

# The Dialogue Strategy Between Left-wing Filmmakers and Film Audience in the 1930s — Focusing on the Construction of Audience by Film Critics of "Morning Paper·Daily Film"

Yilan Wang<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The College of Literature and Journalism, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

\*Corresponding author. Email: 272005502@qq.com

## ABSTRACT

In the 1930s, films became a tool for left-wing film critics to compete for the discourse power of films. This competition was not only directly reflected in the criticism of the film content, but also in the views of the audience. By specifying what viewing qualities the audience should have, left-wing film critics intervened in the construction of the film audience group image. Through the stipulations of ideal audience groups, the territory of left-wing films was delimited. At that time, some film review articles believed that the audience was ignorant and good films were needed to inspire people's wisdom, and some believed that the audience was sober-minded and the film shouldn't abandon the audience. This article attempts to start with articles involving the audience in the supplement "Daily Film" of "Morning Paper" and analyzes that behind this seemingly contradictory attitude, how film critics compete for the discourse power of films through the construction of the ideal audience group image and then get involved in the competition for the political discourse power.

**Keywords:** Daily Film, audience construction, left-wing filmmakers, political discourse power

## I. INTRODUCTION

The 1930s was a golden period in Chinese film history. According to the first volume of Cheng Jihua's "History of Chinese Film Development", there were more than 450 Chinese films throughout the 1930s. Not only were there more films, but compared with the martial arts films and gods and spirits films produced in large quantities in the 1920s, the content was more diverse and the production was more exquisite, and there were many films that both had aesthetic pursuits and reflected the real life. However, the prosperity of the film industry didn't represent the maturity of film theory and film criticism. In the 1930s, the effective and fully integrated discourse was not formed. [1] This situation just provided space for the competition for the discourse power of the film. Film, as an art, also exists as an industry, which is significantly different from other art forms. This feature makes the film to maximize the audience. "Film Fans Weekly" wrote in an article published in 1934: "What is the 'last power' that allows us to maintain film and creation? It is not a big star, a big director, or a producer, but a pure fan and the vast

audience; they are not only the 'last power', but also the 'highest power'. [2] However, after glancing through and checking the "Morning Paper·Daily Film", it was found that in articles involving audience in similar period, different voices were heard within the group of film critics in the same camp. As for why film audience was targeted for competition, some people praised and some people belittled. This article will use the relevant articles of "Morning Paper·Daily Film" as the starting point to find an explanation that fits the historical context for this phenomenon.

## II. THE POWER TO DOMINATE THE DISCOURSE POWER OF FILM WAS NOT FORMED

From the birth of the first Chinese film in 1905 to the early 1920s, although a fixed audience group was formed, from the market reaction, generally, the audience was particularly interested in scenes such as funny fights and detective stories in films. Large and small film companies also produced more films of this type to cater to the preferences of the audience. In 1925, an article signed by Di Xian

in the "Spring and Autumn of Films" magazine published an article named "Ask Film Companies to Pay Attention to the Audience's Psychology", which talked about that "There are differences between the intellectual class and the lower class, between major commercial ports and mainlanders, and between Chinese and foreigners. People of intellectual class and people from major commercial ports like to watch love dramas. Chinese people like to watch foreign dramas. The lower class and mainlanders like to watch detective films." [3] Filmmakers in the 1920s noticed that viewers have different viewing preferences due to different classes, regions, and countries. Foreign films were especially popular. During this period, American films accounted for the largest number of imported films in China, and the most frequently showed of these films were comic films and detective films. [4] However, at that time, because the Chinese film industry was not yet mature and the filming was mostly imitating Hollywood, Chinese films couldn't compete with the United States in terms of quantity or quality. Chinese people wanted to revitalize Chinese films, but the Chinese film industry was weak. The content of the film company's own periodicals and newspapers was mostly to report foreign moviedom news. Taking the first issue of "Film Magazine", which was launched on April 1, 1921, as an example, there were 19 articles published in this issue, only one talked about Chinese films, and the remaining 18 were news reports of foreign moviedom and plot introductions of foreign films. [5] This also indirectly explains the reason why China's film criticism business in this period couldn't accomplish much. On the one hand, it was restricted by the level of theory and practice. On the other hand, the production of Chinese film was little, which was not enough to provide rich content for reviews. According to director Cheng Bugao's recollection, during this period, "Although there were film reviews, they were mainly narrative stories, with a few words at the beginning and the end, with more praises and less criticisms, to attract more people." [6] Before 1921, film criticism was still in its infancy. The scope of film criticism, from the very beginning to describe the spectacle feelings of film itself, the new medium of photoelectric magic, to the early critics' experiential and impressionistic criticism, didn't go beyond the understanding of the traditional "drama". Film reviews in this period were mainly focused on the stage of learning foreign film techniques and promoting Chinese films. Film critics had not yet understood the connotation of film criticism, and a team of professional film critics had not yet formed. The period from 1921 to 1932 was the second stage of the development of film criticism. The main direction of film criticism in this stage was ethical criticism. [7] Due to the limitation of the

