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Abstract
Despite having occupied an important position in the United States Office of War Information (OWI) and having actively participated in a decisive period of Communication Research, Dorothy Blumenstock Jones is a name almost forgotten in the history of the field of communication. All we know about her biography is like some puzzle pieces, although she made significant contributions to the study of movies in the 20th century. This paper seeks to portray not only biographical data about Jones but especially to map her work and its proposals related to the development of film analysis and content analysis - and to place her on the list of pioneers of communication studies.
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Resumen
A pesar de haber ocupado un puesto importante en la Oficina de Información de Guerra de Estados Unidos (OWI) y haber participado activamente en un período decisivo de Investigación en Comunicación, Dorothy Blumenstock Jones es un nombre casi olvidado en la historia del campo de la comunicación. Todo lo que sabemos de su biografía es como algunas piezas de un rompecabezas, aunque tuvo importantes contribuciones al estudio del cine en el siglo XX. Este artículo busca retratar no solo datos biográficos sobre Jones, sino especialmente mapear su trabajo y sus propuestas relacionadas con el desarrollo del análisis cinematográfico y el análisis de contenido, y llevarla a la lista de pioneros de los estudios de comunicación.
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1. Introduction

The history of the field of communication in the United States is traditionally linked to the myth of the four founding fathers (Carl Hovland, Kurt Lewin, Harold Lasswell, and Paul Lazarsfeld). This founding history is specially reinforced by Wilbur Schramm, in his classic book *The Beginnings of Communication Study In America: A Personal Memoir* (1997). The posthumous publication describes the field as a space of confluence of the mentioned researchers and their theories. Schramm affirms: “...they entered into the field before there was a field called communication research or communication study and they created one” (1997: 4). This is not the only narrative that tries to give a panoramic view of the efforts made by the first social scientists who evolved research in Communication - but it reverberates substantially through our imagination (see, for example, Cha, 2020), although it is not long justified (Pooley, 2008).

After the construction of this solid pantheon, little attention has been paid to its surroundings. In Columbia, for example, where Lazarsfeld settled his project, women who have worked with him were symbolically erased (Rowland and Simonson, 2013). Another example is when we talk about propaganda studies. It is easy to remember Harold Lasswell and his contributions to the development of content analysis and the characterization of the so-called Lasswell’s model, but we know little about his assistants in the field of communication. For sure, Lasswell, Lewin, Lazarsfeld, and Hovland played a crucial role in the field. But their magnitude (as well as, of course, the well-known gender issues of the 20th Century) usually leads to underrated other researchers that were also working to build scientific knowledge about communication by the same time with them. When we turn our sights to women, though, this invisibility is even more frequent - as shown by Rowland and Simonson (2013: 6).

This essay aims to rescue the work of one of these women, almost forgotten by communication studies: Dorothy Blumenstock Jones (1911-1980), who were Lasswell’s student at the University of Chicago, and became, during World War II, the chief of the Motion Picture Analysis Division of the Office of War Information (OWI).

Despite her inconspicuousness, Jones made relevant advances in the scientific analysis of films while she was at OWI and later. Some titles of her works help us to understand not only their subjects, but they also show the role of Jones in establishing a methodological approach to analyze movies. It is the case of “The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944” (1944) and “Quantitative analysis of motion picture content” (1950), for example.

I purpose here to reevaluate the contribution of Dorothy Blumenstock Jones to communication studies through literature review, with the support of the historical method (as documental analysis and interview). The pinpoint of the literature review focused on her published works to understand what theories, methodologies, and ideas she developed in her career as an independent researcher (Jones never had a permanent position at universities or institutions, and she never completed a master’s or doctorate).

In the documental analysis, I considered as documents Jones’ published works, and letters, and photos provided by her sons (Kim Jones, born 1945; David Jones, born 1946; and Kelvin Jones, born 1949). I examined letters, photos, and published works to find relevant information on biographical data. This research phase about Dorothy Blumenstock Jones focused on searching for clues on who she was and her affiliations.

At last, I interviewed her sons to figure out who their mother was and which difficulties she found in being a working mother. The interview was made by e-mail, with questions about her work and how she lived her life with them.

These materials were used to construct a scientific biography, according to Lederberg, when he says that “No contemporary scientist has worked in a vacuum; the presentation and solution of problems are part of a history of ideas” (1990: 36). Biography, under this perspective, is one of the ways of making history of science, based on the constancy of a first and a last name (Bourdieu, 1986). Thus, biography is an element for the understanding of the history of a field, resuming “the place of human beings, with all their wonderful quirks and crankiness, in the development of the great human enterprise that is science” (Richards, 2006: 305). The intention is to devise Jones as part of the history of the field of communication, not only as a coauthor or a pupil of Harold Lasswell.

As the academic field reproduces gender stereotypes of society, science had been for a long time a place reserved for men, because men would have reason as the center of their existence, while women would be related to nature and emotions (what is proved to be wrong). So, women were often absent from the history of science, despite their contributions to a research or a discipline. They were seen as mere assistants or housekeepers (Des Jardins: 2010). Jones had to face structural, epistemological, and representational challenges (Souza: 2011) in being a researcher (and thus also being a mother and a wife). Of course, this panorama changed a little (especially in rich countries) in the 20th Century, probably because of women like Dorothy Blumenstock Jones. But the earlier context, which kept
women tied to care and domestic professions, should not be ignored. So, this essay inserts Jones in the history of communication studies taking into account the fact that she was a researcher under the rules of patriarchy and the limitations imposed on the female gender in American society.

