, really feels his responsibility as a big brother, starts playing a prank, does a headstand etc.


26. Beach. Winner and Mrs. Winner come running and embark. The smaller shuttle boat leaves the dock.

27. Room 2. Putte puts more effort, with some success.

28. Room 2. Close-up of Lillan, who no longer cries, but hesitates if she should let herself be amused.

29. Room 2. Full picture. Putte puts his efforts further.

30. Room 2. Close-up of Lillan, she smiles through her tears.

31. Room 2. Close-up of Putte and Lillan. Putte, encouraged by the burgeoning success, does even more things.

32. Deck of the cruiser. The passengers of shuttle boat come on board, among them Winner and Mrs. Winner, who successfully try to overcome their bad mood. However, some irritation remains.

33. Room 2. Putte now does his very best trick and Lillan forgets her grief. Perhaps the culmination of Putte's success should rather be a mishap.

34. Room 2. Close-up of now heartily laughing Lillan.

35. Room 2. Close-up of the children. When Putte has managed to make Lillan happy again, he is completely satisfied, he stands up with Lillan and they go out of the picture.

36. Deck. Among ladies and gentlemen come Winner and Mrs. Winner. Handsome Lieutenant greets and stops, flirting with Mrs. Winner, who is completely attracted by him.
38. Deck. Winner controls his irritation, tells Mrs. Winner that they have more guests to greet. Mrs. Winner smiles and agrees, saying goodbye to Lieutenant lovingly. When they have left, Mrs. Winner makes a face as if she wanted to pinch Winner, regains the happy look as several guests approach. (cf. My wife's lead actress)
39. Garden. Putte and Lillan is playing, laughing and riding. Lillan gets to see a flying animal, follows it with her eyes and nods to Putte, to be quiet. Look, now it perched: Lillan points to it.
40. Garden. Close-up of the dragonfly perching on bush.
41. Garden. Close-up of Lillan and Putte. Lillan: quiet, quiet, sneaks closer to the camera, keeps Putte back. Putte behind her is stretched out with a little bit boredness. (contrast to Lillan's sweet childishness.)
42. Garden. Close-up of the dragonfly. (Trimming the dragonfly's wings or something? This Close-up should be taken with funny zoological expertness.)
43. Garden. Putte and Lillan in the foreground. Lillan: "Now mother can have a new butterfly." Lillan secretly and radiantly becomes happy about this idea. Putte he looks at Lillan, and laughs superiorly: you are being stupid; Lillan does not seem to care, sneaks forward. Putte laughs.
44. Garden. Close-up of the dragonfly. She's flying up.
45. Close-up of Lillan, not annoyed by Putte's words, only sad: no, but that you would scare her: Sneaks out of the picture, Putte looks at her: you are being stupid, you cannot catch her.
46. Garden. Close-up of the dragonfly that perches again.
47. Garden. Close-up of Lillan, turns half around and beckons to Putte to stay calm, sneaks forward.
48. Garden. Close-up of Putte. With big brother's patience, he is prepared to follow Lillan to find that she cannot catch the dragonfly. Then he hears something and turns around.
49. Garden. By the fence. Boy has whistled at Putte, eagerly beckoning him to come and see something fun.
50. Garden. Full picture. In the foreground is Putte. In the background behind the fence to the neighbours yard appears the Boy. Putte forgets Lillan and goes to the Boy.
51. Garden. Close-up of shrubs, in which the dragonfly appears. Lillan frames in the picture and tries to capture it. That fails. Lillan still with good hope. Next time, she'll probably get the dragonfly!


53. Deck. Close-up of Winner. Under usual circumstances he would not get jealous just because his wife dances with a lieutenant, but now he is enticed by his irritation further and further into the bad mood, and goes out of the picture.

54. Deck. Close up of Lieutenant and Mrs. Winner as they stop dancing. They are warm and happy, but in the gaze with which Mrs. Winner seeks her husband, there is a little quarrelsome wife deep inside her.

55. Deck. Close-up of Winner at some kind of buffet. In a bad mood, which he overacts a bit for himself, he finishes making a grog and takes a large swig of it.

56. Deck. Close-up of Mrs. Winner and Lieutenant. Mrs. Winner has seen Winner drinking a grog, is dissatisfied, but controls herself strenuously before Lieutenant.

57. Garden. At the fence, which Putte has climbed over. The interesting thing that the Boy had to show was a hedgehog, which Putte and the Boy now examine interestedly together.

58. Beach 2. In the foreground is the water. In the background comes Lillan, hunting the dragonfly. Right down at the beach, she stops, sneaks even more forcefully.