understanding of the film itself and the lack of theoretical basis in line with the actual Chinese conditions, there was no dominant film critic discourse.

### **III. FILM CRITICS AS THE SPECIAL AUDIENCE AND THE GENERAL AUDIENCE**

On October 12, 1932, "Daily Film" published an article named "Film and Audience". The author Ding Sheng mentioned that Zhu Gonglv said after watching the film "New Resentments in the Palace Museum": "I remember the sentence, 'Anything welcomed by the general audience must be cursed by critics. Whatever critics welcome must be cursed by the general audience. If this sentence is the eternal truth, Chinese films can boldly create films like 'New Resentments in the Palace Museum'". It can be seen from this article that at the time, film audience was clearly divided into two secondary groups: film critics and general audience. The former is also the group of film critics to be discussed in this article — the special audience. They were special because, compared with other audience, they had a higher quality of viewing films, and they mastered a certain degree of film theory and practical knowledge. Moreover, in the special historical context of the 1930s, they mostly were intellectuals who sought progress, consciously accepted the baptism of new ideas, and took the revitalization of China as their own duty. Most of them expected to criticize and transform reality through movies. They used the pen in their hands to criticize the storyline of the film, the performance of the actors, and the idea content in newspapers and magazines in order to promote the progress of the Chinese film industry. Among this group of people, left-wing film critics were the most powerful. "Daily Film" was the most important position where left-wing film critics launched film criticism and theoretical struggles in the 1930s. Through film reviews, they transmitted their political opinions and linked film criticism with politics. An important condition for the realization of this connection was that this group had a natural connection with the dominant mass media at the time, such as newspapers and magazines. It had the convenience of expressing opinions in the public opinion space, and could make full use of newspapers and other media to amplify their voices.

A group corresponding to the special audience is the general audience to be discussed in this article, and they mainly refer to a group that needs to be enlightened urgently. The general audience lacked the ability and resources to use the mass media due to their low level of education, and their voices rarely appeared in the public's visual field. Newspapers occasionally published letters from film fans, and most of them were intellectuals. For

example, "Publishing a Film Fan's Letter" published in the "Daily Film" on August 30, 1933 by the Star Communication was a letter in reply from Mingxing Film Company to a letter from a film fan. It could be inferred from the letter that someone wrote to Zhang Shichuan to express his determination to become an actor. In the letter, Zhang Shichuan advised this person not to come to Shanghai because he was not sure whether this person could sustain his life. This letter in reply mentioned that the letter writer was Du Zhongshi, principal of the No. 1 Middle School in Guang'an County, Sichuan. It can be seen that the group of film critics had an advantage over the silent general audience in terms of the discourse power. The target group of film critics was mainly the working class, urban petty bourgeois, etc. They accounted for a relatively high proportion of film audience, and they were the targets that film critics hoped to strive for. Ye Wenxin introduced the concept of "urban petty bourgeois" when studying the modern history of Shanghai. The "urban petty bourgeois" mainly included: "Educated company employees and business apprentices, manufacturing practitioners, all kinds of full-time personnel, all kinds of service personnel, and teachers from primary and secondary schools and normal schools". [8] In China at that time, if divided by region, the education level of most people in rural and urban areas was low. Some of them took advantage of the historical opportunity of modernization in China, benefited from the new occupations spawned by the development of modern factories, enterprises and other commercial organizations and the prosperity of the urban entertainment industry, and gradually transformed into the working class and the employee class. And together with the original citizen groups, a group with huge demand for urban entertainment consumption was born. As an important part of the film audience, its preference for films determined whether the film industry could achieve sustainable development, and naturally it became the object of all parties in the film industry.