This endeavor does not go without obstacles. Jones is almost an anonymous person, unlike other female figures in the field, as Herta Herzog, that lived a long and now well-documented life[1]. One of the representative episodes of the searching for Jones biographical data, during the exploratory and documentary phase of this research, was when I found a comment made by one of Jones’ sons on a page of Amazon, the giant e-commerce platform. Commenting anonymously[2] a new edition of World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study (Lasswell and Blumenstock[3], 1939), he wrote: “As will be readily apparent by a search of title and author of this book, Dorothy Blumenstock (who happens to be my mother) should be listed as a co-author of this book as she was in its original publication”.

This essay is not a definitive report. It presents the first results of a mapping of the work of Dorothy Blumenstock Jones that was conducted within the scope of the activities of the research group Ponto, focused on affects, gender, and narratives[4]. There are few available materials about Jones, and to write about her is like a puzzle to be worked out. This study is a starting point.

2. Propaganda studies
To understand Jones’ trajectory in communication studies, we need to go back to the beginnings of propaganda studies at the University of Chicago and to the work of her mentor, Harold Lasswell.

Lasswell was a professor of Political Science at the cited university when Jones began her undergraduate course at the same department. A “son” of the University of Chicago, Lasswell previously studied Economics (1918-1922). Later, he started his Ph.D. at the Department of Political Science (1922-1926). The change would be proven the right decision for him. In Political Science, Lasswell gave the USA the first thesis on propaganda and began a successful career as the most prominent specialist in this subject.

In the early 1900s, propaganda was getting more attention not only in the political scene but also in the academy. The first decades of the 20th Century witnessed the increase in the production and consumption of mass media messages, making mass communication part of the constitution of society. So, propaganda became a prominent and necessary subject of study in the social sciences - and turned into an outstanding topic in Political Science, especially after World War I.

In the department of Political Science, Lasswell found in Charles Edward Merriam, “the founder and the leader of the ‘Chicago School’ of political science” (Almond, 1991: 338), the inescapable connection between politics and propaganda. Merriam would become Laswell’s doctoral supervisor.

A few years earlier, Merriam published “American Publicity in Italy” (1919), in which he wrote some of the assumptions that would support Lasswell’s thesis. The publication can be considered semi-scientific literature, but it paved the way for the more scientific study conducted by Lasswell. Merriam was convinced that politics should be a scientific field by using similar methods to the natural sciences (a recurrent prerogative in Chicago School). Thus, Lasswell assumed propaganda as an object of study under Merriam’s supervision and according to his principles.

So, in June 1926, Lasswell presented Propaganda Technique in the War World, pursuing Merriam’s ideas in Political Science. The work Propaganda Technique in the World War materialized the most scientific character that Merriam expected from Political Science - and that he himself, due to his career in government, failed to achieve.

Lasswell’s thesis became a milestone on at least two other fronts: it is the first scientific work on propaganda in the United States - and it is considered the pioneering work in the use of content analysis in the study of mass communication (Wolf, 2002). The thesis has an extensive corpus by current standards, encompassing American, English, French, and German war propaganda during the First World War. The use of a large corpus of analysis will be a pattern which Dorothy Blumenstock Jones will adopt in her research years later.

Propaganda Technique in the War World was published in the next year (1927). If on the one hand, it caused some controversy, on the other hand, it consolidated Lasswell’s name as the leading specialist in propaganda. So, when Dorothy Blumenstock (not yet Jones) entered the University of Chicago, in the 1930s, Harold Lasswell was already “a LEGEND on CAMPUS”[5] (Kutner, 1979).

Born in Saint Louis, Missouri, on March 29, 1911, Dorothy Blumenstock Jones studied Political Science at Chicago University from 1930 to 1934. Jones didn’t have the approval of her parents to go to university and get a higher education “because of her gender”[6], so she had to work as a typist. In some moments,
she didn’t have enough money even to eat,[7], but she persisted. Despite the difficulties, she became
close to Lasswell [Almond, 1989: 323], like a few other students, such as Bruce Lannes Smith, Gabriel
Almond, Philleo Nash, Edith Rosenfels, and William T. R. Fox. These students were called by Leo Rosten
as “his apostles” [Rosten, 1969: 6], and Lasswell included them in research activities conducted by him.
That was how Jones first approached propaganda studies. As we can see from the list provided by
Almond, the group of apostles was composed mainly of men. But the roll also shows that Jones was not
the only woman studying at the University of Chicago and participating actively in the institution’s life.
Many other women were trying to get academic degrees with excellence, with the same competence
as the men of that time. The presence and relevance of the work of women at the University of Chicago
is an aspect that other authors began to explore more, redefining women’s contributions even to the
Chicago School, as “The other Chicago school: a sociological tradition expropriated and erased”

While Jones was at the University of Chicago, she mainly studied Communist propaganda. After earning
her bachelor’s degree, she started to work with Lasswell as a research assistant, from 1934 to 1935. This first
approach turned into a book a few years later, when Jones was working at Western Personnel Service
of Pasadena[8], in California (to where she moved after marrying Jack Evan Jones, in 1938). The book
was the already cited World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study, published in 1939. Before this
publication, Jones and Lasswell published “The Volume of Communist Propaganda in Chicago” (1939),
and “The Technique of slogans in communist Propaganda” (1938) [9].

These works were a result of a large field study in Chicago, considered by Lasswell and Jones
“one of the chief radiating centers for Communist propaganda in the United States” [Lasswell and
Blumenstock, 1939: 63]. World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study was described as “of high
methodological interest because it represents the first attempt to take measurements, of the volume
and effects of every medium of propaganda in the Communist revolutionary movement of a large city”
(Smith, Lasswell and Casey, 1946: 131). In fact, the monumental analysis made by Lasswell and Jones
represented the massive application of the methods that had been developed by the political scientist
since his doctorate, and that sought to make the social sciences more accurate. Jones will always use
this method in her other research.

