

# Free review of george iii in cenema article review example

[Entertainment](#), [Movie](#)



David Chandler in his essay "Representing the Mad King: George III in Cinema" argues that different representations of the notorious King were affected by currents of the time that those representations were created. George III is an infamous historical. Chandler points out that there were three areas of everyday life that George III's unique rule irrevocably changed. He calls his illness "the most famous" in British history and lists three areas where the consequences of it can be measured: political, attitudes towards the monarchy, the understanding of mental illness" (Chandler, 74). As understandings of mental illnesses, madness and the science behind it has changed, over the same time period a lot has changed with regard to what is considered acceptable in divulge to the public about political figures. Chandler shows how the narrative of the Mad King's life has changed over time and also how different representations as interpreted by of different filmmakers have, depending on the perspective and portrayal of the leading characters, has changed the outcome of where the viewer's sympathies lie. Chandler begins by establishing the stakes involved in representing The Mad King. He does this by laying out just what an important historical figure he was, and this implicitly raises the responsibly level of his cinematic biographers. Essentially, everyone is watching how George III will be represented and they are weighing that portrayal against the historical record and leading medical theories diagnosing his illness. Chandler summarizes pre-cinematic portrayals of The Mad King, which subsequent filmmakers have drawn from in order to inform their own representations of the same.

The earliest cinematic portrayal was a silent film *Beau Brummel* (1924)

which was loosely based on an earlier (1890) play of the same name by Clyde Fitch (Chandler, 75). Metro-Goldwyne Mayer became interested in the late 1930s in remaking this, but this project was then shelved until after the war. The film that resulted was titled *Beau Brummell*. Chandler shows that in England this film provoked controversy for its candor in dealing with the “mad” King, which had not been as openly shown as such since a print made two centuries prior. (Chandler, 75). Chandler shows that this film involved some creative licenses in portraying the madness of the king and the periods of his episodes, basically using the 1788-89 episode as the primary story arch for the film. Chandler writes that the script is “full of anachronisms” but also that the film becomes more “historically coherent” if the Regency Crisis as portrayed in the film is understood as being limited to only the one of 1801, rather than the more historically important one which occurred in 1788-89. (Chandler, 75). Chandler though finds *Beau Brummel* to be “not a film about George III” but instead about his relationship with his son and his son’s friendship to Brummel.

Chandler finds the more modern rendition, *The Madness of King George* to be more spot-on in its adherence to history and accurate portrayal of the king. His point though is weakened since he is arguing for the intuitive. You could look at any contemporary film, compare it with one made a half-century prior, and then show that the modern day film is allowed a freer interpretation of fact due to the fact that the culture has opened up in terms of what is acceptable.

## **Work Cited**

Chandler, David Representing the Mad King: George II in the Cinema Journal of Popular Film and Television 73-81