

Book Reviews – February 2011

Table of Contents

Carmen on Film: A Cultural History

By Phil Powrie, Bruce Babington, Ann Davies and Chris Perriam

100 Hundred Years of Spanish Cinema

By Tatjana Pavlović, Inmaculada Alvarez, Rosana Blanco-Cano, Anitra
Grisales, Alejandra Osorio and Alejandra Sánchez

Cinema and Fascism: Italian Film and Society, 1922-1943

By Steven Ricci

A Review by Noelia Saenz..... 5

Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies

By Terry Bolas

Beginning Film Studies

By Andrew Dix

A Review by Juli Pitzer 15

Isuma: Inuit Video Art

By Michael Robert Evans

*Outside Looking In: Viewing First Nations Peoples in Canadian Dramatic
Television Series*

By Mary Jane Miller

A Review by Heather Macdougall 21

The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks

Edited by Peter Graham and Ginette Vincendeau

Stardom in Postwar France

Edited by John Gaffney and Diana Holmes

A Review by John Berra..... 27

Book Reviews

Satire TV: Politics and Comedy in the Post-Network Era

Edited by Jonathan Gray, Jeffrey P. Jones, and Ethan Thompson

A Review by Evan Elkins..... 33

Gilles Deleuze: Cinema and Philosophy

By Paola Marrati. Translated by Alisa Hartz

Cinematic Mythmaking: Philosophy in Film

By Irving Singer

A Review by Alexander Thimons..... 38

Puzzle Films: Complex Storytelling in Contemporary Cinema

Edited by Warren Buckland

A Review by Chris Pallant 45

Superstar: The Karen Carpenter Story

By Glyn Davis

A Review by Mike Miley 49

The Hitchcock Annual Anthology: Selected Essays from Volumes 10-15

Edited by Sidney Gottlieb and Richard Allen

A Review by Christina M. Parker 54

Film and Memory in East Germany

By Anke Pinkert

Nation and Identity in the New German Cinema

By Inga Scharf

A Review by David Embree 59

Dismantling the Dream Factory: Gender, German Cinema and the Postwar Quest for a New Film Language

By Hester Baer

A Review by Paul Cooke 65

Understanding Indian Cinema: Culture, Cognition and Cinematic Imagination
 By Patrick Colm Hogan

Mourning The Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition
 By Bhaskar Sarkar
 A Review by Scott Jordan Harris 69

Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Movies
 By Dave Saunders
 A Review by Joseph Arton..... 75

Jean-Pierre Jeunet
 By Elizabeth Ezra

The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience
 By Jennifer M. Barker
 A Review by Alison Frank..... 79

Being Hal Ashby: Life of a Hollywood Rebel
 By Nick Dawson

The Films of Hal Ashby
 By Christopher Beach
 A Review by Aaron Hunter 86

Steven Spielberg and Philosophy: We're Gonna Need a Bigger Book
 Edited by Dean A. Kowalski

Scenes of Love and Murder: Renoir, Film and Philosophy
 By Colin Davis
 A Review by Chelsea Wessels..... 93

Book Reviews

The Cinema of Naruse Mikio: Women and Japanese Modernity

By Catherine Russell

Forest of Pressure: Ogawa Shinsuke and Postwar Japanese Documentary

By Abé Mark Nornes

A Review by Stephen Potter 97

Anatomy of Film. Sixth Edition

By Bernard F. Dick

A Review by Monika Raesch 105

Playing with Memories: Essays on Guy Maddin

Edited by David Church

The Young, the Restless, and the Dead: Interviews with Canadian Filmmakers, Volume 1

Edited by George Melnyk

A Review by Rachel Walls 112

TV China

Edited by Ying Zhu and Chris Berry

Transnational Television in Europe: Reconfiguring Global Communications Networks

By Jean K. Chalaby

A Review by Bärbel Göbel 121

Carmen on Film: A Cultural History**By Phil Powrie, Bruce Babington, Ann Davies and Chris Perriam**

Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2007. ISBN: 978-0-253-21907-7. 31 illustrations, vii + 303 pp. \$24.95 (pbk).

100 Hundred Years of Spanish Cinema**By Tatjana Pavlović, Inmaculada Alvarez, Rosana Blanco-Cano, Anitra Grisales, Alejandra Osorio and Alejandra Sánchez**

Chichester, West Sussex, Oxford and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-4051-8419-9. 20 illustrations, xi + 277 pp. £19.99/ \$39.95 (pbk).

Cinema and Fascism: Italian Film and Society, 1922-1943**By Steven Ricci**

Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-520-25356-8. 30 illustrations, xi + 233 pp. £16.95/ \$24.95 (pbk).

A Review by Noelia Saenz, University of Southern California, USA

The idea of national cinema seems somewhat outdated when you think of globalization and the transnational nature that characterizes the production, distribution and reception of the contemporary filmic landscape in any given nation. However, in spite of the move towards thinking about cinema as a transnational commodity, there is still an interest and recognition in preserving the idea of national cinemas. National cinemas, as known today, largely developed as localized attempts to compete against the foreign encroachment of Hollywood, although many countries had vibrant film industries since the nascent days of cinema. The attempt to capture the local market by portraying local settings and customs, however, served a dual function of portraying national interests to international audiences. How other nations and international audiences viewed national cinemas was just as important as what films were chosen to represent the nation at film festivals, suggesting a strong link

between national cinemas and conceptions of national identity as they are imagined both at home and abroad. All of the books discussed in this review deal with questions of national identity and cinema's role in reflecting and mediating the nation during different historical periods and national contexts, and are part of a growing body of work that expands on national cinemas to include the transnational. Current scholarship on national cinemas reminds us that we must not forget the national in the rush to embrace the transnational. National identity, as imagined through national cinema, is the product of a negotiation between how the nation imagines itself and how other nations imagine it, and often this negotiation is a product of shifting and sometimes unequal power relations both within the nation and outside of its borders.

The first book discussed, *Carmen on Film: A Cultural History*, examines the history of filmic representations of the Carmen story from its inception in the French imaginary during the nineteenth century to the present. This book, a collaborative product between four different scholars, focuses on three national contexts, France, Spain and the United States, whose unique cultural history shapes the story of Carmen on film. These are not the only cinemas that have adapted the Carmen myth, for, as the authors point out, "there have been some 80 film adaptations since 1906" (ix). However, these three nations comprise the majority of the adaptations. Grounding their work within the fields of cultural studies, film studies and nation studies, the authors of this book use the body of filmic representations of Carmen to examine the cross-cultural relationship between Otherness and the nation. According to the authors, "the "nation" imagines itself and its specificities through Otherness, and it is only by grounding that Otherness in the imagined Sameness of national cinemas that we can understand its function" (xii). By exploring the evolution of the Carmen story on film and through an analysis of how different national contexts and different star personas shape the figure of Carmen, this book ultimately helps determine the cultural specificity of each adaptation, and how that specificity both rewrites the Carmen myth and remains in dialogue with the theme of containment of the unruly and Othered central protagonist and excessive female desire from the original story.

According to the authors, the Carmen narrative was a product of the French Romantic movement of the nineteenth century and its Orientalizing gaze towards Spain, perceived as a country tainted by its proximity to Africa and therefore more exotic and primitive than northern Europe. As the authors point out in their chapter, 'Theorizing Spain', "the Carmen narrative conflates Spanishness with the culture of Andalusia, the most southern region of Spain, close to Africa and the Near East and still bearing the marks of Arab culture..." (22). The Orientalizing of Spain during this period, reflected in a large body of literary and cultural works, was largely a product of touristic and largely masculine visions about the nation. In this regard, the figure of Carmen as Spanish, gypsy, and female marks her as Other. The marking of Spain as Other also served to reinforce the geopolitical power shift that occurred during the nineteenth century, in which France rose to global prominence through its colonial conquests as Spain declined on the world stage due to the loss of its colonies.

While the chapters in 'Part Two: Carmen and the French Cinema' reveal evolving anxieties about femininity, modernity, and national identity as embodied through Carmen, of particular interest is the inclusion of the film, *Karmen Gei* (2001) by the Senegalese director, Joseph Gaye Ramaka in Chapter 11. Ramaka, having lived in France for several decades, set this adaptation of Carmen in Senegal, which explicitly relates the underlying Orientalizing gaze of the original story to a formerly colonized setting. This adaptation, framed as a postcolonial critique of the colonizing and masculine gaze within the Carmen myth, challenges the exotic Othering of the original Carmen story. Unlike in other adaptations, Karmen in this film is a lesbian, whose gaze is "rooted in a specific [African] woman's body [and which]...interrogates spectatorial identification, and more particularly the 'male gaze'" (147). According to the authors, Ramaka's film functions as "a triple decentering" (147) of the Carmen narrative, which ultimately decenters the Western Carmen narrative through its de-centering of normative sexuality and "the myth of Carmen as excessively heterosexual" (147). Ultimately, however, what this film proves is how little the Carmen story has to do with Spain itself, a testament to the true power of French Orientalism.

In spite of the fact that the Carmen myth has little to do with Spain itself, this has not prevented several Spanish adaptations of the story, which attempt to stake national claim to Carmen and move her away from her French origins. 'Part Three: Carmen and the Spanish Cinema', explores the tensions that exist in Spanish adaptations of Carmen between national identity and national stereotype. For the Spanish, Carmen as gypsy is the internal Other, always outside of dominant notions of Spanishness, even while paradoxically, the gypsy and gypsy folkloric culture functioned as a symbol of Spanish national identity abroad. By examining films made both under and after Franco, this tension is revealed through the replaying of Carmen, whose "otherness [is] potently antagonistic, resistant to assimilation and yet constantly returning to be a representation of 'Spain'" (159).

Given that the authors' expertise lies in French cultural studies, film studies and Spanish studies, the strongest chapters of the book are those that focus on France and Spain, in spite of the fact that the section 'Carmen and the Americas' is the largest portion of the book. While the book gives both industrial and ethnic considerations to the portrayal of Carmen in the United States, this discussion overlooks the complex history of Spain in the U.S. imaginary, particularly how folkloric visions of "Old Spain" were envisioned in an attempt to sell the image of California, the location of the booming Hollywood film industry and the Southwest region as a whole. While evoking Spain attempts to whitewash a racialized Latino presence in the Southwest, a process discussed by William Deverall in his book *Whitewashed Adobe* (University of California Press, 2004) as "cultural whitewashing" (251), it simultaneously marginalized that Spanish identity through representations of Spain and Spanishness as exotic and more primitive, which the authors note as different from Protestant Christianity (38). However, while the authors argue that "the American cinema lacks the heartlines to Carmen of some other national cinemas" (37), within the U.S. context, the Carmen narrative functions as a racialized Other because Spanishness in the United States has been historically racialized because of its association with the U.S.-Latino presence. In addition to the fascination with shifting gender roles and the excessive desire within the Carmen figure, one cannot overlook the concreteness of this racialization within the U.S. and Hollywood's role in mediating this hierarchical structure.

Designed as a comprehensive introductory guide to the history of Spanish cinema, *100 Hundred Years of Spanish Cinema* provides a much needed survey of Spanish cinema from its origins to more contemporary fare. Viewing cinema as "a privileged site for grasping tensions and conflicts that have shaped the modern Spanish nation and its identity" (xi), the authors in this book outline the history of Spanish cinema through a discussion of historical, political and cultural contexts that have shaped representations on the screen. Divided into nine chapters, which focus on nine periods in the history of Spanish cinema, the book surveys filmic movements or political periods that defined filmmaking, such as Surrealism, the Spanish Civil War, Neorealism and cinema during the Transition period. While each period comprises distinct chapters, the authors pinpoint the blurring between the different categories and warn against treating these periods as discrete, acknowledging the overlap of production and stylistic conditions that bridge the time frames.

Rather than presenting an encyclopedic list of every Spanish film made in Spain, the authors discuss twenty-two key films during the different type periods to illustrate how the Spanish nation has represented itself through its cinema, paying special attention to the works of auteurs, such as Luis Buñuel and Pedro Almodóvar, but also acknowledging the work of lesser known and often marginal filmmakers. Given that Buñuel's filmic career encompasses some fifty years and spans across three distinct national cinemas - France, Spain and Mexico - it is not surprising that three of his films are discussed in light of the limited number of films covered over all. The emphasis on Buñuel within a survey of Spanish national cinema illustrates one of the fundamental tensions within the concept of 'national' cinema, the idea that cinema does not exist within a purely national framework. Buñuel's career clearly demonstrates how cinema exists through a fluidity of borders, both national and linguistic, that challenges any singular positioning or cooption by a national cinema.

In spanning the history of Spanish cinema, the diversity of periods also illustrates transnational exchanges either as influential models, such as the case with Italian Neorealism, or as central to movements themselves, i.e. Surrealism. In this regard, the history of Spanish national cinema acknowledges a negotiation between and influence of the transnational. While

negotiations between the transnational occurred throughout Spanish cinema's history, it is particularly salient in the final chapter, which focuses on contemporary trends since 1992. According to the authors, Spanish cinema since 1992 exists in a globalized, borderless context and is largely a product of a new political framework (the European Union), new distribution and exhibition structures (international film festivals and television), and resulting changes in infrastructure, which have called for a critical re-thinking of the idea of 'national cinema'. In spite of the impact of globalization and the transnational, national cinema still maintains its cultural capital and link with national identity. However, it must now "renegotiate certain "outdated" notions of Spanishness and national specificity... [which] prompted a creative repackaging of the representation of Spanish national culture for the global audience and the world market" (183). Given this new context for Spanish cinema, this final chapter examines the work of regional filmmakers and women, whose work challenges singular visions of the nation by foregrounding regional identities, feminine voices, transnational diasporic communities within Spain and/or move the idea of Spanish cinema beyond the territorial and linguistic boundaries of the nation. In this regard, Spanish cinema best illustrates the negotiation between the boundaries of the nation and its representation on screen.