Using the configurative method (defined in Lasswell’s book World Politics and Personal Insecurity,
published in 1935), Lasswell and Jones analyzed a large number of materials related to the activities of
the Communist Party in Chicago, after the Great Depression. In addition to this method, Lasswell and
Jones recursed to content analysis. Much of the field research for this work was done by Jones, not by
Lasswell. As an assistant researcher, she was responsible for visiting archives, particularly at the Chicago
Police Department, and attending the Communist Party meetings. In a letter written by the Lieutenant
Mike Mills, who worked at the Chicago Police Department while Jones was doing research for World
Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study, he attests that she spent a year-and-a-half “...analyzing
and going over material in our files” [10] (Mills, 1955).

Mixing quantitative and qualitative analysis, Lasswell and Jones concluded that in times of deprivation
and great suffering, the exposure to Communist propaganda was increased, and people (between
1929 and 1934) were more likely to show a disposition to this kind of propaganda in hard times. Even
under these circumstances, they concluded that Communist propaganda was neutralized by American
nationalism and its values of individualism. So, the Communist propaganda worked as a catharsis for
people’s insecurities but did not change American practices.

In this case, Jones seems to fit perfectly into the idea of a woman who is an assistant but never the
principal scientist [Souza: 2011], working on the project of her professor. In some ways, this perception
is correct. Jones was a young woman struggling to start a career. But she was destined to be more
than a stereotype. She got a degree in Political Science, a discipline that even at the end of the 20th
Century was recognized as a masculine profession [Burton, 1979: 2], in which women were included
only incidentally or marginally [Sarkees and McGlen, 1993]. It is pertinent to point out that Jones,
unlike other research assistants, was credited with co-authoring World Revolutionary Propaganda: A
Chicago Study. Although the reasons for the co-authorship credits cannot be precisely specified, it
can be conceived that Lasswell recognized Jones’ contribution as a much greater effort than that of
an assistant.

In Peter H. Odegard’s review of the book for The American Political Science Review, he wrote:

It is to be hoped that, having developed a technique of analysis and measurement, Professor
Lasswell and Miss Blumenstock will continue their study on a broader front. Perhaps they may
even be persuaded to apply the same methods to a study of revolutionary propaganda
emanating from Rome and Berlin (1939: 685).
Not only did Lasswell frustrate Odegard’s expectations, but also Jones didn’t correspond to his wishes. World War II was beginning, and Lasswell and Jones were recruited by the USA government as the specialists on propaganda that they both were.

3. Propaganda, Communication, War and The Office of War Information

According to Lefler,

...the battles of World War II cannot be restricted to combat; much of the battles fought during the war took place across radio airwaves and on the silver screen. These battles did not directly bring about casualties, although some messages would eventually justify the genocide of millions, but instead changed and motivated peoples’ hearts and minds to believe in the importance of the war effort (2001: 1).

In this context, European countries and the United States understood that taking control of propaganda was necessary.

The necessity of using propaganda as a weapon, though, was not new. As previously seen, propaganda (and mass communication) had grown in interest among most of society - and, with this growing interest, the perception of its power started to be part of everyday discussions of common people. To some extent, research produced by academicians, books published by professionals, common sense columns published in newspapers, and the strong marks that propaganda left during World War I, created an amalgam of emergent and non-scientific thoughts that glimpsed mass communication as a danger that needed to be controlled. Later, this amalgam would be called “the hypodermic needle theory” (Wolf, 2002: 23) and despite not being a real theory, influenced the perception of the authorities and citizens, especially when related to propaganda (see Deborah Lubken “Remembering the Straw Man: the Travels and Adventures of Hypodermic”, 2008).

This perception further led to the organization of divisions during wartime sponsored by foundations and the USA government to shape strategies for official and non-official communication, to ensure control and improvement (effectiveness) of these activities.

Thereby, in 1939, Lasswell and other social scientists were brought together by the Rockefeller Foundation to consider “the current state in the field of mass communication and public opinion studies” ([11], the Rockefeller Foundation Communication Seminar. In addition to this discussion, the possibility of developing a project for war communication was suggested. The broader objective was “refine new approaches to knowledge in the promising area of communication, which the further objective was bringing this information to the attention of relevant government administrators” (Park and Pooley, 2008: 164,165).

In 1940, Lasswell became the head of the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications at the Library of Congress in Washington. The division was entirely supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and ensured the deepening of Lasswell’s studies on propaganda.

The research conducted by the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications represented the most complex collective effort to consolidate a theoretical-methodological background for the understanding of mass communication in the United States and generated a basis for further research, including elaborating a theory of communication. According to Park and Pooley (2008), Lasswell’s role was crucial for the increased use of the term communication in the Division’s studies. The terminology change at the institutes did not happen suddenly, although the studies still focus on propaganda.

Lasswell’s option for the term communication (instead of propaganda) is directly related to the confluence of conditions of war, as a result of which grantors, administrators, and academics sought to distance their work (the study of “communication”) from the one conducted by the enemy (whose production was “propaganda”).

Under Lasswell, the division worked on developing a quantitative content analysis of communication products. The group headed by the political scientist applied the method of content analysis for immediate analysis of organizations, and trained personnel for the analysis of propaganda and intelligence, to supervise similar research in other country regions, because Lasswell should remain in Washington. The division, this way, provided personnel for the Office of Facts and Figures; the Office of Censorship; the Office of Strategic Services; the Army Psychological Operations; the Department of State, etc.