#### **IV. THE IDEAL AUDIENCE AND THE COMPETITION FOR POLITICAL DISCOURSE POWER**

Judging from the article in "Daily Film", some film critics believed that the general audience was ignorant and immersed in the dream world brought by the film. They watched love stories, detective stories, martial arts films and gods and spirits films, sensual and sexy films, etc. and they were satisfied. An article criticized that: "... is purely for entertainment, not watching films for the sake of studying or appreciating films. Therefore, when sensual and fragrant musical films were dumped on the market in large quantities, general audience all

scrambled for them. However, when martial arts films and gods and spirits films were popular, they still equally warmly welcomed". [9] Some film critics believed that Chinese film audience was sober-minded and possessed high quality of viewing films. For example, a translation published in the "Morning Paper-Daily Film" on May 21, 1933 mentioned that: "In fact, the general audience has more upbringing, broad-mindedness, agility of intelligence, and abundance of common sense than any audience who has not watched films, and their education increases every time they watch a film..." [10] Although this article was a translation, its publication represented the attitude of the translator towards the general audience. Even in an article, film critics showed resistance to the general audience. An article called "Who Killed Chinese Films" on May 30, 1934 listed four reasons why Chinese films were unsuccessful. The first reason was "the persistence of the fun center", "...They only needed to be fun to be the main backbone in the film, and this so-called "fun" was completely based on inferior audience psychology, and often lacked satire and humor, which was the most common hidden danger". [11] The author here obviously believed that one of the reasons why Chinese films couldn't be successful was that Chinese film audience had poor taste, and films had to cater to them and lowered the quality. But immediately, when discussing the third reason, the author thought that the film creators "abandoned the mass audience", "In the past, Chinese films were only a part of people's enjoyment tools, and the materials of the stories in the films were also surrounded by such consciousness. Therefore, it had no power to win over the broad masses and was imprisoned in a small prison". [12] Here the author again attributed the unsuccessfulness of Chinese films to the self-entertainment of some people who couldn't produce films that meet the needs of the mass audience, which seemed to conflict with the first point of view.

The commercial nature of films determined that the direction of the film market always followed the audience. If left-wing filmmakers wanted to use films as a propaganda tool, they must add progressive condiments on the basis of satisfying the tastes of the audience. Therefore, cultivating left-wing audience became the goal of left-wing filmmakers. One of the means of cultivating was to directly point out what kind of audience was needed in that era and what kind of content the audience should watch. The article "What Films Should Teach Us" published in the "Daily Film" on July 13, 1932 stated that "A film can have an interesting story without any theme at all, and it can also have a great theme accompanied by an inappropriate story. But under the condition that it is not easy to get the perfection of both, I think that instead of having an interesting story, it is better to

have a great theme. The so-called theme means to point to the educational meaning contained in the film, because the work with valuable educational meaning has the value of social existence". [13] Similar articles showed the notion that left-wing film critics used films as a powerful tool for education and encouragement, [14] explicitly publicizing their views on film functions and mapping their political views.