As an introductory text designed for undergraduate students, the book provides a glossary of film terms for non-film majors and a historical chronology of the Spanish film industry, which also outlines major political and cultural events in Spanish history for those who are unfamiliar with the national specificity of Spanish cinema. In this regard, the book manages to bridge disciplinary boundaries as a teaching tool for various disciplines or for those who are interested in a survey of Spanish cinema. The book itself has a loose design. Each chapter begins with a historical and political overview of the period and then continues with a discussion of two to four key films of the period. The discussion of the films provides a synopsis, critical commentary, a biography of the director, and examples of close readings of the films. This loose structure allows instructors and readers the freedom to interpret the films accordingly, using the close readings as a model to teach and evaluate the films. Overall, the book suffers because of its limited selection of films for close readings and its

broad scope as a survey of Spanish cinema, overlooking larger discussions of gender, sexuality, violence and the family, discussed by scholars such as Marsha Kinder, Marvin D'Lugo and Jo Labanyi. However, *100 Years of Spanish Cinema* is a much needed and comprehensive survey of Spanish cinema, and provides enough information on the history and context of this national cinema to encourage further inquiry and in fact, encourages the use of the book as a springboard for future reading.

While on the surface, the relationship between Spanish cinema and cinema during the Italian fascist period may seem arbitrary, it is important to note how fascist dictatorships marked both national cinemas and viewed the propagandistic potential of cinema as essential to promoting specific visions of the nation. In this regard, Steven Ricci's book, *Cinema and Fascism: Italian Film and Society, 1922-1943*, serves as a comprehensive tool for understanding the complex and often contradictory relationship between the fascist regime and cinema, not only in Italy, but other nations once subject to fascism. This book examines "the relationship between the rise of fascism and the experience of cinema in Italy" (3) from 1922 to 1943, a period of cinema that was, historically, either ignored as a form of historical amnesia because of its ties to the fascist state or critically undervalued as a commercial genre-based cinema.

As Ricci points out in his 'Introduction', the fascist period reveals several cultural paradoxes, primarily the fact that the state allowed a commercial, genre-based cinema that was almost entirely free of representations of the state and was regulated "in less than totalitarian ways" (5). In spite of this fact, however, Ricci argues that "the cinema experience in the period was indeed fascist *in the manner and to the extent* that the state's intervention into cultural affairs regulated processes of reading" (7). Influenced by critical theorists Mikhail Bakhtin and Michel de Certeau, as well as by scholarship within reception studies, Ricci outlines the process of reading as a process beyond cognitive understanding to include how "the network of connections between references affects—that is, how it expands or delimits—a range of possible understandings" (8). According to Ricci, the cinema of the period was fascist in the sense that the state governed specific visions of the nation and the ways in which this

then hailed the spectator in their daily lives and through the cinema.

Ricci uses this process of reading to understand how fascism shaped the experience of cinema in Italy during this period through a discussion of specific governmental regulations that shaped spectatorship by establishing quotas and requiring dubbing of foreign films, censoring content, but more specifically through the creation of the *Unione Cinematografica Educativa* (LUCE), which produced newsreels and documentaries for the state. Using textual examples from films of the period, Ricci also highlights the importance of the athletic, physical body as emblem of the national body, which also paralleled fascism's larger interest in sports. While Ricci focuses on spectatorship, it is important to note that this is not an ethnographic study nor does it provide audience research to support the ways of reading. Instead, he uses critical theory and theories on spectatorship to understand the ways in which fascism structured the lives of Italians and encouraged one particular vision of the nation and culture at-large.

In looking at cinema of the fascist period, Ricci interrogates the purpose of national cinema as a complex process by which cultural identity is constructed through a negotiation of both locally produced and international cinema, not simply by the image conveyed within national cinema. For example, he notes that Italian cinema during this period represented only one-third of the films seen by Italian audiences, who largely saw foreign titles and had a strong preference for Hollywood cinema. This last point reveals an interesting paradox in light of the fascist state's policy of autarky, which provides another instance in which visions of the nation remained in dialogue with the transnational, even as it attempted to convey a specific and cohesive national identity. In this regard, Ricci's discussion of the relationship between Italy and America provides ample ground for examining transnational alliances and negotiations. A fascinating example is the production and circulation of the documentary, *Mussolini Speaks* (1932), coproduced by Columbia Pictures and the Italian state, and aimed at Italian immigrant communities in the United States.

In the last chapter, Ricci summarizes the previous chapters through a discussion of several fascist heuristics that influenced the reading of Italian cinema during this period. First, he argues that the inculcation of the fascist state in newsreels and their omnipresence during cinema screenings invoked fascism as central to national life and order. Secondly, he notes how the state positioned Italian history as derived from a classical Roman past, in order to recount the nation's former imperial glory. Thirdly, fascism naturalized differences between rural and urban topographies, but shied away from portraying the evils of modern life as existing within cities themselves, instead showing them outside or along the way. Finally, Ricci notes how Italian fascism treated the audience as part of an "undifferentiated, national body" (164), which eliminated regional and linguistic differences internally and prevented the circulation of other national languages through dubbing practices. Ricci concludes the last chapter with a brief discussion of the transitional cinema between 1943 and 1948 as a moment characterized by the production of both commercial genre-based fare and more oppositional cinema, largely discussed under Italian Neorealism. Previously conceived as a rupture with the codes of dominant cinema of Italian cinema, Ricci's account of Italian Neorealism instead sees historical antecedents in cinema prior to World War II. For Ricci, this transitional period largely marks the dissolution of the fascist heuristics by representing social difference and through alternate modes of media consumption and distribution offered by radio.

While Ricci's book solely focuses on the Italian context, it is important to note how these four points are not unique to Italian fascism and share parallels with fascist practices in other national contexts, and are also to some extent a part of the national project altogether. For example, in the Spanish context, Franco's regime also used protectionist measures to regulate the Spanish film industry against foreign models, implemented dubbing requirements, and produced newsreels. In addition, Francoist visions of Spain called for a uniform national body that eliminated regional and linguistic difference and re-told national history in terms of imperial glory. However, differences arise when evaluating the representation of the rural and urban divide, which allows for a fruitful discussion of culturally-specific reactions to modernity. As both a book on cultural history and the cinema,

Cinema and Italian Fascism offers an insightful examination of how the state regulated, or at least attempted to regulate, one particular vision of the nation as mediated through the production, distribution and exhibition of the cinema.

Overall, *Cinema and Italian Fascism: Italian Film and Society, 1922-1943*, in addition to *Carmen on Film: A Cultural History* and *100 Years of Spanish Cinema* illustrate contemporary thinking on national cinemas as either revisionist accounts of previously misunderstood or undervalued film periods within national film history, or as interrogations of cultural specificity and its negotiation within transnational contexts. While focusing primarily on the issues of the 'national', this review highlights moments of similitude between two national film histories in order to point out the historical tensions and negotiations that have occurred within the nation and between the national project and the transnational. As the authors of *100 Years of Spanish Cinema* point out, in spite of the influence of transnational entities, such as the European Union on national film industries, the idea of 'national cinemas' still maintain their cultural capital and ties to national identity, but as argued in this review, ideas of national identity have rarely existed outside of negotiations with external and transnational forces.

Screen Education: From Film Appreciation to Media Studies

By Terry Bolas

Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-84150-237-3 (pbk). 3 b/w and 9 color illustrations, v+432 pp. £19.99 (pbk).

Beginning Film Studies

By Andrew Dix

Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-7190-7255-0 (pbk). 24 b/w illustrations, v+304 pp. £9.99 (pbk).

A Review by Juli Pitzer, University of Kansas, USA

In the last two decades film studies has increased its presence in colleges and universities from elective courses in multiple departments to full-fledged undergraduate and graduate degrees in its own department. Since its breakout period in the 1960s and 70s, the appreciation of film has been taken seriously in academia. Multiple books exist on the study of motion pictures from theory to history to criticism. The two books under review offer insights into the teaching and study of film. Terry Bolas's work *Screen Education* provides an extensive history of how film studies grew to its prominent place in Britain, reviewing discussions from the 1930s until the present time. Bolas concentrates on the educator and the concerns s/he has had over the course of time. Andrew Dix, on the other hand, has provided a comprehensive guide for beginning film students covering a wide-range of topics from theory to technology. Together, these texts provide a look at what has been deemed most important in the study of film.

Beginning Film Studies by Andrew Dix is a useful introductory text for students and non-students interested in learning more about film studies and analysis. The book may serve as a practical guide or supplementary text in a secondary classroom setting. In the introduction titled 'Introduction: what is film studies?' Dix introduces the reader to a very general history of motion pictures dating back to the study of optical forms. As the study of the art form evolved throughout history, Dix concludes that "film studies itself is better evoked as plural, contentious,

always in flux...." (3). He continues in a discussion with the purpose of his text, which is to introduce key questions, concepts, and methodologies in film studies. The author's aim is to provide readers with a vocabulary for analysis of film form and style, the ideological dimensions of film and an awareness of 'post-textual' or 'extra-textual' domains of film studies. As we move toward digital technologies, the final aspect of the book is to introduce the beginning film student to the shifts in twenty-first century film studies and the possible directions it may take in the future.

The chapters are organised into three groupings that focus on film's style, text, and commercial aspects of film studies. Each contains a few key features that are worthy of noting. In the middle of each chapter is a section mid-way called 'STOP and THINK'. In this section are bulleted exercises with questions that offer the reader a chance to put what is being read into action. In chapter one, for example, readers are asked to watch a two or three minute sequence of a narrative film in order to analyse and list the significant pro-filmic features in an exercise on understanding *mise-en-scène*. Before the chapter ends, Andrew Dix includes an example of analysis, providing a sample to the reader. Chapter seven focuses on Johnny Depp to demonstrate an analysis of stars. At the end of each chapter there are two sections to offer avenues of further study and investigation called 'Selected Reading' and 'Useful Websites.' The 'Selected Reading' section contains various articles, books, and essays on topics introduced in the chapter, while the 'Useful Websites' section includes helpful website tools. These features make *Beginning Film Studies* feel more like a textbook. At the end of the book are two sections called 'Further reading' and 'Online resources' that contain references, books, and print and online journals for additional study.

Chapters one to three look at the stylistic components of film and provide the reader with vocabulary on the visual, audio, and editing aspects. The first chapter titled '*Seeing* film: *mise-en-scène* analysis' focuses on the components involved in defining *mise-en-scène* such as setting, props, costume, lighting, colour, acting, and cinematography. The second chapter, 'Film editing: theories and histories', offers insight into the complex history of film editing practices. In this chapter readers will be introduced to Eisenstein, Kuleshov, continuity, montage, types of shots, and

cuts. The final chapter in this grouping is called 'Hearing film: analyzing soundtrack', which focuses on the use of speech, music, sound effects and silence.

The next group of chapters introduces the reader to textual analysis theories and approaches. Andrew Dix relies heavily on external sources and key contributors to the study of film. Tom Gunning, Laura Mulvey, David Bordwell, Kristin Thompson, Andrew Sarris, *Cahiers du cinéma*, *Screen*, Louis Althusser, and Christine Geraghty are some of the highlighted names discussed within. Chapter four, titled 'Film and narrative', begins with a brief history of the Russian Formalists in the 1920s and their contributions to film storytelling. The chapter continues with discussions of time, power, and film subjects. 'Film and authorship' is the title and focus of chapter five. This chapter analyses auteur theory, its problems, and alternative authorship questions. David Lynch is the topic of discussion at the end of the chapter. The next two chapters, chapter six and seven, focus on genre and the star system respectfully.

Chapter eight, called 'Film and ideology'. is the last chapter in this section. Chapter eight is a very brief introduction to Marxist, feminist, queer, and racial film studies. Andrew Dix does his best to communicate the definitions, history, and contemporary discussions surrounding each of these areas of film theory. He mentions many major contributors that readers will find in further studies within the chapter's forty pages. This chapter also contains the longest 'selected reading' and 'useful website' sections. The final two chapters in the book, chapter nine entitled 'Film production' and chapter ten entitled 'Film distribution', place the study of film into its commercial realm of production and consumption.

What *Beginning Film Studies* offers in its compact study, it lacks in illustrations and structure. Illustrations or examples of key technical terms are not found, as the only photographs are stills from films that are discussed or mentioned in the chapters. As for structure, important words are placed in italics and their definitions written in narrative form within the text. The book reads more as a narrative than a textbook, which some may find to be helpful and flowing or difficult and moving too quickly through material. At times Dix makes assumptions that his

readers may have a knowledge or understanding of institutions, movements, or key people such as *Cahiers du cinema* or Krakauer. He makes an effort to cover as much as possible, but it is at the sacrifice of longer explanations and inclusions. Instructors choosing to use *Beginning Film Studies* may find that supporting texts such as *Film: An Introduction* (Bedford/St. Martins, 2005) by William H. Phillips, which gives excellent detail and illustrations to the technical aspects of film studies, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith's *The Oxford History of World Cinema* (Oxford University Press, 1999), which provides a historical overview of world cinema through the contribution of essays from multiple authors, would be helpful in providing students of introductory courses a well-rounded film studies foundation. This being mentioned, *Beginning Film Studies* is not meant to cover a world history of film studies or stand on its own as a theoretical guide to film. What Dix has created is a useful tool for those new to film studies to begin to build a foundation that includes a basic understanding of theory, history, vocabulary, and some technical terms in order to view and write about film.