Dorothy Blumenstock Jones was one of these researchers that contributed in a distant front, geographically, from Washington (but close to their needs): she was sent to The Office of War...
Information (OWI). She was nominated the chief of the Motion Picture Analysis Division of the Office of War Information Bureau of Motion Pictures in Hollywood, from 1942 to 1945.

Jones was appointed for the Motion Picture Analysis Division of the Office of War Information Bureau of Motion Pictures in Hollywood probably because of her previous work with Lasswell, but specially due to her participation in Leo Rosten’s research Hollywood: Movie Colony, the Movie Makers (1941), a result of his Motion Picture Research Project. The research was funded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, and Jones earned a grant from the latter. She contributed to this study as executive assistant of Rosten, while she was at the Western Personnel Service of Pasadena. Before the assistance to Rosten, Jones produced under this institution a pamphlet for students in Western campuses named Librarianship: an occupational brief, in 1939. The research on which the pamphlet was based was made under her direction, with Topsy Porter as her assistant.

Hollywood: Movie Colony, the Movie Makers is based on an extensive survey within the Hollywood community and Jones was assigned to analyze the data coming from 4,200 "detailed questionnaires" (Rosten, 1941: XVI), and put the data into reports. She also administered the office affairs of the project for three months in 1940 (Rosten, 1941: VIII). She is credited by Rosten as one of the first readers of the manuscript of Hollywood: Movie Colony, the Movie Makers, among Lasswell, James Allen, Margareth Mead, Saul Padover, Gregory Bateson and Walter Wanger. It is interesting observing that the list of reviewers of Rosten’s book is mostly composed by great names of American universities and a reputed American movie producer (Walter Wang). The only other woman in the list is Margaret Mead, who in the 1940s was already seen as an American icon and came from a tough academic family of Pennsylvania (Lutkehaus, 2010). I mention the American anthropologist here not to diminish her, pointing to some class privilege, but especially to indicate the fact that Jones, who often had only worked by research grants, also belonged to that group.

Hollywood: Movie Colony, the Movie Makers led Jones to define films as her main research object through her career. In 1941, she started her own research, aimed at providing instruments capable of scientifically measuring the content of films. Again, she earned a grant from Rockefeller Foundation. The result of this research was published in January, 1942, in Public Opinion Quarterly, under the title "Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content".

After participating in all those projects, Jones was not an anonymous researcher anymore. She proved to have skills to conduct field research, processing data, review documents, administering offices, etc. When Rosten became a deputy director at OWI, Jones was the name to follow him and to direct the Motion Picture Analysis Division of the Office of War Information Bureau of Motion Pictures in Hollywood.

The Office of War Information was created on June 13, 1942, as a fusion of preexistent offices, services, and divisions: Office of Government Reports, OEM's Division of Information and Office of Facts and Figures, and the Foreign Information Service of the Office of the Coordinator of Information. Its purpose was to "Formulated and executed information programs to promote, in the United States and abroad, understanding of the status and progress of the war effort and of war policies, activities, and aims of the U.S. government" [12]. In fact, OWI worked as a "dominant agency in the propaganda campaign", communicating "American aims in the war and to convey to domestic and foreign audiences the ideals that could bring about a peaceful and democratic post-war feeling" (Lefler, 2001: 2).

So, the main concern of the OWI Bureau of Motion Pictures in Hollywood was to control film content, and how American ideology spread worldwide during wartime. The ideological role of the OWI was emphasized by Koppes and Black (1977: 88): "It was an organization designed not only to disseminate information and to clarify issues but also to arouse support for particular symbols and ideas."

Movies were seen, in the scope of OWI, as the easier way to persuade (with propaganda) the American audience, which bought 8 million admission tickets to movie theaters per week. So, part of the Bureau of Motion Pictures worked in producing a large number of materials to “advise” the Hollywood industry on how to make movies. “The OWI issued numerous guidelines to ensure conformity in the films. The motion picture industry followed the OWI’s regulations, producing films in a standard format. The results were an effective combination of information, patriotism, hero worship, and propaganda” (Lefler, 2001: 3).

Jones and the Bureau of Motion Pictures were connected to the Hollywood Office at OWI, under Nelson Poynter, the famous American publisher. Jones' staff was seen as “staunchly liberal” (Koppes and Black 1977: 89), but there is no way of specifying whether this was a guideline employed by it or simply a coincidence among its members. Jones also worked at the Overseas Branch of the OWI, officially known as the Los Angeles Overseas Bureau, Motion Picture Division (Rosten, 1984). In the Overseas Branch, Jones started to be more sensitized about the portrayal of people from other countries in American films, especially to the plight of the Japanese-Americans (which generated a later work from her on
this subject). The interference of Jones’ staff on prejudicial representations of people who were not white can be seen in the Manual for the Motion-Picture Industry, written by the Hollywood Office. A good example is the excerpt of the manual that recommends: “Don’t refer to the Japanese as ‘little brown men’ or “yellow rats”. This is not a racial war. Many millions of our allies belong to the brown and yellow races and such references are offensive to them” (as cited in Roston, 1984: 42). Of course, the last sentence of the excerpt signifies the necessity of remembering movies as propaganda tools, and the role of the OWI in spreading American symbols and ideas.

Despite the controversial relation between propaganda and democracy (Koppes and Black, 1977), the presence of social scientists of great magnitude on its board made Hollywood advance at least in one good aspect, and it deserves to be cited. “OWI encouraged Hollywood to treat more social issues and to move beyond national and racial stereotypes” (Koppes and Black, 1977: 104).