The "debate of softness and hardness" in 1933 became an important manifestation of left-wing filmmakers' fighting for political discourse. The two sides of the debate had heated discussions on issues such as the nature and mission of the film, the content and form of art, the standards of film reviews and the mission of film critics, and the development path of Chinese films. [15] Although it was about films, the direction of the debate was about who had the discourse power in politics. "Daily Film" was the position of the "hardness theory". Before being occupied by people believing in softness theory in December 1934, "Daily Film" had a relatively fixed team of film critics. Most people thought that the film was to reflect ideology and reality, and to combine with the anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism missions in reality to enlighten the people and educate the public. Indeed, as the "Daily Film" editorial department published on June 18, 1933: "For all films, what we must do in our future criticism is — (1) If it is poisonous, expose it; (2) If it is good and educational, promote it..." [16] However, film critics with a softness view, such as Liu Naou and Huang Jiamo of "Diandai Film", welded the artistic and commercial nature of the film together and advocated sensory realism. [17] When examined, at the beginning of this debate, both parties of softness and hardness had different starting points for discussing the function of the film. Obviously, the left wing was in line with its own political propositions, hoping to arouse the public's awareness of crisis through realistic criticism of film content and ideology and promote the idea of progress and national salvation. People believing in softness theory discussed more about the inner essence of film's artistic beauty.

In 1932, the publications of left-wing organizations were banned by the Kuomintang, and left-wing film critics turned to public publications to publish a large number of articles. This year, as a strategy for the market-oriented operation of newspapers and periodicals, major newspapers and periodicals successively created film specials to attract readers. The left-wing organization also saw the chance and established a group of "film critics" under the leadership of the Left-wing Playwrights Union. Therefore, the left-wing filmmakers participated in the criticism of the film with political motives from the beginning. The members

of the film critic group Xia Yan, Zheng Boqi, Wang Chenwu, Shi Linghe, Lu Si, Mao Yu, Shu Yan, Li Zihua, Chen Liting, Shen Xiling, etc. [18], through various relationships, opened up film supplement positions in major Shanghai newspapers, such as the "Film Times" of the "Times", "Daily Film" of the "Morning Paper", "Films and Dramas" of the "Min Bao", "Film New Land" of the "China Daily" and so on. [19] For example, the left-wing filmmaker Ling He served as the editor of "Shenbao·Film Special", and Lu Si was the editor-in-chief of "Minbao·Films and Dramas". Their articles quickly occupied the layout of the supplement, created a momentum of public opinion, and occupied a high point of public opinion.

As the "debate of softness and hardness" progressed later, and the "softness" party turned from the initial pursuit of art to the tearing and confrontation of political discourse. [20] Faced with the argument of people believing in softness theory that "Films are ice cream for the eyes and sofa chairs for the soul" [21], the left-wing filmmakers also gave a powerful response. Under the pseudonym Luo Fu, Xia Yan successively published a series of articles such as "The Hardness Theory of Softness", "'Let Me Tell You' — The So-called Soft Film's Standardized Form", "The Slinger in the Glass House — With 'the Softness Preacher'", "The Cataracted Business Eye — Who Killed China's Nascent Films", "Please Watch the 'Soft' Coquetry — Pursuing and Attacking the Principal Murder Injuring Chinese National Movies" and so on [22] to resolutely fight back and repeatedly reiterate the left-wing claims. Before people believing in softness theory entered and was stationed in the "Daily Film" with the support of the Kuomintang in December 1934, a large number of articles published by left-wing filmmakers dominated the discourse power of film reviews. The views of the audience could reflect the content of left-wing discourse during this period. The evaluation of the representative left-wing film "Spring Silkworm" published in the "Daily Film" on October 28, 1933 mentioned that: "...So the 'spring silkworm' achieves her greatness, but she must incur many people who don't understand. We extol the 'spring silkworm' because you and I have foreknowledge. Before we watch the 'spring silkworm', you and I have all the knowledge and understanding. After watching the 'spring silkworm' and then integrating with your 'understanding', you will feel that the 'spring silkworm' is worthy of praise. But there are more people besides you and me who still need the 'spring silkworm' to develop their 'understanding'..." [23] Undoubtedly, left-wing filmmakers hoped to use films to enable the mass audience to "understand" the reality and mission of the times.