59. Beach 2. Close-up of Lillan at the beach, trying to catch the dragonfly. At the same time she stumbles on a stone and steps into the water, which only reaches her shin. Ugh so wet! Lillan returns and shakes her wet foot, gets the attention caught by the dragonfly again, sneaks along the beach through bushes.

60. Deck. Mrs. Winner frees herself from Lieutenant, without making him notice any of her unhappiness.

61. Deck. At the buffet, a little secluded, no one else in the immediate vicinity although in the background you can see them dancing. Close-up of Winner, not drunk or clumsy, but in a miserable mood, takes the glass again, but before he has time to drink, Mrs. Winner comes from behind and hits the glass violently out of his hand. It falls to the floor and shatters. Winner turns around in surprise, when he can understand Mrs. Winner gets angry, but she laughs past him, he turns around.

62. Deck. Full picture. In the foreground are Winner and Mrs. Winner. Lieutenant and a lady have danced in their direction during the dance. The Lieutenant, greets (in passing) laughing with Mrs. Winner, who greets back to him. Winner keeps something like a
good look until the couple danced away. Then Winner and Mrs. Winner's expressions suddenly change and they turn on each other angrily.

63. Deck. Close-up of Winner and Mrs. Winner, furious at each other, but in a low-tone and without big gestures so as not to attract attention. Mrs. Winner reproaches his grog drinking with sparkling eyes and clenched teeth. Winner reproaches back Mrs. Winner about her flirtation with Lieutenant. Both express that the other's offense is decisive.

64. Beach 2. Close-up of Lillan, who is more and more excitingly chasing the dragonfly. It perches on the bush, reeds, etc. near the water. Without thinking, Lillan rushes on and tries to catch the dragonfly in vain.

65. Beach 2. Close-up of Lillan near the water. She has failed, but looks briskly for the dragonfly that has flown above the water.

66. Beach 2. Close-up of the dragonfly on a reed or bush further out.

67. Beach 2. Close-up of Lillan in the water, looks for the dragonfly and wants to sneak up on her. Becomes aware of the water, which reaches her over the knees. Trying to avoid it by lifting one leg at a time. When it does not succeed, she pulls on the dress (byholma) so as not to wet them down and goes carefully further out. No idea of danger and no prank-boy-like pleasure in going out and being soaked, just a smiling desire to catch the dragonfly.

68. Garden. Putte and the Boy play and go completely and keep up in their pursuits.

69. Beach 2. Full picture. Lillan rushes after the dragonfly. She is very close to catching it and without thinking about it further, she runs further and further out. The water rises her upwards and she drops her hat off.

70. Deck. Close-up of Winner and Mrs. Winner. They continue in rising resentment. Mrs. Winner interrupts with a strained smile over the camera. Someone is coming. Mrs. Winner and Winner are separated in anger. Slowly fade-out.

71. Deck. Water surface. The image slowly fade-in. Close-up of Lillan's hat bobbing on the surface. The camera follows it. The hat comes close to the boat. The camera tilts up, over the hat, long side of the boat, finds Mrs. Winner standing at the edge of the deck. She stands looking out into space, not downward in heartfelt resentment at Winner. She turns to the side and gets to see:

72. Deck. Another part. Close-up of Winner, resentful, looks past the camera, smiles hard and scornfully, turns the other way.

73. Deck. Close-up of Mrs. Winner. She has seen Winner, sneers meanly, turns away again, will then look down, twitches, bends down and sees:
74. At the cruiser. Close-up of the hat on the water by the cruiser.

75. Deck. Close-up of Mrs. Winner. A tense expression that quickly turns into horror. She turns around, stares here and there confusedly, sees someone, runs to him.

76. Deck. Full picture. Mrs. Winner grabs the sailor, begs him and drags him, points down to the water and asks him for help. The sailor quickly takes a boat hook and picks up the hat. Mrs. Winner takes and checks it feverishly.

77. Deck. Close-up of the hat and Mrs. Winner's hands. In the hat you see the name: Lillan (?) If the name cannot be inserted suitably, the hat may have some peculiar little ornament, as seen at the beginning of the film.

78. Deck. Close-up of Mrs. Winner. So far, her fright has been somewhat held back by a bit of hope that it would not be Lillan's hat anyway. Now she is completely confused by her anxiety, says half hysterically to the sailor that he must row her home. The sailor comes to another side of deck and Mrs. Winner follows.

79. Deck. Close-up of Winner. He gets his attention on Mrs. Winner. What is this? Quickly goes out of the picture.

80. At the cruiser. The sailor helps Mrs. Winner in the dinghy. Winner comes rushing on the ship's deck, shouting: what is it? Mrs. Winner, notwithstanding the previous quarrel, replies half-crying, as she shows the hat. Winner gets upset, runs down to the dinghy.