While *Beginning Film Studies* serves as a potential text for classroom education, *Screen Education* subtitled *From Film Appreciation to Media Studies* by Terry Bolas is a well-researched documentation about the history of film education in Britain from the 1930s to the contemporary. Bolas bases this project on a MA dissertation he wrote in 2003 focusing on *Screen*, the popular film journal during the early and mid 1970s. *Screen Education* addresses the multiple issues that early film enthusiasts faced in bringing 'film appreciation' from the periphery to its accepted formal position of study in higher education. The primary focus of Bolas's research is on two organisations that played major roles in the formulation of film education. The first was formed in 1950 as the Society of Film Teachers (SFT), renamed the Society for Education in Film and Television (SEFT) in 1959. Bolas relies on interviews and archival research in his evaluations of SEFT, which disbanded in 1988. The second institution is the British Film Institute (BFI), instigated in 1933. Bolas unfolds the complex history of the relationship between the BFI and SEFT, and the contributions each made to film education.

Bolas's historical approach is outlined in chapter one, entitled 'Cinema under Scrutiny'. His purpose is to investigate the

reasons why SEFT, a small teachers' organisation, maintained a forty-year-long prominence in Britain only to dissolve upon film education's universal acceptance. Through its subsequent chapters, prologue, and epilogue, Bolas takes the readers on a journey through the essential evolution of film studies and film appreciation in Britain. Included in the book are two helpful appendices at the end called 'Screen education: a timeline 1930-1993' and 'Expansion of media studies – the statistics'. The timeline is an excellent year-by-year resource that outlines the organisations, personnel, events, and publications of influence. The section on statistics contains charts that demonstrate the growth in media studies education in secondary and post-secondary institutions. Nine colour and three black and white photos show the historical locations and buildings where BFI and SEFT operated over time. At the very end of the text is an exhaustive bibliography of useful journal articles, essays, and books for further study.

The publications made by BFI and SEFT maintain a significant place of prominence in the discussion. Bolas's previous work on *Screen* is evident, as he devotes two of the eleven chapters entirely to the history and achievements of *Screen*. Anyone familiar with film studies would recognise the significant contributions *Screen* and its sister publication, *Screen Education* (hereafter *SE*, as not to be confused with the title of Bolas's text), have made. According to Bolas it was these two journals that made the most impact on the discipline in the 1970s. The dramatic shift in *Screen* and *SE*'s prominence, Bolas argues, is due to the editorial changes in the late 70s that shifted the focus of each publication. These changes are reflective of the many roadblocks and breakthroughs that Bolas attributes to the complex analysis of SEFT's history.

A second, but equally important argument found within the text is the ongoing need for support for film educators. BFI and SEFT had both similar and different goals for their constituents, needs that Bolas argues have not been adequately met since SEFT disbanded in 1988. Part of the inadequacy lies in the disagreements among secondary educators and post-secondary educators where teaching needs differed greatly. Though it has been referred to in this article as film studies, Bolas points out the evolution of the discipline from 'screen studies' to 'media

Book Reviews

education' in referencing the study of film, television, and now digital media technologies. In the epilogue, Bolas discusses the frequency of which media education has grown in secondary and post-secondary institutions in the last two or three decades. However, he illustrates that there has been no sufficient organisation in accommodating instructors since SEFT.

Screen Education is an excellent resource for those interested in the history of the BFI, SEFT, *Screen*, and film education in Britain in general. Terry Bolas offers insight into the lifespan of the Society for Education in Film and Television that one may not find elsewhere.

Isuma: Inuit Video Art**By Michael Robert Evans**

Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008. ISBN: 9780773533783. xiv+242pp. £22.99 (pbk), £66.00 (hbk).

Outside Looking In: Viewing First Nations Peoples in Canadian Dramatic Television Series**By Mary Jane Miller**

Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008. ISBN: 9780773533677. x+492pp. £24.99 (pbk), £70.00 (hbk).

A Review by Heather Macdougall, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

McGill-Queen's 'Native and Northern' series contains sixty-plus titles, which cover such disparate subjects as archaeology, history, environment, language, and biography. While there are of course many overlaps and connections between all of the volumes in the series – the relationship between Native and non-Native peoples, for example, is a theme which is relevant to nearly every topic addressed – two recent books in this series have a particularly strong resonance when read together. Michael Robert Evans' *Isuma* and Mary Jane Miller's *Outside Looking In* both examine televisual representations of Canada's indigenous populations, with the two authors taking complementary approaches. While both books are written by academics who are outsiders to the cultures they discuss, Miller's is more explicitly (as the title suggests) an analysis of how Canadian television represents aboriginal communities and characters to an overwhelmingly non-Native audience. Evans, on the other hand, travels north to Igloolik on our behalf, in search of the inside scoop on the blossoming Inuit video art scene and an appreciation of the role of Isuma Productions in that particular Inuit community. Furthermore, Miller offers a comprehensive and far-reaching survey covering over five decades worth of programming – as well as the related publicity, fan discourse, journalistic and academic criticism – while Evans' work is a much more intimate case study of a particular creative co-operative operating under unique conditions.

Miller's volume could almost be considered two books in one. The first half sets up a framework for analysing representations of both Canada's North and its Native peoples, and then provides a chronological survey of aboriginal characters in Canadian television series since the 1950s. The second half of the book is a more in-depth treatment of *North of 60*, a long-running and popular television drama. Throughout the book, Miller demonstrates how "dramatic representations of First Nations in series television have changed significantly over time, sometime ahead of the perceptions of the audience, sometimes reflecting them" (4). In tandem with her analysis of how representations of Native people have evolved, she also chronicles the encouraging trends towards greater creative input of Native talent in various capacities: starting with those series from early television which cast white actors in Native roles, through the use of Native actors as unofficial cultural advisors in numerous series of the 70s and 80s, to the employment of Dene consultants on every episode of *North of 60* and the use of aboriginal talent on both sides of the camera in *Spirit Bay*. She also highlights how particular long-standing issues related to aboriginal communities have been framed differently across various television series, and how this framing is related not only to evolving sensibilities but also to genre expectations and production contexts. She stresses the cumulative effect of these representations, noting that "for good or ill, by engaging the imagination through drama rather than through news or documentary, television was able to work powerfully on its audience and their attitudes to First Nations peoples" (395). At the same time, she isn't overly enthusiastic about the actual results of this campaign, concluding that "since its inception in 1952, CBC television [the national public broadcaster] has rarely been far out in front of the general audience in the way it represents 'Indians', while the private networks ... have scarcely been in the parade" (394).

In many ways, the book is a treatise in favour of a more progressive television culture and increased (or at least reliably stable) public funding. It seems to be aimed primarily at a Canadian readership, with frequent use of the first person plural to refer to non-Aboriginal Canadians, and occasional compliments directed at Canadian audiences in comparison to their southern neighbours. For example, she claims that "since the earliest days of live Canadian television drama, Canadian viewers have

tolerated, even preferred, in their own television drama open endings, ambiguities, a refusal to present oversimplifications or a quick fix for a long-standing social problem" (399). Setting aside for the moment the fact that Canadian audiences do tend to watch a lot of American television (calling into question the idea that tastes are so drastically different from one side of the border to the other), in many cases international audiences have also enjoyed Canadian series; *North of 60*, for example, was sold to 122 countries world-wide, and Miller herself demonstrates that the fan culture surrounding the show has a very healthy contingent of American viewers. The shows are therefore important texts for exploring how Canada presents itself not only to itself but also to the global public. Miller generally applauds those series that have attained international exposure – not coincidentally, they are the same series that tended to do well in Canada too – noting that "the face of Canada in countries all around the world continues to be the face of *The Beachcombers* and *North of 60*. To be very Canadian about it – we could do worse" (234).

Much of the book consists of synopses of specific episodes and other explanatory passages. For example, there is a lengthy section on the characters from *North of 60* that is more descriptive than analytical. While in other contexts this might become tedious, here it is necessary since the central argument requires a fairly good familiarity with the series themselves, and it would be difficult for the reader to find and watch the episodes him/herself. Indeed, Miller references a lot of material that is no longer available elsewhere. For example, she devotes a chapter to *Radisson*, a late-1950s series which was notable as the first Canadian series to feature Native characters (although not Native actors). No copies of any episodes survive, and although Miller mentions having seen the series herself as a teenager, she is now limited in her research to written archival sources such as an episode guide and some publicity documents. She was able to access episodes of *North of 60* through various archives, but even that very popular and relatively recent series has never been made available on DVD. Furthermore, many of her analyses of fan discourse surrounding the shows rely heavily on websites and other internet-based forums, many of which have since disappeared from the web. The book therefore represents an

important record of this type of ephemeral material that might otherwise be lost completely. As such, it will surely serve as a vital resource for future researchers working in this field as they search for a historical perspective to contextualize ongoing developments in aboriginal representation in film and television. Miller herself provides some suggestions on the directions that both research and television production could pursue; in particular, she makes a strong argument for the importance of public funding for serious adult drama representing First Nations peoples on *mainstream* Canadian television, and not only on specialty channels as seems to be the current trend. She ends her book with a hope for future television drama "made by partnerships of writers, producers, and directors from both the inside and the outside that builds bridges between the two worlds" (406).

While Miller advocates a greater involvement of Native talent, seemingly under the assumption that more Native input will result in more authentic and culturally sensitive output, Evans problematizes this assumption in his book, noting that "The question of whether putting video cameras in the hands of indigenous people represents a triumph over Western colonialism or a more insidious form of it produces a complex answer" (139). In his case-study on the Igloolik-based video collective Isuma, Evans focuses on the ways that its production activities differ from Southern models – or what would typically be called "Western" models in scholarship from other perspectives. Probably the most internationally-recognized of Isuma Productions' films since its incorporation in 1990 is the Inuktitut-language feature film *Atanarjuat: The Fast Runner*, which won the Camera d'Or at Cannes in 2001. The film's international success is a worthy subject for academic attention, but for Evans – like for the members of Isuma – the fundamentally Inuit character of Isuma's production process is of far greater interest than the televisual text that happens to be the result of that process. Evans' primary objective is therefore to explore how the Isuma videographers have been able to adapt the technology of video to suit their own cultural and communal needs, with only secondary consideration given to how the resulting products were circulated to and received by a wider audience. Most of the information in Evans' book comes first-hand from the members of the collective themselves and from his own observations during a

nine month stay in Igloolik. He adopts a broadly ethnographic approach: descriptions of day-to-day life in the tiny and remote (by Southern standards) village help to set the context for his description of Isuma's video operations.

Perhaps unavoidably, the book spends a good deal of time on the biographies and careers of the main players on the Isuma team, particularly Zacharias Kunuk and Norman Cohn. Evans follows Kunuk closely, and it is clear that the author's opinions are greatly influenced by those of the artist. At times, he defers perhaps a little too readily to his principal informants, and so his own voice gets lost as he essentially acts as a mouthpiece for Kunuk and the rest of the Isuma team. For example, he readily accepts Kunuk's criticisms of the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation (IBC), which also has a branch in Igloolik, and at which Kunuk began his career in video. Kunuk claims that the IBC is far too influenced by Southern values, with its headquarters in Ottawa and its steady funding from the Department of Canadian Heritage. (Isuma by contrast receives most of its operating budget through project-specific grants from state-sponsored arts organizations, such as Telefilm or the National Film Board). Noting also that much of the training for Inuit television producers comes from the South, and that the IBC tends to reproduce many of the features of mainstream television production culture (such as being deadline-driven), Evans contends that the IBC "is a colonial enterprise in that it impresses the objectives of a dominant society onto an aboriginal society, and it is insidious in that it does so with a Native face" (123). This is an interesting critique, and to his credit Evans includes some very relevant academic theory on indigenous media, but the IBC could have been given some space to defend themselves. To balance the scales slightly, the author does lend a few short sentences to Isuma's own critics (they remain unidentified) who claim that Kunuk's condemnation both of the IBC and of the guidelines enforced by granting agencies are simply self-serving; in other words, that Isuma's real goals are "the acquisition of large sums of money and the freedom to spend the money any way they choose" and that "Isuma's efforts are directed less at cultural preservation and social survival and more at the personal accumulation of power and control" (136-7).

The focus on funding processes at times seems somewhat petty, but the implications are quite important. By exploring the unique vision of Isuma productions, Evans raises questions with a broader significance: for example, who gets to represent a minority culture to the dominant culture? Given that there is more public money available for English- and French-language documentaries (including those on Native subjects) than for indigenous-language productions on the same topics, Isuma's interpretation of the government's message is that "when it comes to video portrayals of indigenous cultures, presentation is more acceptable than self-presentation" (133). Although Evans supports Isuma's anti-colonial critique of the establishment, he doesn't seem to acknowledge the irony of his own academic project in this context. Nevertheless, he is right in stressing the fact that even in the most carefully and sensitively produced documentaries and dramas, there is still an important difference between accuracy and authorship. It is in part for this reason that the work done by Isuma is both ground-breaking in artistic terms and fascinating in academic and theoretical ones.

Both *Isuma* and *Outside Looking In* are written in a clear and accessible language that befits the kind of interdisciplinary work which may attract scholars from a variety of disciplines. Furthermore, both books are organized into chapters with many short sub-sections, each quite intuitively titled, making it easy to skim through or to read those passages that are of highest interest to individual readers. In fact, Evans' book – though very thoroughly researched – is concise enough for a casual reader, and given that the subject itself is so remarkable, the book will certainly appeal to those with even a tangential interest in the Inuit or in video art. Miller's volume, on the other hand, is much more involved and requires serious mental engagement in order to keep track of the many different series and characters discussed (at least after the introductory chapters, which provide a useful and accessible survey of the relevant theoretical perspectives). For that reason, it will probably appeal most to those who are looking for a very detailed and thorough consideration of this important topic. In that case, it won't disappoint: even tipping the scales at nearly 500 pages, Miller has clearly had to edit out entire chapters which she provides instead to interested readers via her website.

The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks**Edited by Peter Graham and Ginette Vincendeau**

London: Palgrave, 2009. ISBN: 978-84457-282-3. 48 illustrations. x+274 pp. £14.99 (pbk).

Stardom in Postwar France**Edited by John Gaffney and Diana Holmes**

New York: Berghahn, 2007. ISBN: 978-1-84545-020-5. 5 illustrations. viii+239 pp. £37.50 (hbk).