In fact, on July 26, 1932, soon after the release of "Daily Film", the author signed Jie Ying published an article entitled "A Great Creation to Adapt to the Psychology of the Audience". The article stated, "What kind of era is it now... In short, it is an era in which the oppressed masses are revolutionizing and emancipating themselves... Art transforms life and is also transformed by the environment. Art that can't grasp the spirit of the times is useless for this era. I'm afraid that it will encourage the old forces and hinder the progress of the new era. As far as films are concerned, of course they have to adapt to the audience, and need to recognize the audience to adapt to in the era... Since the oppressed masses are the audience of films, the basic creed of the film should be to adapt to the hearts of the oppressed masses". [24] Soon after, on October 12, 1932, the article "Film and Audience" mentioned that "Are unrealistic films so popular with audience in China? We can't help but feel sad about the level of the audience for the commercial success of a film built on an empty imagination". [25] Two articles clearly showed that authors believed that qualified film audience must have a spirit of resistance, must emancipate themselves, and must keep up with the times. If they just used film entertainment to escape the reality problem, they were not viewers that the film needed. Therefore, behind the seemingly contradictory evaluation of the author of "Who Killed Chinese Films", it was to express his views on what kind of audience the film should cultivate. On August 20, 1933, Zheng Hong published "An Audience's Opinion — Contributing to Film Critics and Producers" in "Daily Film", and the article mentioned: "This criticism field is completely in the form of Monroe, and external opinions are rarely available to readers, because they are not public. Therefore, the authority of criticism in the Chinese film industry is completely in the hands of these groups". [26] "These groups" here referred to groups of film critics formed by the groups they served. While giving opinions to film critics, this article also proved side-on that film critics were actually using public opinion tools like newspapers to express the group's standpoint. Therefore, for the general audience, whether it was criticism or praise, the essence was to fight for the discourse power of the film and then to fight for the political discourse power.

## **V. THE COMPETITION FOR POLITICAL DISCOURSE POWER FROM FILM PRACTICE**

After the "September 18th Incident" and "The Incident of January", Chinese anti-imperialist patriotism rose among the masses, and this sentiment was naturally reflected in the demand for film creation. The left-wing filmmakers of this period realized that in order to realize the struggle

for political discourse power through the construction of ideal audience, they must move further towards film production. If left-wing filmmakers expressed their positions on established film content, their freedom to express political opinions would be greatly restricted. Therefore, they had to participate in film creation and pass their political opinions to the general audience. According to Xia Yan's "Lazy Searching for Old Dreams", around 1932, they formulated a plan to make progress in the film. One of them was "Through different channels, directors and actors with progressive ideas, who had already emerged in the field of drama at that time, should be sent into the film industry to train new people and expand their positions". [27] Xia Yan himself personally participated in the creation of the film "Wild Torrent", which was screened at the Central Grand Theater and Shanghai Grand Theater on March 5, 1933 at the same time. He polished the script of the film that was acclaimed at the time based on a predetermined story told by director Cheng Bugao. The "Daily Film" issue of March 6, 1933 commended this film, "'Wild Torrent' is a masterpiece of the star company's diachronous transformation. It is obvious that there are good harvests in the sense of the story and the skills of the performance..." [28] For three consecutive days, Su Feng, Shu Yan, An E, Xi Naifang, Tie Sou, Yi Qun, etc. published articles on "Daily Film" to highly praise "Wild Torrent".

