

BRITISH BOARD OF FILM CLASSIFICATION 3 SOHO SQUARE, LONDON W1V 5DE
VIDEO REGISTRATION FORM (for films already examined for the cinema)

TITLE (for Reg):
TITLE as submitted: LORD OF THE FLIES
TITLE on screen:
Former Title:
 (if any)

DISTRIBUTOR: Warner Home Video Ltd
BRAND NAME ON PACK: Warner Home Video Ltd
Running time, as submitted: 01:26:38:06

Gaps in tape: N Incl: Excl:
Colour: N B & W: Y Colour Added: N

English Lang: Y Subtitled: N Dubbed: N
Foreign Lang: N Which: Silent: N

DIRECTOR: PETER BROOK
PRODUCER: LEWIS ALLEN
STARS: TOM CHAPIN
HUGH EDWARDS
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN: UK

KEYWORDS: *psychological drama - allegory - children - violence (g.v.)*

On-screen title checked:

Video Ref No: AF44454

Reg. Date: 8-5-90
Register No: VFB 14744
Approved R/T: 1:26:38:06
Cuts, if any:
SRT: 86m.38s
ART:
CRT:
FINAL VIEWING:
Date: 8/3/90

CATEGORY
 (subject to receipt of unbroken tape)
Date: 19/3/90

PS

PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION HISTORY - ON FILM

TITLE: LORD OF THE FLIES
Distributor: British Lion Film Corp Ltd

Film Ref No: F44454

1st viewed: 10/06/1964 Sub'd Ftg: 8168
Date passed: 01/07/1964 Sub'd R/T: 01:30:45:00
 PAL equiv: 01:27:07:00

Action taken:

Passed 'X' (16) uncut in 1964 - category lowered to AA in 1970, after representations had been made via MPs. (The novel was by now an A Level textbook.)

Former title: (if any)
Cuts, if any (ftg): N
Cut time:

CATEGORY: AA
Film file supplied: MICROFICHE
 App'd Ftg: 8168
 App'd R/T: 01:30:45:00
 PAL equiv: 01:27:07:00

Date of 1st viewing: 8/3/90
Action taken:

Duty Examiners: SS [signature]
Others:
As cut on film:
Cuts needed: *No*

Pass (PS) uncut,

Date of 2nd viewing: 14.3.90
Sections viewed:
Action taken: *whole tape at home*

Cuts Needed:

I don't see any reason why this shouldn't be 'PS'. Compared to the recent version the violence is very muted and the language at 'bloody' level. I would not imagine that many 6-9 year olds would want to see this, and it is well within the grasp & capabilities of 10-12 year olds.

Action Noted:
Referred to:

TITLE: LORD OF THE FLIES

Distributor: PALACE

Country of Origin: USA

Film: X Video: X

Genre: CLASSIC ADAPTATION

First: X Resub: X

Eng Lang: X

Foreign Lang:

Cuts:

No Cuts: X

Subtitled:

Dubbed:

Category: 15?

	Uc	U	PG	12	15	18	R18	CUTS	REJECT
THEME				X					
TREATMENT					X				
VISUALS: NUDITY		X							
SEX									
VIOLENCE					X				
HORROR					X				
LANGUAGE					X				
DRUGS									
CRIMINAL TECHNIQUES									
LEGALITY: OBSCENITY									
CHILDREN									
ANIMALS								?	
BLASPHEMY									
FILM AS A WHOLE					X			?	

Keywords:

A respectful and visually stunning adaptation of the William Golding novel, stronger and more violent than the Peter Brook film of the 1960s. This is at present clearly '15' but a '12' might be cautiously mooted.

Boys from a US military academy are wrecked on a luxuriant but deserted island with only one injured adult who is in a fever and later dies. Ralph appears a natural leader, talking about rules, arranging for beacons to be lit and watched and comforting the younger boys. He is challenged by Jack who eventually splits off to form his own ersatz 'tribal' gang, ritually primitivised by fear of an unknown monster in a cave - the dying teacher. The persecuted Piggy is soon the only one left loyal to the 'civilised' values of Ralph, but he is killed and Ralph hunted down, only to be saved at the last moment by the arrival of the marines, the 20th century deus ex machina.

No problem for '15', occasioned by 1) four "fucks", all at crucial points in the narrative, for example at 925/1000 in Reel 3 where Jack decisively moves

TITLE: LORD OF THE FLIES

against Ralph; 2) violence, in particular the killing of Simon (Reel 4, 1520), off-screen stabbings followed by shots of a bloody body, only one illuminated in the darkness; and the death of Piggy (Reel 5, 815), quite shockingly explicit; 3) the effectively horror-filmic treatment which is actually more appropriate to the original story than the Brook version. Director (and editor) Harry Hook achieved menace with his Kikuyu story 'The Kitchen Toto' and here makes use of the darkness of the jungle, the rituals of the boys in dancing and hunting, and the explicit cutting of the pig's head (and its reference to human mutilation) to good effect; 4) cumulatively this adds to the very real horror of bullying in a world beyond adult appeal - the tormenting of Piggy, the flogging of a boy held by others (Reel 4, 1810), the final hunting down of Ralph.

And yet, one must say, this is a common school text at 'O' level - not a 'children's book' but a modern classic utilised in education. Can a case be made for '12' partly for pedagogic reasons, partly for the intrinsic moral/literary interest of the story to adolescents, which is the reason for the schools' choice in the first place?

The Company has also asked for a 'PG', clearly inappropriate in itself but raising the question of a '12'. The 'fucks' could be reduced - they do have a dramatic function, though they are clearly part of a modernising and Americanising of the literary text as well. More problematic is the specific violence and more generally the mood and theme. I have to admit ignorance of the 12-year-old boy's mind - even my teaching experience was with juniors and with adolescent girls. Both MM and myself felt this was a prime candidate for a test screening for perhaps 13 - 16-year-olds with teachers. It is true indeed that knowledge of a school text can debrief with its prior familiarity - particularly knowledge of the saving of Ralph at the end - though we know in a sense that the 'real' ending is more bleak. But it is presumably 14 - 16-year-olds who will be studying the book as a text so the 12 - 14-year-olds are not so protected. Also the visual packs more of a punch than the printed. Certainly the theme of the 'savagery' underlying the veneer of civilisation is a potent myth in the modern psyche and translates easily into the sub-texts of fear of bullying and the anarchic threat in that child's world which we adults have escaped and forgotten perhaps. Does this make it an important film for young adolescents to see then, or one they need to be protected from? I tend to go for the more cautious '15' here, but this may be an over-classification. Another team and test screening? Sea urchin (?) stabbed on spear and held at 14/40 Reel 2, is a potential cut for Animals Act - or is this classed as straightforward fishing? Please advise.