A Review by John Berra, Nanjing University, China

Auteur theory and studies of star identity are two subjects which are integral to the field of film analysis and, while only the former is French in origin, the latter is extremely relevant when discussing the cultural modernisation of France and its entertainment industry following the Second World War. The second edition of *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks* and the recently published edited collection *Stardom in Postwar France* provide valuable insight into these areas, and both cover the period in which a radical break from tradition seemed necessary in order for French culture to flourish at home and on the world stage, albeit via distinctly different critical approaches. The former is an expanded edition of the anthology of writings by the critics and filmmakers who were closely associated with the French New Wave, while the latter tackles the topic of stardom, taking some theoretical guidance from earlier, more general texts on the subject, but navigating a unique and consistently argued line of enquiry into the cultural significance of celebrity.

The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks begins with Ginette Vincendeau's introductory essay, 'Fifty Years of the French New Wave', which provides a thorough review of the literature that has been published on the subject since the academic emergence of auteur studies in the 1960s to the present day. She is particularly critical of James Monaco's *The New Wave: Truffaut, Godard, Chabrol, Rohmer, Rivette* (Oxford University Press, 1976), as Monaco structures his study of the movement in alignment with the popular perception of the directors who are most associated with it. Vincendeau believes that this is indicative

of the "clear pecking order" (11) which often hinders such attempts to analyse the French New Wave, and notes that Monaco, "devotes five chapters to Godard, four to Truffaut and one to each of the other three" (11) and goes on to state that Godard and Truffaut have both been the subject of over twenty books, while the number of studies of Chabrol, Rohmer and Rivette is much smaller by comparison. *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks* does not entirely readdress the balance, once again allocating key sections to discussions of Truffaut and Godard, whose dazzling directorial debut *À bout de souffle* (1960) is the subject of the case study which closes the text. However, its inclusion of the landmark essays 'A Certain Tendency in French Cinema' by Francois Truffaut and 'La Politique des auteurs' by Andre Bazin alongside such equally opinionated pieces as 'Little Themes' by Claude Chabrol and Robert Benayoun's 'The Emperor Has No Clothes', makes this second edition an ideal starting point for students and cinephiles alike to familiarise themselves with the intense theoretical debate which still surrounds the French New Wave, not to mention the unique personalities whose work as both critics and filmmakers, swiftly spurred the movement to mainstream prominence and commercial acceptance.

This second edition of *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks* distinguishes itself from the earlier incarnation of the anthology through the inclusion of the aforementioned 1954 essay by Truffaut, and the case study of *À bout de souffle*. Truffaut's essay attacked the reliance on 'psychological realism' in the mainstream French cinema of the period and elaborated on its limitations, insisting that "there are only seven or eight writers who work regularly for the French cinema" (53) and accusing each of them of having "only one story to tell" (53). Within the essay itself, Truffaut concedes that many of his comments are "deliberately pessimistic" (60), but his writing reflects the critical disenchantment that would be partially responsible for the flurry of filmmaking activity towards the end of the decade that would come to constitute the French New Wave. The case study of *À bout de souffle* re-prints three reviews from 1960-1962, with each critic expressing contrasting views of Godard's breakthrough success. Luc Moullet notes that, "with Godard spontaneity is more important than the formula" (227) and finds the film to be the "most representative" (221) of the New Wave movement, while Georges Sadoul is somewhat torn between not liking the

characters, and being touched by the extended second act set entirely in a hotel room, which he describes as a, "double soliloquy on the incommunicability of two lovers" (237). Raymond Borde, however, exhibits sheer contempt for the film, describing it as, "clumsy, halting and as badly put together as a page written by a six year old" (228) whilst also expressing frustration with his fellow critics and publications such as *Le Monde* for jumping on the bandwagon and creating a cult around Godard's debut. The 'spontaneity' which Moullet enjoys is simply "sheer amateurism" (231) according to Borde, who believes that Godard "must have said to himself that there were bound to be a few naive people who would hail the birth of a new style" (230) and dismisses the director's technique as simply "slapping together bits of film shot at random" (230).

While many of the articles collected for this collection may seem reactionary in nature, they are entirely in keeping with the ethos of the French New Wave as a filmmaking movement which was ignited in the pages of the magazine *Cahiers du Cinema*. In the interview with Truffaut that follows his own essay, the critic-turned-director admits that many of his films have been made as reactions to other films, some of which were made by other directors and some of which were made by himself, or his associates. Perhaps this second edition of *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks* would have benefitted from a concluding chapter examining the legacy of the movement in order to place it within the wider contextual scope of cinematic history. However, readers seeking such a perspective could follow this collection of essays with Barry Keith Grant's *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader* (Blackwell, 2008) which features the essays by Truffaut and André Bazin alongside later pieces by Robin Wood and Peter Lehman, and also Naomi Green's *The French New Wave: A New Look* (Wallflower, 2007) which succinctly explores the social and culture change in France which led to the critical attitude that permeates many of the essays in *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*.

The French New Wave, and the popularity of its leading directors, is further explored in one of the essays in *Stardom in Postwar France*, with Godard once again being the subject of choice. However, this collection of essays covers a number of aspects of French cinema and national culture, offering a collective insight

into how success was achieved in a variety of interrelated fields, from film to politics to literature, within a specific time period. Therefore, Smith's aforementioned chapter on Godard sits comfortably alongside Holmes' study of Brigitte Bardot, and Johnson's enquiry into the intellectual celebrity attained by Claude Lévi-Strauss. Although a more exhaustive study of stardom within the French film industry has been provided by Vincendeau's *Stars and Stardom in French Cinema* (Continuum, 2000), and Richard Dyer's landmark text *Stars* (BFI, 1998) is often cited as the best starting point for 'star theory' in general, this latest addition to the wide variety of literature on the subject will be of interest to students seeking the appropriate theory with which to bridge cinematic stardom with celebrity as a whole. It also serves a successor to Greene's *Landscapes of Loss: The National Past in Postwar French Cinema* (Princeton University Press, 1999) which examined how French filmmakers attempted to maintain memories of a distant past whilst undertaking projects which were undeniably contemporary and politically progressive.

In their introduction, editors John Gaffney and Diana Holmes insist that "a study of stardom in a period of particular social change can reveal what is becoming and what is being left behind; what is being aspired to and what is being forgotten or denied" (1), yet they also subscribe to the notion that "stars can restate, often in new and modern forms, old identities and values" (1) and believe that it is this socially combustible combination of the old and the new "encapsulated in the phenomenon of French post-World War II Stardom" (1). The editors also provide a concise but clearly argued first chapter, 'Stardom and Theory in Context', which serves to introduce arguments about stardom and to detail the social-political climate of postwar France with reference to the entertainment sector and the 'generation gap' which occurred at the time as the youth of the nation sought to distinguish themselves from their elders, and were targeted by the retail and culture industries as a result. Gaffney and Holmes confidently reinforce their introductory argument, emphasising the multi-faceted, perhaps self-contradictory, natures of the stars who will be discussed in more detail later in the text; Johnny Hallyday was "at once rebellious teen hero and sober, patriotic conscript" (23), while Raymond Poulidor's status as a national celebrity "rested on his

combination of a very modern talent as sporting entrepreneur with the traditional values of the French peasant" (23) and, although the essay that Holmes contributes on Brigitte Bardot is titled 'The Girl of Today', she and Gaffney assert that "both on and off screen her assertion of female desire was firmly recuperated for a more traditional politics of gender" (23). Most of the eight case studies that follow approach their subject from a similar perspective, making this a consistently argued volume, although inevitably some repetition of theory and academic reference points does result.

Providing the most explicit link with *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, Alison Smith's essay on Godard argues that it is possible to consider some directors as stars, even though their presence is behind the camera, on the grounds that their reputations lead to a widespread public knowledge of their work, while their public personas are partly the result of their own mastery of self-promotion and filtered through various forms of mass media, cultivating trade-mark images and leading to general interest in their private lives and personal pursuits. This criteria obviously fits many successful directors of different nationalities, from Alfred Hitchcock to Steven Spielberg, or Quentin Tarantino to Takashi Miike, but Smith makes a convincing, if conventional, argument for Godard, discussing his awareness of alternate forms of media and the importance of attaching his celebrity to that of others, his association with the politicised youth movement of the day, and mystique he acquired during his 'disappearances' from mainstream filmmaking. Smith suggests that it is Godard's refusal to become "familiar or integrated" (149) that has made him a star, contrasting with such New Wave founders as Chabrol and Rivette who are undeniably established but whose names are not as ensconced in the popular lexicon, and there are parallels with Christopher Johnson's essay about Lévi-Strauss who is considered to be "the romantic outsider, the restless and nomadic protagonist of *Tristes tropiques* who feels at home nowhere and who is not of his time" (173).

Studies of more conventional forms of stardom are provided by the aforementioned essays about Bardot and Hallyday. Both essays examine the contradictory nature of their subjects; that they were at once fiercely modern icons, and yet were also media

identities utilised by the establishment to reaffirm certain social and national values. Holmes adopts Dyer as her analytical starting point, acknowledging that her subject conforms to his assertion that 'stars' are intertextual and that their identities and ideologies are communicated through multimedia; in the case of Bardot, becoming "the darling and the victim of the paparazzi, the subject in France of more press coverage than President de Gaulle, a recording artist, a television performer, and a semi-deity" (43). Although Holmes acknowledges that Bardot was a figure of liberation for French women of the period, she also fitted back into a "traditional definition of femininity" (63) by the media, thereby accepting male authority while also empowering the female youth of the day. Chris Tinker has a similar view of Johnny Hallyday, the recording star and actor, often referred to as 'the French Elvis', who may have found initial success due to a rebellious rock-and-roll image, but would later become a more conventional role model as a dutiful soldier and a devoted husband. As with Bardot, Hallyday represented a break from tradition, but also a means of re-establishing the cultural industry and Tinker notes that Hallyday "represents the paradox that sees French rock 'n' roll both as an oppositional expression of young, male, working-class disaffection and as a recuperable and marketable commodity of youth culture" (82).

In their conclusion, Gaffney and Holmes find a link between "the stylish modernity" (221) of the French New Wave and the heightened celebrity culture of the postwar period, with both benefitting from the emergence of new media. While the re-printed essays in *The French New Wave: Critical Landmarks* encapsulate an exciting time of cultural change with their fierce opinions and alternative approach towards reading film, the essays commissioned for *Stardom in Postwar France* benefit from being positioned within an established field of academic enquiry and, as such, are equally rewarding, if less immediately invigorating. In conclusion, both of these texts succeed as academic snapshots of the French culture industry at a time of great change, and should serve to provoke discussion and debate when considered in conjunction with some of the broader studies referenced in this review.

Satire TV: Politics and Comedy in the Post-Network Era**Edited by Jonathan Gray, Jeffrey P. Jones, and Ethan Thompson**

New York: NYU Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-8147-3198-7. xiv + 283 pp. £13.99 (pbk), £51.00 (hbk).

A Review by Evan Elkins, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA

It is a misfortune of timing that erstwhile satirist Al Franken's defeat of incumbent Republican Norm Coleman in Minnesota's 2008 US Senate race occurred too late for inclusion in the new anthology *Satire TV: Politics and Comedy in the Post-Network Era*. Franken's crossover from ironic commentator to sincere participant represents a remarkably clear indication of one of the book's chief preoccupations: the reciprocal influence and blurred boundaries between political satire and civic participation. In *Satire TV*, editors Jonathan Gray, Jeffrey P. Jones, and Ethan Thompson present a collection of media scholarship that investigates these dynamics in cable- and convergence-era American, British, and Canadian political television satire. Exemplified most visibly by programs such as *The Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report*, this satire often represents a significant site of resistance against systems of political power. Rather than theorizing a faceless hegemonic order, however, the twelve pieces in *Satire TV* all interrogate satire's texts, performers, and audiences in their specific socio-political, cultural, and industrial contexts, focusing primarily on satire's interactions with and effects on particular political institutions, figures, and worldviews. Since the majority of the pieces look at American satire from the early 2000s, the anthology largely represents an investigation of satire in and of post-9/11 America during the presidency of George W. Bush.

After a brief forward by David Marc, *Satire TV* begins with an essay in which Gray, Jones, and Thompson define the parameters of the research contained within the book and trace the history of political satire's televisual existence. Opening with a description of one of the previous decade's most notorious public collisions between satire and "real" American politics, Stephen Colbert's

evisceration of Bush at the 2006 White House Correspondents' Association Dinner, Gray, Jones, and Thompson highlight the moment as a microcosm of political satire's increased visibility and relevance in the post-network age. They note that Colbert's performance represents five key characteristics of post-network political satire: 1) its popularity 2) its virality and cult appeal 3) its articulation of subjective definitions of "humour" based on one's political philosophy 4) the "sad irony that contemporary satire TV often says what the press is too timid to say" and 5) its ability to engage political discussion and participation (4). The introduction is particularly strong when offering definitive boundaries for satire - a concept notoriously difficult to pin down. Gray, Jones, and Thompson parse through the often-blurry definitions of terms such as satire, comedy, humour, and parody while provocatively arguing that laughter is not a necessary component of satire. This offers a precise vocabulary for the book's conversations about mediated comedy while expanding conceptions of what might be considered a satirical text. This illumination of satire as a distinct, yet far-reaching, mode of televisual practice is one of *Satire TV's* most significant contributions to media scholarship and studies of comedic genres more broadly.

The anthology is divided into four sections, each containing three chapters. After the editors' introduction, the first section, 'Post 9/11, Post Modern, or Just Post Network?' continues with two chapters on presidential satire. The second section, 'Fake News, Real Funny', offers three methodologically distinct analyses of the fake news genre exemplified by *The Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report*. Part three, 'Building in the Critical Rubble: Between Deconstruction and Reconstruction', investigates satire's ability to construct new systems of interpretation and political intelligence, countering the charge that satire is merely concerned with deconstruction. The final section, 'Shock and Guffaw: The Limits of Satire', explores the boundaries of satire's ability to provoke politically progressive forms of reception.