While the success of "Wild Torrent" set a model for left-wing filmmakers to participate in film practice, it once again confirmed the left-wing filmmakers' view that the film, as an industry, couldn't be separated from its commercial attributes. With regard to revolutionary ideas, it was necessary to integrate into the film naturally without preaching empty words, so this required left-wing film critics to fully consider the characteristics of other audience. Zheng Hong said in "An Audience's Opinion — Contributing to Film Critics and Producers" that: "Chinese films can be said to be watched by a small number of people of the intellectual class, and more by those without education. This is naturally due to the social and economic situation on the one hand, but on the other hand, these uneducated or those receiving a little education don't have the power to appreciate foreign goods, so they tend to go on the road of Chinese films..." [29] In fact, in the 1920s and 1930s, the groups who could afford films were mainly those people from the citizen class. The famous director Cai Chusheng's statement in 1934 could confirm this, "Unfortunately, few workers and peasants have the opportunity to watch films nowadays, and the largest number of viewers are urban citizens". [30] Zheng Hong said that the reason why Chinese films were watched less by people from the intellectual class was that the

intellectual class held cultural hegemony and enjoyed the monopoly of culture. Compared with the Chinese films of uneven quality in their eyes at that time, well-made and skilled Hollywood blockbusters were their first choice. Then Zheng Hong said that people who were uneducated or people who received a little education tend to Chinese films because they didn't understand foreign products. Is this contradictory to Cai Chusheng's claim that workers and peasants rarely have the opportunity to watch films? The two are not contradictory. The two people's statement exactly showed that Chinese films had a large market among the middle and lower classes, that was, the main groups referred to by left-wing filmmakers were the main consumers of Chinese films, and whether the content of left-wing films could reach them directly became the key to whether left-wing filmmakers could win the discourse power in politics.

It was true that peasants were restricted by their economic conditions and geographic location and couldn't consume films, a fashionable entertainment product. Workers' wages were not high at that time, and they were unable to treat films as a normalized entertainment consumption expenditure. Judging from the ticket prices of some first-run cinemas, taking the Grand Theatre, which mainly screened films from the eight major American companies, as an example, the film "Blood Ambition", which officially showed on June 16, 1933, was advertised in "Daily Film". This was also the first film advertisement of Grand Theatre since the release of "Daily Film". The ticket price for the matinee downstairs was 0.6 yuan, and 1 yuan or 1 and a half yuan for upstairs. The ticket price for the front row of night films downstairs was 0.6 yuan, the back row was 1 yuan, and 1 yuan and a half or 2 yuan for upstairs. According to the "Wage Rate in Shanghai" published by the Commercial Press in 1935, the number of workers in 16 industrial sectors in Shanghai increased from more than 410,000 in 1930 to more than 600,000 in 1934. [31] During this period, the actual daily income of these workers decreased from 0.669 yuan in 1930 to 0.600 yuan. "...The culture and entertainment levels and directions of different income groups are not the same, but even the workers' families with the lowest annual income of 200-300 yuan have an annual culture and entertainment expenditure of 0.63 yuan..." [32] It could be seen that the theater with the lowest ticket price of 6 dimes was not affordable for the working class. At that time, most of the first-run cinemas, such as Cathay Theater, Xinguang Grand Theater, Shanghai Grand Theater, Calden Grand Theater, etc., mostly sold tickets at a minimum price of 0.6 yuan, so the ticket price of cinemas originally distinguished the film audience' level.