According to her sons[13], Jones was profoundly against prejudice of any kind, and she suffered at least two major discriminations: one because of her Jewish ancestry and other for speculations about her being asked if she had “black blood”. Her sons says that “when people made antisemitic remarks she let them know she was Jewish”[14].

Thus, it can be assumed that Dorothy Blumenstock Jones was involved (at least indirectly) in the changes that OWI made in Hollywood. She was recognized as “OWI’s most perceptive social critique” (Koppes and Black, 1990: 88), and was concerned in interpreting American films in a complete sense, transporting (and perfecting) the maddening methods that she learned with Lasswell to the Motion Picture Analysis Division - and so on, to film analysis.

4. Dorothy Blumenstock Jones and film analysis

When Jones finished her work at the OWI in 1945, she had already given birth to her first son Kim Jones, born on January 1st of the same year. This fact means that she worked through almost the entire year of 1944 pregnant, in a full-time work shift. Her husband was overseas, in the Merchant Marine. On December 28, 1946, she would give birth to her second son, David Jones. On October 1st, 1949, she and her husband had the last baby, Kelvin Jones. Jones didn’t stop working and was always submitting research proposals even with three kids to educate. Her husband testifies that she always tried to work: “Dorothy worked, as possible, since we first married - at film research, and at a variety of projects basically in film and juvenile delinquency research”[15]. All the work she did was not a problem in the family. On the contrary, it was a source of pride and gave the children access to what they call “movie nights”, as Jones bought a 16mm projector with the money from one of the research grants she received[16].

Due to this particular acceptance and support from her family, and by the fact her husband was steadily employed (appliance salesman, then draftsman, then planner and estimator for production of airplane parts), we can assume that Jones had some advantages over other women, who longed to be researchers or academicians. Nevertheless, her productivity is still impressive and still suffers from the numerous challenges of maintaining a family and a career in the first half of the 20th Century. Despite these dualities, Jones will produce relevant works on film, with some of them being labelled classics.

Most of the research made by Dorothy Blumenstock Jones after World Revolutionary Propaganda (and at OWI) is about what became her specialty area: the analysis of motion pictures. From 1938 to the 70s, Jones studied: 1) communist propaganda, with Harold Lasswell; 2) propaganda and cinema; 3) juvenile delinquency and movies.

The last investigation made by Jones (on juvenile delinquency), working at the Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles (where she was a member of the staff, as assistant research director) is less documented than her earlier works. There are no publications on databases about this period. But some hearings before the United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare attests that Jones “Did welfare research and served as a research consultant on the mental health survey of Los Angeles County and on a survey of delinquency prevention made by the welfare planning council for the Los Angeles City Council” (The United States, 1963: 344). The Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles was founded in response to American president Lyndon Johnson’s demand for a war on poverty (Brauer, 1982). And, as we see, Jones’ husband’s memorial corroborates that she continued studying movies and juvenile delinquency.[17]

Consequently, the list of her most important writing in communication goes from 1938 to 1957, as can be seen in the table below:
Table 1: Works of Dorothy Blumenstock Jones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Technique of slogans in communist Propaganda (article) (with Harold Lasswell)</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of communist propaganda in Chicago (article) (with Harold Lasswell)</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study (article) (with Harold Lasswell)</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content (article)</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944 (article)</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content (article)</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Faulkner: Novel into Film (article)</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War without Glory (article)</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sunrise”: A Murnau Masterpiece (article)</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Language of Our Time (article)</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism and the movies (article)</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood’s International Relations (article)</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author.

Even so, these works span three decades (decades that largely shaped communication research). In some senses, Jones’ research grew over the years, reaching maturity with the last four writings on the list above. Hence, it is possible to divide her production into three phases, defined chronologically, but taking into account the contents of Jones’ texts.

4.1. Phase 1 (1938-1939)

In this first phase are the following publications: “The Technique of slogans in communist Propaganda” (1938), “The volume of communist propaganda in Chicago” (1939), and World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago study (1939).[18]

This roll of publications shows that Jones began with massive scrutiny of communist propaganda, working as an assistant researcher to Harold Lasswell. This phase as a dedicated apprentice turned her into an expert in content analysis and in the management of research corpus unimaginable by current standards, which are extremely stricter. From 1938 to 1939, she learned how to take surveys and collect data using quantitative research. She also learned how to make inferences on propaganda.

These writings were not produced without some adjustments to American ideals on democracy, contrary to the expansion of communist ideology in the United States. Both Lasswell and Jones were great defenders of American democracy. But those studies gave them a deep comprehension of the organization of communist movements in Chicago, making them not exactly hostile to the communist activists. Jones’ sons tell that she remarked that “the Communists were the only organizations she knew of supporting the rights of black people in the 1930s”[19].

The first phase of Jones’ works settles the methodological and theoretical basis that she developed in phase 2 and, in many manners, surpasses in phase 3. As I already explained these works in topic one (Propaganda studies), I will move forward to phase 2, which made Jones one of the first specialists on movie analysis in the USA.

4.2. Phase 2 (1942-1950)

In the second phase are the following publications: “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (1942), “The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944” (1945), and “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (1950).[20] These are studies conducted outside of the OWI demands, although the first one was produced during her period in the Motion Picture Analysis Division. During this phase, Jones was an associate researcher with Warner Bros (1945-1947).
About the first publication of this phase, she attests that in “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” she wants to understand what is movie content, how to measure it, and how to construct instruments of analyzing films. So, she says:

The present study grew out of the survey of Hollywood which was made by Leo C. Rosten under the auspices of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations. Dr. Rosten’s study was largely concerned with a survey of who makes the movies—who determines what is to go into Hollywood pictures. It became obvious during this survey that there was a need for a scientific study of what is in the completed film — of movie content (Jones, 1942: 411).