These divisions form an organizational framework that is systematic, clear, and a significant contributor to the collection's argumentative logic. In particular, 'Fake News, Real Funny' exemplifies one of the anthology's strongest assets: its thorough, interdisciplinary approach. While its presentation of three

successive chapters analyzing *The Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report* seems initially repetitive, each article takes a different methodological tack, and the three pieces add up to a well-rounded understanding of *The Daily Show* and Colbert's places in contemporary television satire and American politics. First, Amber Day's 'And Now...the News? Mimesis and the Real in *The Daily Show*' looks at the ways in which that program plays with conceptions of what constitutes "real" news. Next, Joanne Morreale's 'Jon Stewart and *The Daily Show*: I Thought You Were Going to be Funny!' deploys rhetorical analysis in order to investigate the program's epideictic rhetorical strategies and situations. Finally, Geoffrey Baym's 'Stephen Colbert's Parody of the Postmodern' filters *The Colbert Report* and its host's self-aware cult of personality through an analysis of postmodern politics and textuality by arguing that Colbert represents a parodic critique of the false, empty, postmodern simulacrum of "news" presented on cable channels such as Fox News. Though Day, Morreale, and Baym arrive at similar conclusions - all revolving around *The Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report* as exemplary of progressive inquiry into contemporary politics - doing so via divergent methodologies and theoretical frames bolsters the validity of these conclusions and points to satire TV's resonance across multiple discursive planes.

The book's comprehensive approach comes to the fore in a different way in the anthology's final section, which attempts to pull off a difficult task: highlighting the limits of political satire without undercutting the book's preceding arguments for its vitality and progressive potential. In particular, the pieces in this section highlight the processes by which the fluidity of reception might enact interpretations in opposition to a preferred reading. As Bambi Haggins points out in 'In the Wake of 'The Nigger Pixie': Dave Chappelle and the Politics of Crossover Comedy', these interpretive differences can have dangerous consequences and, in the mind of the viewer, may reinforce harmful racial stereotypes rather than critique them. Avi Santo's 'Of Niggas and Citizens: *The Boondocks* Fans and Differentiated Black American Politics' closes the anthology with a look at the ways in which the Adult Swim program *The Boondocks* engenders a differentiated black politics that "stresses the importance of economic success for black cultural survival but is ambivalent toward the ways material

wealth destroys community solidarity" (253). In both pieces, but particularly Haggins's, the reader is left with an ambivalent vision of what satire television might achieve *vis-à-vis* the promotion of progressive politics. She ends her article with the blunt proclamation, "As long as there is racism, doing racial satire will be problematic" (248). This statement is deliberately unsatisfying, but it offers a necessary corrective to the preceding chapters' overall sense of optimism. On the same hand, that very optimism keeps Haggins' piece from seeming overly pessimistic, resulting in not just an analytical balance but a tonal one as well.

Ultimately, Haggins and Santo's essays represent essential contributions to the volume's larger examination of mediated American politics. However, much of the book's analysis of political experience is just that - American. While the volume's stars-and-stripes-laden jacket indicates the USA-centric focus of the book, the introduction frames the anthology as an investigation into political satire in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. However, only two of the twelve pieces, Jonathan Gray's 'Throwing Out the Welcome Mat: Public Figures as Guests and Victims in TV Satire' and Serra Tinic's 'Speaking 'Truth' to Power? Television Satire, *Rick Mercer Report*, and the Politics of Place and Space' venture outside of the United States in any significant manner. The unfortunate result is that these essays may seem initially to be token inclusions, and the book often reads as one about American political satire with occasional gestures toward international analysis. At worst, this emphasis ironically reinforces the very American hegemony that Tinic highlights in her analysis of Canadian political satire's critique of American arrogance. That Gray and Tinic's pieces are two of the book's most perceptive pushes against this criticism somewhat, and they both shed necessary light on the global and transnational functions of political satire. Indeed, the strength of these pieces leads one to lament that the book does not follow through on its promised international scope as thoroughly as it might have.

Still, no one volume can touch on everything, and despite these qualms, *Satire TV* represents a valuable investigation into the complex relationships among mediated politics, televisual comedy, media reception, and democratic participation. With academic studies of comedy still representing a somewhat small

(but ever-growing) facet of the media studies canon, Gray, Jones, and Thompson's anthology represents a worthy primer on the broad functions of satirical media, a timely investigation of a contemporary televisual phenomenon, and an argument for further examination of the political dimensions of television comedy. With a wealth of global political satire still largely unstudied, *Satire TV* offers a model by which scholars of media might continue to comprehend and analyze satirical texts, contexts, and receptions.

Gilles Deleuze: Cinema and Philosophy

By Paola Marrati. Translated by Alisa Hartz

Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-8018-8802-1. xix + 138 pp. £30.00 (hbk).

Cinematic Mythmaking: Philosophy in Film

By Irving Singer

Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-262-19589-8. x + 243 pp. £16.99 (hbk).

A Review by Alexander Thimons, Northwestern University, USA

In two recent books, Paola Marrati and Irving Singer provide widely divergent views on the ways cinema studies and philosophy intersect, and on how such intersections can make fruitful contributions to both fields. The texts - Marrati's *Gilles Deleuze: Cinema and Philosophy* and Singer's *Cinematic Mythmaking: Philosophy and Film* - differ in tone, style, and scope, but both demonstrate that serious consideration of films of all types can benefit greatly from an engagement with philosophical questions. What exactly such questions are, and the specific uses to which they can be put, provide the thrust of each book.

For those looking for an exceptional introduction to Deleuze's two books on the cinema, Marrati's text will be a valuable resource, but this is no Cliffs Notes Deleuze, for several reasons. First, anyone who has encountered *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* and *Cinema 2: The Time Image* (University of Minnesota Press, 1986 and 1989, respectively) knows that the books do not lend themselves to facile summaries. Further, those already familiar with the *Cinema* books will benefit from Marrati's insights far more than those who have not yet encountered them. Second, and more importantly, Marrati also forwards a provocative and refreshing thesis in her own right. In the 'Preface' added for the English edition, she makes explicit the claim that is implied through much of the discussion that follows: "the best political philosophy of Gilles Deleuze can be found in his Cinema books" (xv). Readers will find compelling support for such an assertion throughout *Gilles Deleuze*.

Marrati's organization follows that of the *Cinema* books rather closely, with the first three chapters focusing on the primary concerns of *Cinema 1*, the movement-image, perception, and montage, respectively, and the latter three discussing post-war cinema, the time-image proper, and immanence, the province of *Cinema 2*. A preface, introduction, brief conclusion, and additional essay based on a 2006 lecture provide valuable context. Though she addresses nearly all of his major claims, she leaves discussion of individual films, with few exceptions, to Deleuze himself. This is not to say that film is not important to Marrati, but rather that important philosophical claims that may be lost among Deleuze's breathless litany of brief, supporting film analyses in the *Cinema* books are here drawn into focus on their own. This gives the claims a clarity that is appreciated, though readers inclined to do so might do well to have Deleuze's books at the ready; Marrati often directs readers to multi-page passages in her notes. Also absent is any sustained engagement with other analyses of Deleuze's work; aside from brief mention of Rancière, and occasional reference to unnamed critics of the *Cinema* books, Marrati avoids recent Deleuze scholarship, preferring instead to remain within the philosophical milieu in which Deleuze initially wrote the books - that is to say, primarily among Bergson and Nietzsche.

By leaving analyses of individual films to Deleuze himself, Marrati provides readers a work of striking authority and precision. It may be folly to suggest that Bergson's importance to the *Cinema* books is underestimated; after all, several of their chapters deal explicitly with Bergson. Nevertheless, the early chapters of Marrati's text render particularly clear Bergson's influence on Deleuze, and the ways in which the two philosophers diverge. Consider chapter two, 'Cinema and Perception'. In a dense but readable sixteen pages, Marrati introduces Heidegger's 'The Age of the World Picture', (*The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, Harper Torchbooks, 1982) and quickly compares it with the first, important chapter of Bergson's *Matter and Memory*, (Zone Books, 1990), explaining Deleuze's affinity for the latter, and drawing a series of equivalences that help explain Bergson's complicated theory of images (and its relationship to Einsteinian relativity). Before the chapter ends, Marrati will have further explained Bergsonian consciousness, parsed perception-,

action-, and affection-images, the often-confusing subcategories of the movement-image, and isolated the importance of cinema to Deleuze's brand of Bergsonism. It may seem overwhelming, but Marrati's efficiency and clarity ensure that it is not.

Marrati never deviates from this rigorous, dense-yet-readable style, with the exception of the additional essay in the appendix, which is conversational in comparison. Nevertheless, in later chapters, which focus on the time-image and cite Deleuze's other texts more than they do Bergson's, the work, without sacrificing such rigor, becomes almost lyrical in its elucidation of Deleuzian immanence and the importance of belief to *Cinema 2*. Here, the importance of the *Cinema* books to Deleuze's larger philosophy is brilliantly elucidated. This is no simple task. Deleuze, for his part, has provided fodder for critics by describing the *Cinema* books as a taxonomic, rather than historical, project, while in a seeming contradiction tracing the crisis of the movement-image to the historical trauma of World War II and the Holocaust. Marrati convincingly argues that Deleuze's achievement cannot be a historical one, since history itself is no longer sustainable as a concept within his paradigm. The crisis of the movement-image is concomitant with the crisis of history, so the time-image's emergence is after the possibility of a universal or revolutionary historical progression has lapsed. As Marrati says, "Time presents itself where history fades away" (65). As she does earlier with the movement-image, in the final two chapters Marrati concisely and lucidly reviews the time-image and its subsidiaries -crystalline images, sheets of the past, and so on - but here such terminological discussions yield most clearly to a discussion of the rather daunting philosophical concept of "belief in the world". (85-6) Whereas "'Classic' cinema simultaneously constitutes and participates in the revolutionary dream of peoples" (79), the cinema of the time-image acknowledges that this belief has been ruptured, and builds alternate connections between humans and the world that do not depend on such history. "The world is indeed there, but what is now lacking is the hope required to create new possibilities of life in it. The true modern problem is thus the problem of a faith that can make the world livable and thinkable once again, not in itself, but for us" (89). A cinema of time strives to effect such faith without making recourse to now-ersatz historicism. The final pages of Marrati's text focus on the relation between *Cinema 2* and Deleuze and Guattari's *What is*

Philosophy? (Columbia University Press, 1996), which, she argues, builds implicitly on the *Cinema* books in its discussion of philosophy's relation to immanence.

Thus readers looking for an introduction to Deleuze's work on cinema will find it in Marrati's evident commitment to precision and her remarkable clarity in the face of a series of notoriously complex texts. Such readers may be surprised, however, to find that an introduction to the *Cinema* books is also an introduction to the most important aspects of Deleuze's philosophy as a whole. After reading *Gilles Deleuze*, readers may find themselves compelled to view the texts, and *The Time Image* in particular, in terms of the ethical position necessitated by our inability to relate to the world in the belief that we can change it through revolutionary and historical change, and by the ways in which new links to the world might be thinkable outside of such a historical-chronological conception of time.

While *Gilles Deleuze*, then, is a rigorous elaboration of a relatively small body of texts, Singer's *Cinematic Mythmaking* has a much wider purview, examining a variety of films that demonstrate cinema's mythmaking capacity. Indeed, Singer argues that cinema, playing the role that other media did in previous eras, is the primary means through which myths are produced and disseminated. Myths, per Singer, can have cosmological, heroic or evaluative themes, or an amalgam of the three, and the essays trace how well-known myths are modulated to suit the times and societies in which they were made. Furthermore, Singer argues that myths address, through different means, many of the questions engaged by philosophers, and so an awareness of the mythmaking function of cinema is also a key to its philosophical import.

Those accustomed to the deliberateness of a more explicitly theoretical text like Marrati's may be given pause by Singer's casual writing style, which, in his words, "precludes the pomposity of authorial claims to objective assurance" (x). To view this as a fault of the book, however, is to miss the point entirely. In a 'Prefatory Note,' Singer begins by stating that the book is an "accumulation of thoughts and writings" (ix) drawn from a series of courses he taught at MIT, and a "panoply of insights and ideas that matter to [him]..." (x). Swiftly, the tone is set, and the

ensuing essays follow in precisely this manner: conversational, engaging discussions by an infectious enthusiastic cinephile. Though it may take readers a while to become accustomed to the unconventional cadence of Singer's writing, they will be rewarded with a series of engaging essays and, as promised in the note, no shortage of insights.

After a brief introduction, there are five chapters and no conclusion. Each works closely with a small number of films, their mythological antecedents, and in some instances other source materials on which the films were based. The first, for instance, examines *The Lady Eve* (Preston Sturges, 1941) and the Adam and Eve myth; the second, *Pygmalion* from Ovid through George Cukor's *My Fair Lady* (1964). Though there is usually a primary myth examined in each chapter, Singer happily does not limit himself to tracing strict parallels or to single films. The third chapter, for instance, studies Henry James's novel *Washington Square* (Simon & Schuster, 1986), the William Wyler film adaptation *The Heiress* (1949), Agnieszka Holland's 1997 adaptation *Washington Square*, along with an anecdote told to James by a friend which inspired the novel, as well as the stage play *The Heiress*, by Ruth and Augustus Goetz. Each of what Singer calls the narrative's "transformational entities" (84) has a particular relationship to myths relating to romantic love, particularly those of Don Juan and Dido and Aeneas, and to the Romanticism against which James tried to position himself. The previous chapters, and the final two, one on Cocteau, and another on Fellini and Kubrick, are similarly structured.