But high film tickets didn't mean that the lower-class citizens represented by the working class had fewer opportunities to watch films. At that time, there were many cheap cinemas in Shanghai with ticket prices around 0.2 or 0.3 yuan. In many cases, a newly released film was shown in these cinemas after the first and second runs. Judging from advertisements in "Daily Film", taking the left-wing films "Three Modern Women" and "Wild Torrent" recognized by mainstream film history as examples, on January 1, 1933, the Shanghai Grand Theater officially showed "Three Modern Women", although the advertisement didn't indicate the ticket price, referring to the starting price of 0.6 yuan when the Soviet film "The Way Out" was released in February 1933, people at the bottom of the society couldn't afford it. On January 31, 1933, the film was released again in the Donghai Grand Theater. The ticket price was 0.2 yuan downstairs and 0.4 yuan upstairs, less than 30 days since the film's premiere. Similarly, "Wild Torrent" was released at the Central Grand Theater and Shanghai Grand Theater on March 5, 1933 at the same time with same ticket prices of 0.4 yuan, 0.5 yuan and 0.8 yuan. The film was released on March 21, 1933 in the Star Grand Theater with ticket prices of 0.2 yuan, 0.3 yuan and 0.4 yuan, only 16 days from the premiere. Therefore, although the working class couldn't afford the first-run cinemas, these films had low ticket prices in cheap cinemas, and the interval between the release time and the premiere time was not long, so these movies could reach the general audience in a relatively short time. It could be seen that the strategy of left-wing filmmakers to cultivate left-wing audience by participating in film production was feasible. Films, accompanied by the recent fever of film reviews, allowed the mass general audience to basically keep up with the rhythm of one review for one film in the newspapers. This undoubtedly allowed the left-wing ideology to reach a large number of general audience. And by glancing through and checking the film advertisements in the newspapers and periodicals, it could be known that for the left-wing films that were screened, cinemas also deliberately re-released them by holding a film week to attract the middle and lower class groups. According to advertisements in "Daily Film" on August 30, 1933, the Pearl Grand Theater opened Lianhua Film Week on that day. The films released included "Three Modern Women" and "Morning in the City" and other representative left-wing films with ticket prices of 0.2 or 0.3 yuan. Through a roundabout way, left-wing filmmakers achieved the goal of participating in film practice to win over the audience and writing film reviews to guide the audience. By cultivating left-wing audience, left-wing filmmakers thus realized the seam between the film content and the audience's experience, and then the competition for political discourse power.

## VI. CONCLUSION

It was not difficult to see the complicated historical context of the development of Chinese films from the "Morning Paper·Daily Film", which was released for less than four years. For left-wing filmmakers who wanted to use films to publicize political ideas, they must clearly understand that the film was not only an art form, but also a mirror of social reality, and it was also an industry costing money. In the public opinion field of newspapers and periodicals, all players in the game must be familiar with the popularity and commercial nature of the film industry. If left-wing filmmakers want to define the territory of left-wing films by constructing the ideal movie audience, they must seam the audience's viewing experience and reality experience. Then, on this basis, the bargaining chip for political discourse power can be increased. As Bourdieu said: Many actions and performances of artists and writers can only be explained by referring to the field of power [33], the contradictory attitudes of left-wing filmmakers towards film audience can only show their original appearance and intentions when they are placed in the field of power for fighting for political discourse power in the 1930s.