The second paper was published while she was associated with Warner Brothers Studios. The paper describes the characteristics of the so-called war films, produced by Hollywood between 1942 and 1945.

This phase corresponds to the results of Jones’ efforts in implementing a scientific approach to the study of films, adopting content analysis to the examination of Hollywood movies. Following the steps established in World Revolutionary Propaganda: a Chicago Study, the three writings of phase 2 provides a methodological and theoretical basis (“Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (1942) and “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (1950)); and an extensive example of the application of these bases (“The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944” (1945)).

Thus, it is clear that Jones is constructing a framework in accordance with the traditions of the University of Chicago (e.g., the establishment of rigorous methods of analysis, close to mathematical or life sciences), focused on getting as close as possible to objectivity and scientific truth.

Jones did not despise, even for a moment, what she had learned from Harold Lasswell about content analysis. In these works, the volume of analyzed material was as gigantic as that of the previous phase. The direction of analysis content in communication would change only with new generations of researchers, due to the need to increase the feasibility of their research. As Janowitz (1968) explains, over time, the volume of materials analyzed by content analysis tends to be reduced, especially from the 1970s onwards. But this is not the case with Jones’ research.

Jones presents the approach to content analysis in her first paper, in a divergent way:

The present study has been an experiment in the application of quantitative techniques to film content. Our purpose has been to devise methods for describing and summarizing in quantitative terms socially significant aspects of film content. Through the development of such techniques we should be able to learn what is in the film. This is a first step toward understanding the ways in which the film reflects our culture as well as, perhaps, influencing it (Jones, 1942: 412).

This work deserves a more careful examination because it clarifies Jones’ methods as no other.

“Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” is, according to her, the second attempt to use the methodology in film analysis. The first one, Edgar Dale’s Content of Motion Pictures (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), is considered by her with a lack of definitions, however. She criticizes Dale’s study for being too moralistic, concerned with evaluating if a movie is “good” or “bad”, and deciding how a film should be, based on moral standards. This is not the intention of Jones, who demarcates that her analysis is objective and, thus, more scientific than Dale’s. Jones explains that she is “...interested solely in recording, summarizing, and analyzing what is presented on the screen (Jones, 1942: 412). This posture reveals how closely she is aligned with her alma mater and how the traditional values of science and objectivity mark her speech, and shows how Jones was committed to producing what she considered to be true social science.

Jones does not analyze a large number of movies in this first “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (according to the standards she got used to analyzing films, of course): “only” 25, which she called an experimental group. “All our schedules were applied to an experimental group of twenty-five pictures. The results were analyzed statistically and summarized in considerable detail, as a further test of the productivity of each schedule” (Jones, 1942: 414).
Intending to understand what is present in a complete movie (Jones, 1942), she describes in this paper the methods to create schedules of analysis and how they could be applied. Jones either presents the schedules used by her to investigate the movies. The results show: 1) what are the movies about; 2) what are the characters in Hollywood movies; 3) the values of the movies.

One of the most intriguing findings of this study is the one that confirms that “love” is the more important value to Hollywood movies, receiving special attention from Jones. It is a very interesting finding that is still confirmed by recent studies (e.g., Creating the couple: Love, marriage, and Hollywood performance, by Virginia Wright Wexman, published in 1993).

Despite the findings, Jones understands that the importance of “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” lies in the verification of the method. She says:

> The present study represents the first attempt to test scientifically whether or not quantitative methods can be applied successfully to so complicated a medium as motion pictures. We have devised methods for describing and summarizing socially significant factors in the film. We have tested and demonstrated these methods by applying them to a group of films. The techniques which we have evolved need further testing, further development. It is evident, however, from this experimental study, that the outlook for motion picture content analysis is a promising one (Jones, 1942: 424).

The idea that motion pictures could be analysed using content analysis methods will be consolidated in “The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944”, where she analyzes 374 Hollywood movies, reviewing three years of World War II. In fact, her team saw 1313 films in order to classify them. The objective of the research summarized in “The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944” was to analyze war films released during 1942, 1943, and 1944, trying to understand how Hollywood interpreted the Second World War, and comprehend how Hollywood showed to the World the role of the United States on the conflict (Jones, 1945).

Her schedules in this research were concerned about: 1) the reasons why America fought in the war; 2) who was the enemy; 3) who were the allies; 4) the American production; 4) the home front; 5) American fighting forces. As some of these themes involved the representation of different cultures, Jones started to observe and criticize the way some ethnicities and nations were constructed under stereotypes. Jones’ perception of people who suffer some kind of discrimination played an important role in her analysis.

Jones reports:

> Hollywood’s indifference about foreign audiences became a critical factor. Every film made in Hollywood either contributes to or detracts from the reputation of America and the American people overseas. In the case of pictures portraying the role of this nation and of our allies during this war, the influence of Hollywood was multiplied a thousandfold. Yet most film makers

---

**Figure 1: Film analysis sheet**
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Source: Jones, D. B. (1942). “Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content”. 
failed to realize that the melodramatic blood-and-thunder combat film, with the American hero singlehandedly disposing of a score of Nazis, would bring jeers and hisses in a London movie house, or that a musical singing out that the Yanks had done it once and would do it again would cause a riot between American and British soldiers in a theater in Bombay (Jones, 1945: 13).