This structure reflects Singer's description of the book as an "accumulation of thoughts," and many of those thoughts will appeal to a wide variety of individual readers. In my reading, I was particularly appreciative of Singer's treatment of cinematic sound and music as integral to understanding the films he discusses here. Too often such aspects are ignored. Also, such discussions allow him to make frequent recourse to eighteenth and nineteenth century operas, which emerge as important mythmakers in those centuries. In fact, nineteenth-century Romanticism, both in opera and in other media, informs several of the essays. Elsewhere, Singer notes uses of formal devices and cinematic conventions as mythmaking tools; these sections are almost always persuasive. When discussing the film adaptation of

Pygmalion (Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard, 1938), Singer discusses mythic temporality, and argues that "the rubric 'once upon a time,' which is characteristic of mythmaking, itself abstracts us from the parameters of our habitual life from day to day. The term signifies a non-historic time, not before recorded history but outside it..." (63). Any similarity to Marrati's discussion of Deleuzian temporality is only incidental. Instead, he demonstrates how *Pygmalion's* use of "cascading montages" (64) allows a demonstration of this mythic temporality in a manner not possible without cinematic technologies. Discussions such as these demonstrate both the affection Singer has for the cinema and the intense consideration he gave to the films discussed.

Readers may also recognize Singer's voice as that of a well-regarded academic, with a score of books to his name, whether through the authority with which he discusses everyone from Nietzsche to Freud, his building upon his own large body of work, or in an occasional "tell it like it is" sense of mischief. Statements like "Bergson's concept of intuition is therefore mistaken, or at least useless" (9), or, in reference to Cavell's and Marian Keane's analyses of *The Lady Eve*, "[Their] mode of interpretation seems to me unneeded and far-fetched" (46) are sure to provoke a grin, if not necessarily assent. Of course, these statements are contextualized to some extent in the actual text. Elsewhere, readers may find their eyebrows arching after one paragraph, and then their heads nodding in agreement after the next. I often found myself wanting further explanations, both of the statements I found questionable, and of the many instances when I was intrigued and convinced by what Singer had to say.

In fact, both books left me eager for more, not because of their failings, but because the questions they raised and addressed were far from exhausted by what they had to say about them. I will certainly view the films Singer discusses in a new light when I encounter them in the future; further, I feel as though, through reading *Cinematic Mythmaking*, I have been introduced to the author's vast oeuvre, to which I will return, especially to seek out the books on love and sexuality that he occasionally references. In Marrati's case, I look forward to reading more of her own work, and I am also excited to return to Deleuze's texts with a greater appreciation of the importance the *Cinema* books have in his thinking as a whole. Both ask readers to reevaluate the

Book Reviews

relation between cinema and philosophy, and though they go about such a project in different ways, I consider myself convinced.

Puzzle Films: Complex Storytelling in Contemporary Cinema

Edited by Warren Buckland

Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-4051-6862-5 250 pp. £19.99 (pbk).

A Review by Chris Pallant, Bangor University, UK

The admission by Cole Sear (Haley Joel Osment) that he can see dead people in M. Night Shyamalan's *The Sixth Sense* (1999) prompts, for the vast majority of first-time viewers, one of the most unexpected narratological twists in modern cinema. This moment of revelation also reflected - microcosmically - what had become a growing condition of cinema during the 1990s: complex storytelling. Warren Buckland's edited collection, *Puzzle Films: Complex Storytelling in Contemporary Cinema*, which "examines the influence of this new storytelling epoch on contemporary cinema" (1), thus serves as a timely response to this recent cycle.

Buckland himself provides much of the early insight, offering both an introduction to the peculiarities of the puzzle film, during which he usefully applies classical narrative frameworks, such as Aristotle's *Poetics* and contemporary alternatives, namely the cognitivist approaches of David Bordwell and Edward Branigan. Buckland's introduction of Bordwell at such an early point in the anthology reflects the extent to which subsequent chapters borrow from, and build upon, the latter's cognitivist approaches to film spectatorship.

In the opening chapter, Thomas Elsaesser usefully discusses the varied hermeneutic approaches available to, what he terms, the "Mind-Game" film (19-40). Of particular interest is his assessment of the appeal of such films and the changing production ideologies that underpin them. Elsaesser observes that many of the responses to 'Mind-Game' films found on fan-sites "either ignore the fictional contract and treat the film as an extension of real life, to which factual information is relevant, or they tend to use the film as the start of a database, to which all sorts of other data - trivia, fine detail, esoteric knowledge - can be added, collected and shared" (35). Given that these

commentators are likely "very savvy media-consumers" (35), their disengagement with traditional strategies of interpretation, for Elsaesser, indicates the existence of an informal, yet shared, system of rules, which "permit participation" (35) in the 'Mind-Game' film. Consequently, such films become "part-text, part-archive, part-point of departure, part node in a rhizomatic, expandable network of inter-tribal communication" (35). Such spectatorial investment, Elsaesser concludes, sees the 'Mind-Game' film become the ideal product for DVD commodification - "DVD-enabled" (38), as he terms it - where multiple (chronologically dynamic) viewings and para-textual information are supported effortlessly.

The chapters by David Barratt, Stefano Ghislotti, and Chris Dzialo, which constitute the middle portion of the anthology, draw on Bordwell to help ground their respective case studies. In particular, Ghislotti follows Bordwell by adopting the Russian Formalist terms *fabula* (roughly translated as 'story') and *syuzhet* (the narratological mechanics that facilitate our interpretation of the story). Crucial for Ghislotti is Bordwell's assertion that "[d]epending on how the syuzhet presents the fabula, there will be particular spectatorial effects. Armed with the notion of different narrative principles and the concept of the syuzhet's distortion of fabula information, we can begin to account for the concrete narrational work of any film" (David Bordwell *Narration in the Fiction Film*, London: Routledge, 1986: 51).

Barratt makes excellent use of graphics to help illustrate the strategies employed by Shyamalan to prevent the first-time viewer anticipating the aforementioned twist. Whilst his study is well researched from a narratological and cognitivist perspective, it is surprising to find no reference made to Richard Dyer's influential study *Stars*. Surely, part of the success of Shyamalan's subterfuge lies in the audience's (exploitable) foreknowledge, their "preconceptions about a character" (Richard Dyer, *Stars*, BFI, 1999: 107), in this case Bruce Willis', which might lead them to assume the Willis character, as is the case in the majority of his films prior to *The Sixth Sense*, will survive the film (if not actively 'saving the day').

Ghislotti, like Barratt, makes use of graphical analysis, and also introduces mathematical formulae to help plot the intricate

narrative structure of Christopher Nolan's *Memento* (2000). One minor caveat, however: in this anthology it is Ghislotti's chapter, which, because of its extensive use of psychology, may provide the greatest challenge for a traditional film studies readership. Dzialo's chapter contributes to this field of enquiry by focusing on the works of scriptwriter Charlie Kaufmann. Given Kaufmann's slim directorial history and overt preoccupation with the issue of adaptation, Dzialo manages to engage this topic without letting the tired issue of 'intent' dominate. In fact, the *restrictions* of filmic adaptation underpin Dzialo's most insightful observations, such as identifying Kaufmann's desire resist the linearity of 'time's arrow', and to "change classical Hollywood storytelling and the way it is experienced to make it more complex, like flipping back and forth through a screenplay" (125).

The second half of the anthology is dedicated to tracing the development of puzzle films outside of the confines of American cinema. Michael Wedel's analysis of *Run Lola Run* (Tom Tykwer, 1998), stands out for its complex reconciliation of the tensions created between "a sequential ordering of events on the narrative level and... the spatio-temporal suspension of linearity on the level of the cinematic discourse, including the acoustic dimension, recurrent visual motifs, and the loss of goal-orientated character agency in the workings of the urban environment" (144-45). Following this, a series of articles, culminating with Eleftheria Thanouli's discussion of *Oldboy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003), tap into the rich vein of puzzle films that have come from Eastern filmmakers. Thanouli's chapter serves as a fitting conclusion, as she seeks to emphasise the complex existence of such films, arguing that *Oldboy* "is a typical product circulating in the networks of world cinema nowadays, stimulating questions such as 'what makes a film travel or "translate" to other cultures?'" (217), and, "and above all, 'how can one resolve the tension between Hollywood and national cinema in this increasing phase of globalization?'" (217). Ultimately, Thanouli concludes, in what could almost serve as a summation of the puzzle film genre as a whole, "[h]owever inventive Park's choices may appear, they are not path-breaking; rather, they seem to fit in with a wider trend in current filmmaking that strives to outgrow the classical norms and experiment with new tools and new territories" (230).

Book Reviews

Perhaps a better subtitle for the anthology might be 'Complex Storytelling in Contemporary *Live-Action* Cinema', because, despite Buckland's attempt to establish a sense of breadth in the latter half of his anthology (as is so often the case when the periphery of such a collection is approached), he falls short. Whilst numerous references are made to how the puzzle film might be helpfully re-conceived as a 'jumping off' point for the participant (spectator), little energy is spent exploring this in greater detail. Reference could have been made, for example, to the animated *The Animatrix* (Peter Chung, et al., 2003), which feeds off the complex storytelling nexus established in *The Matrix* trilogy (Andy and Lana Wachowski, 1999; 2003; 2003). Ultimately though, Buckland's collection does provide a thought-provoking study of what has become an important genre in contemporary cinema.

Superstar: The Karen Carpenter Story

By Glyn Davis

London: Wallflower, 2008. ISBN: 978-1-905674-88-6. 16 illustrations, 117 pp.
£10.00 (pbk).

A Review by Mike Miley, Flintridge Preparatory School, USA

Within cult cinema, Todd Haynes' film *Superstar: The Karen Carpenter Story* (1987) is in a class by itself. Haynes' film, best known for its all-Barbie Doll cast, was removed from circulation in 1989 when Richard Carpenter threatened to sue Haynes for unauthorized use of The Carpenters' music and image. Naturally, the injunction against the film catapulted *Superstar* into the pantheon of cult classics, making it a must-see film that admirers hear about years before getting an opportunity to see it. Any film would struggle to fulfill such a level of anticipation; the fact that a forty three-minute film starring Barbie dolls endures and overcomes its hype testifies to the singular merit of *Superstar*.

Glyn Davis' book *Superstar: The Karen Carpenter Story*, one of the more recent entries in Wallflower Press' Cultographies series, provides the reader with a deep appreciation of how unique *Superstar's* cult standing is and demonstrates that cult cinema can take on forms other than midnight screenings and raucous audience participation. This intriguing, multi-faceted look at the life, death, and resurrection of the most notorious rock biopic of all time functions as a rock n' roll biography all its own. In looking at the unique nature of *Superstar's* cult, Davis' accessible and ardent study offers scholars and film fans alike a more nuanced appreciation for cult cinema and its power to obsess. In its 117 pages, it is the longest study of the film to date, and while not wholly successful, it proves to Haynes scholars and fans of the film that, when it comes to discussing *Superstar*, "we've only just begun".

The Cultography of *Superstar* is divided into four sections. 'Doll Parts: Assembling *Superstar*' details the film's production. 'Going Underground: Distribution, Reception, Legal Wrangles', chronicles *Superstar's* infamous exhibition history. 'Watching the Signs Along the Way: Reading *Superstar*' analyzes the film across four topics: 'Genre', 'Intertexts', 'Camp', and 'Dolls'. The final section,

'*Superstar* and Cult Cinema', aims to evaluate the cult status of the film, but mainly rehashes earlier portions of the book.

Unlike other films, *Superstar's* cult is not found in the viewer's response to the film but simply in the viewer's acquisition of a copy of the film. To see *Superstar* is to be initiated as a full member into its cult. There are no rituals involved other than watching the film, for being in the presence of a copy of *Superstar* constitutes a rare and sacred rite. As such, *Superstar's* worth goes beyond the film itself, incorporating into its narrative the quotidian, personal circumstances of each individual's viewing experience.

This is where Davis begins: with a personal story of how he came to see - and possess - a copy of *Superstar*. It has the makings of a great caper: a friend must sneak into her boss' office to "borrow" his copy of *Superstar*, leaving her and Davis with less than 24 hours to view it before the boss will discover the tape's disappearance. In that time, Davis and his friend do not just watch the film: they make six copies of it for friends. There is no better demonstration of *Superstar's* power, for in less than twenty four hours, Davis not only became initiated into the cult of *Superstar* but became an evangelist filled with the need to spread the Good News.

What is so spot-on and touching about this introduction is that this is how everyone discovers *Superstar*: through personal interactions, clandestine rendezvous. Therefore, "personal histories ... who a copy was tracked down from, who it was watched with, who it was copied for [*sic*] ... imbue *Superstar* with a rich, affective importance" to the devoted (40-41). The content is still important, Davis argues; however, fans "also have strong feelings for [*Superstar*] because it reminds [them] of [their] own histories of viewing and friendship" (41).

This mirrors the production of the film itself, about which Davis is detailed but not encyclopedic. Like most low-budget films, *Superstar* is a collaboration among "a group of close friends" (22). What makes *Superstar* different, even for an independent film, Davis states, is the "DIY aesthetic" of the film (104). The handmade, doll-sized sets and costumes strengthen the film's

personal touch and gives it the affectionate feel of "a fan letter to Karen Carpenter" (104).

This cult power only multiplies when this "homemade tribute" enters the underground world of bootlegs, though *Superstar's* exhibition history does not begin underground (104). No one intended for *Superstar* to become a cult film, much less an illegal one, and Davis's engrossing account of *Superstar's* two years of quasi-above-ground distribution shows that, at least initially, "Haynes and his collaborators struggled to get *Superstar* shown anywhere" (26). In fact, *Superstar's* underground status does not begin with its well-known legal disputes but with the art house/avant-garde community's lack of interest in screening the film: *Superstar's* first attempts at legitimate exhibition were rejected by the venues themselves, venues that, naturally, were suddenly eager to screen the film once it received positive reviews in *Artforum* and *The Village Voice*.