81. Deck. The dance is in progress. The Lieutenant looks around for Mrs. Winner.

82. In the dinghy. The sailor is rowing. Mrs. Winner tells upset as she shows the hat. Winner asks eagerly and upset. Then their eyes meet, they remember their quarrel and vulgarity appear again in their eyes. They look from each other to the rowing sailor, then sit quietly and wait impatiently for them to arrive. The dinghy is landing. Winner first comes ashore and runs up the hill, leaving Mrs. Winner helped come ashore by the sailor. The image shifts to:

83. Room 1. The image appears from the previous one. Winner comes rushing in, looks around, runs into the next room.

84. Room 2. Winner comes in from room 1. Then finding the room empty, he runs to the window and shouts.


86. Garden. Full picture. In the background, Winner jumps out of a window. In the foreground Putte and the Boy. The boy thinks it's something Winner is angry about and gets going.
87. Room 1. Mrs. Winner comes in, looking around, goes into room 2.
88. Room 2. Mrs. Winner comes in from room 1, looks around and searches for Lillan in vain, noticing:
89. Room 2. Close-up of the shards of the dragonfly jewelry.
90. Room 2. Full picture. Mrs. Winner comes close to the shards of the jewelry. Her eyes are filled with tears.
91. Garden. Putte and Winner. Winner excitedly asks Putte about where Lillan may have gone, runs and shouts:
92. Room 2. Mrs. Winner is overwhelmed by her despair, collapses crying.
93. Beach. Winner and Putte come to the beach. Winner is upset, shouts and looks around, can find nothing, calms his anxiety down, returns:
94. Room 2. Crying Mrs. Winner. Hear the noise. Turns her head, see:
95. Room 1. At the door. This is pushed up from the outside and through the door an old seaman becomes visible with the soaked and unconscious Lillan in his arms. He's moving forward.
96. Room 2. Mrs. Winner comes up, wavering between hope and anxiety, runs out and goes into room 1.
97. Room 1. The seaman and Mrs. Winner meet at the sofa, where he lays down Lillan. Mrs. Winner kneels at the girl, turns to her, and then to the seaman with hysterical questions. He answers briefly pointing to that he found her around there. Mrs. Winner barely hears him. The seaman looks at her, leaves.
98. Garden. Winner and Putte shout and search for. Winner gets to see:
99. Garden. The seaman comes from the villa.
100. Garden. Winner and Putte [e]. Winner understands that the presence of the seaman means something, runs there with Putte.
101. Room 1. Mrs Winner by the Lillan lying on the sofa. Winner comes in, rushes to them. Putte comes after.
102. Room 1. Close-up at the sofa. Winner, Mrs. Winner and Lillan. Without caring about each other, the parents devote their care to the child. Greta?(Mrs. Winner?) opens her eyes, smiles, picks up her hand, which she has kept closed, opens it and shows:
103. Room 1. Close-up of Lillan's hand with dragonfly, immobile but not crushed.
104. Room 1. Close-up at the sofa. The parents still pay all their attention to the child. Lillan hands over the dragonfly to her mother and says with a smile, which at the same time is a shy begging for forgiveness because she has ruined the jewelry: "Lillan has caught a new
butterfly for mother." Lillan ends the line. Mrs. Winner takes after the dragonfly and kisses the child under the tears of joy, remembers, looks at Winner and he looks at her. They avoid awkward glances each other, but then seek their hands together.

105. Room 1. Close-up of Lillan and over her sofa back. Putte looks over, he has clung up to look at Lillan. When he sees that she is alive, he smiles happily and nods to her, she smiles again and Putte starts playing with her.

106. Room 1. Close-up of Winner and Mrs. Winner. They smile at each other, ashamed, remorseful and reconciled. The image fades out.
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The Lesson (Charles Giblyn, 1917)
The Phantom Carriage (Körkarlen, Victor Sjöström, 1921)
The Rescuing Angel (Walter Edwards, 1919)
The 400 Blows (Les Quatre Cents Coups, Francois Truffaut, 1959)
*Treasure Island* (Chester and Sidney Franklin, 1918)

*Tyrolean Rebellion* (*Tyrolens frihetskamp*, Carl Froelich, 1913)

*Veckorevy 1922-09-18* (Svensk Filmindustri, 1922)

Unidentified Original Title (*Bobbys goda hjärta*, Vitagraph, 1917?)

*Watering the Gardener* (*L'ArroseurArrosé*, Louis Lumière, 1895)

*2001: A Space Odyssey* (Stanley Kubrick, 1968)