Jones’ last paper in phase 2 (“Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content” (1950)), which has the same title as the first one, is a great revision and defense of analysis methods, with a more extensive corpus. In this case, she analyzed 1,200 films. She catalogued the main topics that Warner Brothers worked on during thirty years.

This last paper, with only five pages, is a summary of the complete research, but it gives a list of major topics that Jones considers that makes the essence of Hollywood movie’s contents: 1) American histories and traditions; 2) the economic system; 3) problems of society; 4) Other nations and people; 5) Science.

4.3. Phase 3 (1953-1957)

The third phase represents a mature phase in Jones’ works, when she can speak about cinema in a more essayistic style, analyzing movies and Hollywood. We can divide these later analyses into three categories: 1) movie reviews; 2) contextual analysis of movies, Hollywood, and society; 3) content analysis of ethnics representations on Hollywood. All these three categories, in the meantime, indicate a mature researcher, less attached to rigid formulas for writing and presenting results, but marked by an original and autonomous thought about cinema. During this phase, Dorothy Blumenstock Jones received a grant from Rockefeller Foundation in Film Criticism (1951-1952), a grant from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T), to make a study of the portrayal of China and India in Hollywood motion pictures for their Center for International Studies (1954-1955), and a grant from the Fund for the Republic (1954-1955) to analyze Communism and the movies.

During this last phase, Dorothy Blumentock Jones wrote three papers devoted to analyzing single movies: “William Faulkner: novel into film” (1953); “War without glory” (1954); “Sunrise”: a Murnau masterpiece” (1955). She examines in these movie reviews Intruder in the Dust (Clarence Brown, 1949), All Quiet on the Western Front (Lewis Milestone, 1930), and Sunrise (Murnau, 1927). These three writings do not have great scientific value, though. They look more like movie reviews, despite the accuracy of analysis provided by Jones.

The papers related to contextual analysis of movies, Hollywood and society, on the other hand, offer us sociological perspectives of the influence of the movie industry in society. They are not monumental research anymore, but they offer qualified personal opinion that comes from Jones’ large experience in scrutinizing films.

“The language of our time” (1955) emphasizes, with a solid background research knowledge, the undeniable fact that the 20th century was a visual age.

This emphasis upon visualization throughout our society points to a fact that we have been slow to recognize and accept. But with more than 400 telecasting stations operating in this country, with over 36,000,000 (as of June, 1955) television sets in use, and with set-owning families spending an average of well over three hours each day before their TV sets, we can no longer deny that the language of pictures-and, more specifically, that of moving pictures-is the language of our day (Jones, 1955: 168).

Here, Jones does not mention content analysis nor even a lot of numbers, but she makes precise anatomy of the importance of audiovisual media and claims for the creative and positive use of these means.

“Communism and the movies” (1956) is a brief return of Jones to content analysis of films in its essence, as defined by herself earlier. It is also her return to her very earlier theme: communist propaganda. This paper was written during the “Red scare” in Hollywood, associated with the McCarthy Era, when 300 artists were officially blacklisted (Pontikes, Negro and Raio, 2010). The letter at the end of this paper was written under the demand of Jones. She was very active in the motion picture industry. According to Kim Jones, the letter was probably solicited in response to her fear of being called to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) [22].

In “Communism and the movies”, she analyzed 159 films between 1929 and 1947, and established criteria for “recognizing and evaluating possible Communist-inspired content” (Manchel, 1991: 1098). Jones created five categories:
This research was devoted to analyzing the production of the so-called Hollywood Ten, a group of motion-picture producers, directors, and screenwriters (Alvah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Adrian Scott, and Dalton Trumbo) considered communists. The study, though, indicated that none of the 159 films showed any trace of communist propaganda.

The last writing concerned with a contextual analysis of Hollywood is “Hollywood’s International Relations” (1957). Again, Jones does not work with content analysis, but brings to her examination a consistent background knowledge about the theme. She rescues the history of the Office of War Information’s Bureau of Motion Pictures to remember the policies that were implemented during the operations of the institution, making Hollywood more sensitive to foreign audiences (Jones, 1957).

In this last work of Jones, we see how she worked to make Hollywood less prejudiced about other nations and cultures. At least, this change was her desire, as she concludes:

Mutual respect among peoples of all nations and creeds is one of the basic requirements of a free and peaceful world. Thus, the increasing international awareness of Hollywood over the years, although it may still be found lacking in some respects, is an encouraging sign in an age when international tolerance and good will has become imperative for the survival of mankind (Jones, 1957: 374).

This perception runs through Jones’ last and rare book, The portrayal of China and India on the American screen, 1896-1955: the evolution of Chinese and Indian themes, locales, and characters as portrayed on the American screen (1955), published a year earlier. With this work, using content analysis, Jones described how Chinese and Indians were portrayed by American films. The study is based on an analysis of 325 motion pictures with Chinese or Indian themes shown in American theaters during the years 1896-1955. After a brief explanation of the role of American films on the world market and of the importance of Asia on the American screen, this report gives an illuminating discussion of the evolution of Hollywood’s image of the “Orient” and “Orientals”. (Gerbner, 1958: 223).

In 1967, though, Jones started to work with Barbara Avedon and Donna Reed in Another Mother for Peace (AMP). The organization was a grass-roots anti-war group founded in opposition to the Vietnam War. Accordingly to her son, Kim Jones, she worked tirelessly and passionately and cared deeply about the mission of the organization. She would occasionally complain about taps on her phone (citing clicks and other suspicious noises) and about the (occasionally threatening) crank calls she received. She was exhilarated by the successes of the antiwar movement she helped spawn and saw her critiques of the government very much in the frame of her organization: as an exercise in participatory democracy. After this more political action, Dorothy Blumenstock Jones did not return to research. She died in 1980, at 69 years, in a hospital in Philadelphia, from cancer.