## References

- [1] Li Yueyang. Between the Nanjing National Government and Left-wing Films — Taking Sun Yu's Film as an Example [J]. *Film Art*, 2010(03):117-124. (in Chinese)
- [2] Zhao Yingcai. "Resonance" [N]. *Film Fans Weekly*. Vol. 1, Issue 7. 1934.11.7. (in Chinese)
- [3] Di Xian. Ask Film Companies to Pay Attention to the Audience's Psychology in "Spring and Autumn of Films", 1925, Issue 12. (in Chinese)
- [4] Hu Wenqian. *Early Chinese Films and Hollywood* [D]. Nanjing University, 2013. (in Chinese)
- [5] Shanghai Library. *Full Bibliography of Chinese Modern Film Journals* [M]. Shanghai Science and Technology Literature Publishing House, 2009:02. (in Chinese)
- [6] Cheng Bugao. *Reminiscences of the Film Circle*, China Film Press, 1983 edition: 89. (in Chinese)
- [7] The Staging of Early Chinese Film Criticism Here Adopts the Division in Li Daoxin's "Chinese Film Criticism of 1897-2000". He believes that the overall feature of film criticism from 1921 to 1932 is ethical criticism.
- [8] Wen-hsin Yeh, "Progressive Journalism and Shanghai's Pretty Urbanities: Zhou Taofen and the Shenguo Enterprise", in Frederic Wakeman and Wen-hsin Yeh(eds.), *ShanghaiSojourners*, Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studied Monogtaph Series, 1992, pp.186-238.
- [9] Simon. Fragmentary Feelings of the Film Circle Towards "The Cultural Level of the Audience" and "Star Writer" [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1935.10.29. (in Chinese)
- [10] S.ECKMAN.JR's original work, translated by Hua Ling. Why Insult the Audience [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1933.21. (in Chinese)
- [11] Qi. Who Killed Chinese Films [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1935.30. (in Chinese)
- [12] Qi. Who Killed Chinese Films [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1935.30. (in Chinese)
- [13] What Films Should Teach Us in "Daily Film", 1932.7.13. (in Chinese)
- [14] Qin Yi. Re-understanding of the "Debate of Softness and Hardness" of Films [J]. *Journal of Nanjing University of the Arts (Music and Performance Edition)*, 2013(03):165-170. (in Chinese)
- [15] Fan Xue. The Anxiety of Left-wing Film Criticism — From the "Softness" and "Hardness" Debate in the 1930s [J]. *Modern Chinese Culture and Literature*, 2019(02):1-15. (in Chinese)
- [16] The Future Criticism of Our Statement Is "Constructive" [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1933-06-18. (in Chinese)
- [17] Zhao Jian. Argument Polarization, Position Drift, Knowledge Selection: Mentality Outline and Historical Review of the "Debate of Softness and Hardness" of Films in the 1930s [J]. *Contemporary Cinema*, 2018(10):104-109. (in Chinese)
- [18] Song Danling. The Relationship Between the Communist Party of China and "Left-wing Films" in the 1930s [J]. *CPC History Research and Teaching*, 2014(03):69-77. (in Chinese)
- [19] Cheng Jihua. The Communist Party of China Led the Chinese Left-wing Film Movement [J]. *Film Art*, 2002(05):7-11+6. (in Chinese)
- [20] Chen Xihe, Lu Jiajia. The Struggle for the Discourse Power in Films — A Study of Xia Yan's Film Theory and Criticism Activities in the 1930s [J]. *Contemporary Cinema*, 2019(04):79-84. (in Chinese)
- [21] Liu Naou. The Depth Problem of Chinese Film Description [J]. *Modern Film*, 1934, Vol. 1, Issue 6. (in Chinese)
- [22] Chen Xihe, Lu Jiajia. The Struggle for the Discourse Power in Films — A Study of Xia Yan's Film Theory and Criticism Activities in the 1930s [J]. *Contemporary Cinema*, 2019(04):79-84. (in Chinese)
- [23] Xia Tianwu. New Film Impressions — Audience of "Spring Silkworm" [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1933-10-26. (in Chinese)
- [24] Jie Ying. A Great Creation to Adapt to the Psychology of the Audience [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1932-07-26. (in Chinese)
- [25] Ding Sheng. Film and Audience [N]. *Morning Paper·Daily Film*, 1932.10.12. (in Chinese)
- [26] Zheng Hong. An Audience's Opinion — Contributing to Film Critics and Producers [N]. "Daily Film",1933.8.20. (in Chinese)
- [27] Xia Yan. *Lazy Searching for Old Dreams* (revised and enlarged edition) [M]. Beijing, Zhonghua Book Company, 2016: 150. (in Chinese)
- [28] Criticism of Wild Torrent in "Daily Film", 1933.3.5. (in Chinese)
- [29] Zheng Hong. An Audience's Opinion — Contributing to Film Critics and Producers [N]. "Daily Film",1933.8.20. (in Chinese)
- [30] Cai Chusheng. After 84 Days — To the Audience of Song of the Fishermen [N]. "Film Fans Weekly", 1934.1(1). (in Chinese)
- [31] "Wage Rate in Shanghai" edited by the Social Bureau of Shanghai Municipal Government. The Commercial Press, p.5. (in Chinese)
- [32] Xin Ping. *Discovering History from Shanghai: Shanghai People and Their Social Life in the Process of Modernization During 1927-1937* [M]. Shanghai People's Publishing House, 1996 edition, p.336. (in Chinese)
- [33] Pierre Bourdieu. *The Law of Art: The Formation and Structure of the Literary Field* [M]. Translated by Liu Hui, Central Compilation & Translation Press, 2001 edition, p.263. (in Chinese)