Davis lists nearly every gallery and festival that screened *Superstar* to show how this two-year "messy, viral spread" throughout America ensured *Superstar's* survival after it was withdrawn from circulation, for this is where the VHS tapes that would later become the bootleg "masters" originate (31). Furthermore, this impressive and distinctive distribution history gives the reader an appreciation for the "many different spaces [and] range of audiences [the film] may have reached" (31). Davis believes this makes *Superstar* "a multifarious text" that "defies easy compartmentalization [which] only contributes to its marginal standing and its position as a perverse curiosity" (31-32).

As with its multiplicity of audiences, *Superstar* has an analogous approach to genre and intertextuality. Davis' analysis of these approaches - which makes up over half his analysis of the film - represents a significant contribution to the study of this film and Haynes' entire body of work. By discussing how Haynes exploits genres as varied as horror, documentary, movie-of-the-week, rock biopic, and melodrama, Davis illustrates that Haynes does not appropriate genre conventions merely to deconstruct them but rather to build upon the audience's awareness of genre tropes in order to strengthen the impact of his narrative. With *Superstar*, as in his other films, Haynes constructs a film that

"operate[s] on two separate levels ... as [an] engaging tale and as [an] artificial construction that reference[s] known cinematic genres" (60) to reveal the "extent to which all identities are constructed" (79).

Better still is Davis' unpacking of *Superstar's* sophisticated intertextual structure, in which he treats each reference individually so that the reader can appreciate the cumulative effect that these images have on the text as well as on the viewer. Davis' treatment of the Holocaust footage and the clip from *Flesh and Fantasy* (Julien Duvivier, 1943) that appear in the film both stand out as rich pieces of analysis that reveal Haynes' intricate allusive structure. This layering of sources and theoretical approaches, Davis argues, reinforces *Superstar's* cult power, for, in providing a rich field of signifiers, Haynes encourages the viewer to watch the film repeatedly in the hopes of discovering new intertextual connections. Such rigorous and thorough analysis reveals that, even at 43 minutes, *Superstar* is an almost inexhaustible text.

The final two categories of analysis, 'Camp' and 'Dolls', unfortunately, are not as illuminating. Both sections have a digressive quality that detracts from the focus and insightfulness of Davis' earlier analysis. Davis spends much of 'Camp' drawing parallels between Karen Carpenter and Judy Garland to establish Carpenter as a gay icon. The section reads more like an analysis of Garland than of Carpenter, and since its main objective is to characterize Carpenter's public persona as a masquerade, a "performance of ordinariness", the Garland analysis feels superfluous and strained (79). Similarly, the 'Dolls' section discusses other films featuring dolls, then looks at Freud's and Ernst Jentsch's work on the uncanny before arriving at the relevant (and more analytically fruitful) topic of dolls exposing "particular ideals of femininity embodied in mass cultural artefacts and Karen Carpenter's anorexia" (91). Since the introductory material on dolls and the uncanny is not applied to a reading of *Superstar* at any consequential length, it does not add as much to the reader's appreciation of the film as it could.

Despite the relative lack of scholarship on the film, Davis' bibliography is diverse and lengthy given the size of the book, ranging from scholarly texts on cult cinema, semiotics, pop

music, and gender studies to more popular publications such as *Entertainment Weekly*, *Time Out*, and *Film Threat*. Regrettably, sizable portions of the book, particularly those concerning *Superstar's* screening history and bootleg status, rely too heavily on Lucas Hilderbrand's essay 'Grainy Days and Mondays: *Superstar* and Bootleg Aesthetics' (*Camera Obscura* 57, 2004: 56-91). Hilderbrand's essay, a landmark in *Superstar* scholarship, discusses how the practice of bootlegging *Superstar* and the attendant loss of quality with each dub strengthens the overall impact of Haynes' film, to the point that viewers prefer their fourth-generation VHS dubs to a pristine 16mm print of the film. By quoting Hilderbrand in such large chunks rather than steering the narrative himself, Davis misses an opportunity to apply Hilderbrand's ideas to cult cinema as a whole, an undertaking for which Davis is amply qualified. Instead, Davis leaves the reader with implicit suggestion rather than fleshed-out analysis.

Davis' analysis works best when he engages with *Superstar* as an enthusiastic, but academic, devotee. The strength of his decision to provide a personal focus to both the film's historical narrative and his formal analysis cannot be overstated, for in doing so he adds a layer of insight that contributes to establishing *Superstar* as a bona fide cult classic. Even though much of *Superstar's* notoriety comes from its legal woes and underground circulation, Davis convinces the reader that no one would be talking about *Superstar* were it not for the film's ability to connect with viewers on a personal and intellectual level. At its best, his book supplies the reader with a more profound connection to the film. In spite of the areas where it comes up short, one puts Davis' book down impressed not only by the cult of the film but by the power of *Superstar* itself, how it continues to influence and resonate with viewers and academics and transcend its status as mere contraband.

The Hitchcock Annual Anthology: Selected Essays from Volumes 10-15

Edited by Sidney Gottlieb and Richard Allen

London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-905674-95-4 (pbk), 978-1-905674-96-1 (hbk). xvii + 224 pps. £16.99 (pbk), £45.00 (hbk).

A Review by Christina M. Parker, Emory University, USA

In the Introduction, Sidney Gottlieb reveals that he and fellow editor Richard Allen "tried to be less directorial than custodial" in their compilation of essays and, in a nearly anti-directorial stance, grounded their editorial work in "guiding principles ... to discover, provoke, or otherwise stimulate, cultivate, and make widely available essays that reflect the variety, vivacity, and far-ranging relevance and importance to Hitchcock studies" (1). The present volume certainly succeeds, if not dangerously so, in being quite protean in its manner of bridging the traverse between studying Alfred Hitchcock the director and the presently mutating terrain of "Hitchcock Studies".

The Hitchcock Annual Anthology: Selected Essays from Volumes 10-15 assembles fifteen pieces previously published in the annual between the years of 2001 and 2007. The book is divided into five sections: 'Hitchcock and His Collaborators', 'Historical Perspectives', 'Hitchcockian Thematics', 'Individual Films', and 'Hitchcock and Critical Theory'. The organization of the volume seemingly provides a trajectory that moves from the individual director, or the biographically and historically specific, to the analyses of Hitchcock's films as sovereign artworks - stand-alone works of genius that transcend the director and have now become integral in the more macrocosmic discussion of what is repeatedly designated as "Hitchcock".

The first section of the anthology, 'Hitchcock and His Collaborators'. stands upon only one piece, 'Working with Hitch: A Screenwriter's Forum with Evan Hunter, Arthur Laurents, and Joseph Stefano', responsible for *The Birds* (1963), *Rope* (1948), and *Psycho* (1960), respectively. One might expect that this piece, hinging upon the discussion of three scriptwriters who worked with him, would be most pointedly about Hitchcock as a director. However, quite amusingly, Hitchcock is portrayed as entrancingly

enigmatic from the point of view of his historical collaborators, who all have extremely varying takes on the director's behaviors and/or intentions. Although Stefano and Hunter do agree on one puzzling point, that they "rarely saw Hitch give any direction to anyone" (29). Indeed, the general disagreement amongst the screenwriters regarding why Hitchcock imagined a character or scene in one way or another becomes comic at times – "STEFANO: My answer to the question as to why the birds did it? Because Alfred Hitchcock told them to" (33) – and propels the sense that their widely disparate notion of Hitchcock may be rooted in the director's own merrymaking. The transcript of the forum is quite fascinating, perhaps because of the inconsistencies of interpretation and experience. It serves, as well, to whet the readers' appetite for a future-reaching, prismatic approach to "Hitchcock Studies".

The second section, 'Historical Perspectives', presents a somewhat motley crew of essays and, despite the engaging material, reads rather disjointedly. In the first piece, Nathalie Morris explores 'The Early Career of Alma Reville', a.k.a. Mrs. Alfred Hitchcock, in the British film industry. While Morris details the impact that Alma had on Hitchcock's film-making, the article ultimately focuses on Alma's own autonomous career, from editor in the cutting room at London Film Company to "assistant director on Hitchcock's first films before their marriage in 1926" to screenwriter well into the 1930s (43). The elucidation of Alma's own place in the history of British cinema is fascinating and the illustrations of her shot-by-shot editing of *The First Born* (1928), included here in order to shed light on Alma's influence on visual innovation later attributable to Hitchcock, are particularly telling. The next two pieces in the section are reproductions, the first one of an article written by Alma Reville for *The Motion Picture News* (January 1923) entitled 'Cutting and Continuity', followed by an article from *The Picturegoer* (December 1925) about Alma's career as a young director in England entitled 'Alma in Wonderland'.

After being so immersed in the career of Hitchcock's wife, the transition to the next piece in the section, Sidney Gottlieb's 'Hitchcock on Griffith', is somewhat jarring. Gottlieb claims that his intention in this essay is to illustrate Hitchcock's appreciation of D. W. Griffith as one of his "early and most sustained

arguments for the legitimacy of the director as auteur". This compact piece is provocative and gratifying to read, and is followed by a short piece written by Alfred Hitchcock in 1931 for *Film Weekly* on the occasion of Griffith's *Abraham Lincoln* (1930), entitled 'A Columbus of the Screen'. This alternation between critical essays and reprints of historically relevant articles ends here, however, and the last piece in the section is Charles Barr's 'Deserter or Honored Exile?: Views of Hitchcock from Wartime Britain'.

The third section, 'Hitchcockian Thematics', greatly improves the momentum within the volume and is perhaps the strongest section overall. It begins with a tremendous essay by legendary Hitchcock scholar Robin Wood, one of the last pieces published before his death in December 2009, 'Hitchcock and Fascism'. Wood ventures to consolidate ideas from his history of Hitchcock scholarship in order to produce a new pattern of interpreting the multitudinous portrayals of fascism – cinematic, gendered, political – in Hitchcock's films, specifically here in the historically undervalued *Lifeboat* (1944).

Wood's essay is particularly gripping because it radiates every color in the spectrum of Hitchcock Studies – social, historical, technical, thematic, psychoanalytic – and his reading of *Lifeboat* as "a cinematic kaleidoscope" through which "the perspective changes at every turn of the narrative" (116) bonds his essay with the ideology of *The Hitchcock Annual Anthology*, a homage to "Hitchcock" not so much as a person but as a prism.

In 'Alfred Hitchcock's Carnival' Mark M. Hennelly, Jr. broadens critical analysis instituted by David Sterritt in 'The Diabolic Imagination: Hitchcock, Bakhtin, and the Carnivalization of Cinema' published in the first volume of *The Hitchcock Annual* in 1992. What Hennelly does differently and quite effectively, though, is to take into account "Hitchcock's biographical ties to carnivalesque material and the Rabelaisian function of specific carnivals in his films", including *The Ring* and *Strangers on a Train* (124).

The third and final essay in the section on thematics is Thomas Elsaesser's 'Too Big and Too Close: Alfred Hitchcock and Fritz Lang', a compelling examination of both directors as touchstones

for the development of "pure cinema" by the French film theorists of the 1960s. Although the article is quite densely written, Elsaesser provides a thought-provoking assessment of the relationship of their respective works, including: the reflections of Lang available in the films of Hitchcock, the connections between the directors in their rediscovery of "mythic patterns in human experience" and their respective importance in "establishing cinema not only as a popular art, but as a permanent art" (148). Almost incongruously, the strength of Elsaesser's scholarship lies in its extension beyond Hitchcock as a figure, and for that matter Lang as well, and into new and unmarked territory where Hitchcock (and Lang) studies can put "cinema, in the face of doubt, nevertheless in the service of life" (166). Elsaesser reaches out for the artistry of Lang and Hitchcock as a necessary building block of "a philosophy of film, coming after our all but abandoned theories of cinema" (166).

Many of the analyses in 'Individual Films', the penultimate section of the book, concern themselves with psychoanalytic readings, especially Slavoj Žižek's '*Vertigo*: The Drama of a Deceived Platonist', which posits the need "in a true Freudian spirit" for a theory of what he calls the "symptomatic" excess of distortions and misrepresentations in *Vertigo* scholarship (212). The section also includes analyses of two oft-neglected Hitchcock films, Richard Allen's 'Sir John and the Half-Caste: Identity and Representation in Hitchcock's *Murder!*' and Mark Rappaport's '*Under Capricorn* Revisited'. Deborah Thomas's essay on 'Self-Possession and Dispossession in Hitchcock's *Marnie*' is perhaps most remarkable for its ability to forge its own refreshing study of the film without any extended use of secondary sources or other critical analyses.

Of all the pieces in the collection it is Thomas Leitch's 'Hitchcock and Company' that aids in unraveling the mystery of "Hitchcock Studies" and harmonizing this medley of essays. Leitch provides an extremely comprehensive survey of the major critical movements in the field in order to "consider the shifting relations between Hitchcock studies and the larger film of film studies, and suggest several models for disciplinary studies" he hopes will define the field in the future (237). Leitch's essay responds to Gottlieb's editorial estimations in his 'Introduction' to the first compilation of essays from the annual in 2002, entitled *Framing*

Hitchcock: Selected Essays from The Hitchcock Annual (Wayne State University Press, 2002: 14). Gottlieb writes that the "fact that we so commonly speak of 'Hitchcock studies' indicates that a very worthwhile endeavor has been legitimated, but should also warn us that we may be no short step from something potentially worrisome: 'Hitchcock Inc.,' for lack of a better term." Leitch's 'Hitchcock and Company' offers a brighter alternative, a panacea for the growing pains of Hitchcock scholarship. The title of his essay is also an answer, a label "not meant to imply the corporate structure of a centrally controlled 'Hitchcock Ltd.' Or 'Hitchcock Inc.,' but a more decentralized structure: a network of Hitchcock commentators – historians and interpreters, academics and amateurs, fans and professionals – joined only by their shared interest in Hitchcock" (251).