5. Conclusions

This essay tried to make a brief instantaneous of Dorothy Blumenstock Jones, as an exercise of memory. Until the elaboration of this text, there was no publication concerned with the trajectory of this researcher who, as we have seen, carried out very important work in the field of film analysis. In this sense, as an unprecedented study, it has limitations.

The first one is the already cited fact that the work of forgetting Jones was well conducted. Thus, finding out who she was and how her program of research was projected needs more effort than when we talk about your mentor Harold Lasswell, for example. Even other students of the political scientist have a more documented intellectual biography or analysis of their research, such as Bruce Lannes Smith or Gabriel Almond.

The second limitation is that, during the production of this essay, two specific writings of Jones were not directly read as primary font. As rare works, they are not easily available, and we could not read them,
only excerpts in other publications. These works were: *The portrayal of China and India on the American screen, 1896-1955: the evolution of Chinese and Indian themes, locales, and characters as portrayed on the American screen* and “Communism and the movies”. The book and the article must be included as primary font further.

The third limitation refers to the Covid-19 pandemic context: the archives with any documents of Jones are working with reduced capacity. Thus, any effective search for them is also reduced,[24] making it infeasible to get “dirty fingernails that dig through ‘untapped archival material ... and oral history work’” (Rowland and Simonson, 2013: 6).

Despite limitations, we hope that now Dorothy Blumenstock Jones is more than a name lost in the past, more than a forgotten author who figures in a cover book of Harold Lasswell. In fact, this initial research presented in this paper showed that Jones had an active participation in the constitution of the first scientific research projects on film in the United States. She was engaged in research networks, institutes and had a good frequency of publications. She became chief of one of the most important divisions of the OWI, the Motion Picture Analysis Division of the Office of War Information Bureau of Motion Pictures in Hollywood, without having a permanent position at universities or even a master degree. She also must be credited with the development of content analysis as a method to make research on films, despite its sometimes naivety or simplicity. Thus, when we talk about the founders of this method in the United States, we shall not only mention Lasswell, but we should mention her. For me, it represents her strong capacity of research and analysis that did not depend on titles. Besides it, I also must reinforce the fact that she did all that she did with the limitations that being a woman from the beginnings of the 20th Century represents, being a mother and a wife. What Dorothy Blumenstock Jones has achieved is no small feat.

From this starting point, we hope that further research on Jones helps to understand more deeply the history of the communication field as a history also made by women. Film analysis developed and was refined in the following decades, but at its beginning, Jones was more than fundamental. With this study, we expect that Jones will get the recognition she deserves as a pioneer of film studies in the United States, developing a first theoretical and methodological support for the analysis of cinematographic products - in a time when being a researcher was not a common destiny for women.

**Figure 2: Dorothy Blumenstock Jones**

Source: courtesy of David Evan Jones.
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Notes

1. Herzog has one good fuller treatment in the collection: What Do We Really Know About Herta Herzog?: Exploring the Life and Work of a Pioneer of Communication Research (Klaus and Seethaler, 2016).

2. The “anonymous” was David Evan Jones, son of Dorothy Blumenstock Jones. I found his identity after crossing data on an obituary website, where Dorothy Blumenstock Jones’ name was found beside the name of her husband, Jack Evan Jones. After crossing data, I found a dedicatory by David Evan Jones to his parents. I sent an email, and he confirmed that he was one of Jone’s three children. This study would not have been possible without their help. A. (2017, June 3). Omitted coauthor (Comment on the article “World Revolutionary Propaganda: A Chicago Study (Classic Reprint) Paperback – August 9, 2012”). Amazon. https://www.amazon.com/World-Revolutionary-Propaganda-Chicago-Classic/dp/8009478940.

3. Dorothy Blumenstock Jones published a few works before marrying and adopting her husband’s surname. To demarcate this activity before she became a wife, I chose here not to unify the citations under the name she adopted after her marriage. I also chose to keep the author’s full name in some paragraphs in which she is cited since in post-marriage publications the maiden name is abbreviated to a simple B.

4. Page of the research group at CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development of Brazil): [omitted to not identify the author of this paper. To be added later].


8. Western Personnel Service of Pasadena is described by Leo Rosten (1941: 389) as “a non-profit agency supported by contributions from several academic foundations and eighteen Western colleges and universities”.

33
9. Later, all the works that Lasswell and Jones made on communist propaganda, together or alone, would represent a problem for both of them. Lasswell would ask friends and colleagues to write letters in his defense, testifying that he was a defender of democracy. Jones’ sons sent me a letter that proves that she had to do the same. The letter is at the end of this paper.


11. From Lasswell’s affidavit to Yale University. Document from 1951, retrieved from Harold Lasswell’s Papers, Yale Manuscripts and Archives at Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, on June 20, 2010.


16. Her sons are not sure about from which project she received the grant.

17. Jones’ sons also corroborate that she made research about movies and juvenile delinquency. Going deeper into this part of Jones’ research requires planning and execution of going to archives. It wasn’t possible during the production of this paper, but it is going to be carried out later.

18. The only book written by Jones with Harold Lasswell.


20. Although the first and last works of this phase have the same name, they do not have the same content.


22. A committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, established in 1938 to investigate alleged communist activities.


26. Even from internet requests.