At first, I felt that *The Hitchcock Annual Anthology* lacked focus, and the first sign was the absence of any thematic directive in the title. This volume imparts a strange sense of remove from Hitchcock; I found it simultaneously irksome and yet strangely satisfying that I was unable to pin him down – what Wood might have deemed my own fascist tendencies as a reader. Rather than *Framing Hitchcock* (as the title of the annual's first compilation suggests was its intention), the present anthology appears to be doing something profoundly different, resting upon the essence of the publication's spirited iconoclasm for license. Ultimately, this book is authoritative yet amorphous, a tremendous addition to the oeuvre of Hitchcock studies. The annual's new partnership with Wallflower Press and the inaugural *The Hitchcock Annual Anthology* will, to borrow Leitch's final sentiment, "keep his work alive for everyone who takes pleasure in sharing Hitchcock's company" (252).

Film and Memory in East Germany**By Anke Pinkert**

Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-253-35103-6, x + 275 pp. £54.00 (hbk).

Nation and Identity in the New German Cinema**By Inga Scharf**

New York and London: Routledge, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-415-96280-3, xiv + 235 pp. £65.00 (hbk).

A Review by David Embree, European Graduate School

In *Film and Memory in East Germany*, Anke Pinkert notes that filmic research in Germany's post-reunification context has been largely focused on the cinematic output of the West. In this context, the term 'German' has come to signify 'West German'. She argues that "critics themselves have contributed to the erasure of an important, if not alternative, strand of postwar film history in the East, whose comparative standing in relation to West German cinema still needs to be explored" (204). As a preliminary step in this direction, I would like to review Pinkert's study of (East German) DEFA film of the immediate postwar decades – the 1940s to the 1960s, alongside Inga Scharf's study of the New (West) German Cinema of an overlapping, albeit slightly later period – the 1960s to the 1980s. This review will be particularly attentive to a range of theoretical concerns present in both texts that are especially relevant in the specific context of the German (post-)war period. These include theorizations of trauma discourse, Freud's notion of mourning and melancholia, self-reflexivity as a constructive mode of historical representation, and gendered as well as generational conflicts. It is my hope that this review exposes a range of concerns commonly *shared by* and *applicable to* both bodies of postwar German film.

Pinkert expresses certain reservations about what she perceives to be the *dehistoricizing* and *depoliticizing* nature of currently available theorizations of trauma discourse, writing that:

Both the cultural analysis of trauma that resorts to a medical psychiatric discourse traditionally less mutable to

political distinctions *and* a poststructuralist approach that renders notions of unrepresentability into a kind of traumatic sublime tend to flatten the specificities of a given political and historical context. (8)

As such, she addresses DEFA's representations of war trauma from films of the 1940s to the 1960s with a focus on the specific historical and political context of postwar East Germany. Her concern for historical specificity is evident in each of the three broad sections of her study. Part one, 'Vanishing Returnees: War Trauma, Antifascism, and the Crisis of Masculinity', is concerned with early DEFA films of the 1940s and their representations of the symbolic reintegration of the figure of the returning Wehrmacht soldier. Part two, 'Fantasmatic Fullness: Strained Female Subjectivity and Socialist Dreams', also explores DEFA's relation to war trauma by looking at films of the 1950s where representations of loss and death become conspicuous by their absence. Part three, 'Germany, Year Zero: Recasting the Past in the Present', is concerned with the self-reflexive relation to war trauma assumed by a certain strand of DEFA films of the 1960s.

Critics have frequently analyzed the self-reflexive mode of filmmaking common to the New German Cinema. Pinkert writes, for instance, that "a self-reflexive interest in the mediality of the cinematic apparatus is a convention of art cinema in general and the New German Cinema in particular" (213). She expands this traditional approach, however, by adjusting her focus to include the self-reflexive tendencies of a certain strand of DEFA films of the 1960s. Konrad Wolf's *I Was Nineteen* (Ich war neunzehn, 1968) and Jürgen Böttcher's *Born in '45* (Jahrgang 45, 1966/1990) are among such "antifascist films [that] redistribute the war experience of displacement, loss, and violence through cinematic modes of self-consciously mediated historical discourse" (146). According to Pinkert, these films self-consciously betray the mediated nature of their re-presentations of (post-)war (East) German life. Wolf's *I Was Nineteen*, for instance, alternates between (seemingly) authentic documentary style footage and more conventional, staged moments. Beyond drawing attention to its own mediality, the film's unconventional approach seems to "challenge the notion that history can be pictured, if not reproduced, through the medium of film" (157).

Scharf also analyzes the self-reflective mode of filmic representation, writing, for example, about "films that can be perceived of as being memory spaces [because they] *make their constructedness visible* and might hence be seen as anti-ideological and democratizing" (my emphasis, 136). She includes two New German Cinema productions by female directors in the category of 'memory spaces' or 'memory narratives' – Helma Sanders-Brahms's *Germany Pale Mother* (Deutschland, Bleiche Mutter, 1979) and Jeanine Meerapfel's *Malou* (1980). She labels these productions 'memory narratives' because, as examples of Bhabha's notion of the 'performative' sense of time, they provide the viewer with "non-sequential, ambivalent, problematic, and disjunctive" (84) personal histories that do not necessarily confirm official, 'pedagogical' national accounts. She finds examples of this latter category, what she call 'history narratives', from within the New German Cinema as well, including Theodor Kotulla's *Death in My Trade* (Aus einem deutschen Leben, 1977) and Edgar Reitz' *Heimat* series (1984). Scharf claims that these films represent distinctly "male ways of dealing with the past" (97). I would argue, however, that she ultimately fails to effectively demonstrate what distinguishes these latter films from those she labels 'memory narratives' and, as a result, her gender-based distinction between male and female 'ways of dealing with the past' comes across as tenuous at best.

Scharf then relates the distinction between 'memory narratives' and 'historical narratives' to Freud's distinction between mourning and melancholia, contending that 'memory narratives' carry out the task of mourning, which represents "the 'normal' (here understood as healthy) response to the experience of loss" (138). In effect, these narratives take part in the process of *working-through* past experiences of trauma and loss. 'Historical narratives', on the other hand, exemplify melancholia – the 'pathological' relation to trauma and loss. As such, they *act-out* their relation to loss. Scharf's recourse to Freudian theory allows her to accomplish what her previous discussions of 'memory narratives' and 'historical narratives' fail to accomplish – namely, establishing a solid distinction between the two narrative techniques. It does not, however, allow for the kind of nuanced reading of Freud's distinction between mourning and melancholia that Pinkert provides in the introduction to her study, where she

writes that Freud "saw melancholia as an arrested process in which the depressed and self-berating self remains narcissistically attached to the lost object through compulsive repetitions. In contrast to this state (...) he conceived of mourning as an active engagement with loss that enables boundaries between the grieving self and the lost object, between the past and the present." (9) She ultimately challenges Freud's distinction between mourning and melancholia, however, by asserting that "the various melancholic attachments to loss (...) can be viewed as an ongoing, creative, open-ended process of mourning rather than as a pathological holding on to a fixed notion of the past" (10). This becomes important to her assessment of DEFA's representations of the symbolic reintegration of the figure of the returning Wehrmacht soldier in films of the 1940s, such as Wolfgang Staudte's *The Murderers Are among Us* (*Die Mörder sind unter uns*, 1946) and Gerhard Lamprecht's *Somewhere in Berlin* (*Irgendwo in Berlin*, 1946). Focusing on a minor character from Lamprecht's film – a "former Wehrmacht soldier, Steidel, who survived the war severely 'shell shocked'" (45), Pinkert notes that Steidel appears to be stuck in the past as he re-enacts certain war time activities, such as continuing to dress in uniform. Yet, this character's 'pathological' re-enactments of war related trauma "emerges as one of the most visible locations of historical loss in early postwar cinema" (48). From this, Pinkert formulates the argument that DEFA films of the 1940s engage with Germany's traumatic war past in a productive manner, and that this engagement at least partially invalidates the criticism frequently leveled at postwar German culture that it has neglected to meaningfully reflect on the events of World War II.

A number of filmmakers of the New German Cinema participated in this manner of criticism by confronting the complicity of their parents' generation in the events of World War II. Scharf discusses the collaborative production, *Germany in Autumn* (*Deutschland im Herbst*, 1977/1978) as an example of this attitude. The film explicitly questions the suspicious deaths of key members of the RAF (Rote Armee Fraktion) that took place in the fall of 1977. She also points to personal ties between certain New German Cinema filmmakers and key members of the RAF. It is well known, for example, that Wim Wenders and RAF leader Holger Meins collaborated on Wender's debut film, *Summer in the City* (1970). Connections between young West-German

filmmakers and revolutionary political movements of the 1960s and 1970s created a crisis of self-perception for many of these filmmakers, stemming from the fact that "the *NGC* [New German Cinema] received significant state funding due to a far-reaching restructuring of the West German film funding system" (30). Scharf notes that "for the majority of filmmakers this posed a serious dilemma as they found it difficult (if not impossible) to negotiate the receipt of funding from the establishment with being part of a subversive *Gegenöffentlichkeit*[counterpublic]" (30).

New German Cinema filmmakers also expressed the discordance they felt with respect to their parents' generation outside the realm of revolutionary politics. Werner Herzog, for instance, has frequently claimed that his generation of filmmakers was left essentially 'fatherless' – that, in Scharf's paraphrase, "fascism caused a cultural wipeout which, amongst other things, interrupted the German tradition of filmmaking (...) as it forced leading Jewish-German filmmakers, such as Fritz Lang, abroad (mainly to Hollywood)" (33). As such, Herzog has professed to feeling a greater affinity to the 'grandfather' generation – an affinity that ultimately led to his 1979 re-make of F.W. Murnau's silent classic, *Nosferatu* (1922). He also developed close ties to Lotte Eisner, an important figure of the German expressionist film movement. Scharf observes that Herzog's and Eisner's symbolically charged association "established crucial links between a variety of seemingly irreconcilable, national/cinematic sides: German Expressionism and the *NGC* [New German Cinema], grandfathers and grandsons" (34). Interestingly, Wenders developed a comparable relationship with the older American film director, Sam Fuller, which led to a number of collaborations between the two, including Fuller's acting appearance in Wender's highly acclaimed film, *The State of Things* (*Der Stand der Dinge*, 1982). Pinkert reminds us, however, that conflict between the 'war' generation and the postwar generation was by no means limited to the West. She cites Jürgen Böttcher's *Born in '45* (Jahrgang 45, 1966/1990) as a manifestation of the generational conflict that flourished in the East German context of the 1960s as well. The film eloquently expresses the feelings of a younger generation of East Germans, who "refused to be defined by the legacy of fascism and the

historical catastrophes of World War II and fascism" and who "longer shared unquestioned beliefs in epochal developments, conformity, and discipline for the sake of the antifascist socialist cause" (181).

Born in '45 was originally barred from release in 1966 "in the wake of the Communist Party's Eleventh Plenary" (179). Yet, after the fall of the GDR in 1990, when Böttcher's film was finally released to the public, critical reception seemed to be fixated on the "specific retrospective insights into the ideological and aesthetic restrictions imposed by the East German state" – largely neglecting the film's greater "contributions to a postwar European cinema" (179). This, according to Pinkert, typifies the reception that DEFA encounter in today's Western-biased scholarly atmosphere. On the final page of her study, Scharf also writes about the limited amount of scholarship that integrates East German cultural productions into the greater context of postwar Europe, asserting that "in view of the research that has been done on the *NGC* [New German Cinema], issues which would be worth investigating at greater length concern (...) a comparison between West and East German cinema" (204). Pending the appearance of such scholarship, Scharf's and Pinkert's studies, when approached together, provide an important indication of the range of theoretical concerns that might productively serve as the basis for a comparative East-West study of postwar German cinema.

Dismantling the Dream Factory: Gender, German Cinema and the Postwar Quest for a New Film Language

By Hester Baer

New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-84545-605-4. 22 illustrations, xiii + 304 pp. £55 (hbk).

A Review by Paul Cooke, University of Leeds, UK

Taking as its starting point Helmut Käutner's 1947 essay 'Dismantling the Dream Factory', Hester Baer explores postwar German cinema's self-conscious attempt to find a new film language that could both distance itself from the ideologically discredited spectacle of Nazi Cinema while also engaging a public that still looked for the type of genre-driven, entertainment fare the same cinema largely produced. Through the close examination of ten key films released between 1946 and 1962, Baer traces the trajectory of the industry, highlighting the ways each of her case studies can be read metacinematically to reflect specific elements of the debate on the ideological place of film in the postwar reconstruction, a debate that reached its initial culmination in the Oberhausen Manifesto, with its well known declaration of the death of 'Daddy's Cinema'. What this study makes abundantly clear is that the focus on the oedipal struggle of the generation of filmmakers that would go on to achieve international fame with the New German Cinema - until recently, a primary focus of German film studies - ignores the rich complexity of German (in the case of Baer's book, predominantly West German) film production in the period that preceded it. In so doing, her study makes a major contribution to the burgeoning field dedicated to investigating what was once dismissed, as Johannes von Moltke puts it in his seminal study of the Heimat film, as "the quintessential 'bad object' of German film historiography" (*No Place like Home: Locations of Heimat in German Cinema*, University of California Press, 2005: 21). Central to Baer's investigation is the demographic of the German cinema audience, seventy percent of which was comprised of women well into the 1950s. Baer examines how this impacted upon both the form and content of the films produced, "re-read[ing] postwar West German cinema as a women's cinema,

understood in the broadest terms as a filmmaking practice seeking to appeal to female spectators" (7).

Part One, 'Relegitimizing Cinema: Female Spectators and the Problem of Representation', examines initial attempts to relegitimize the industry, tracing the debate during the pause in film production in the immediate aftermath of the war about where German filmmakers should look for their role models, be it the cinema of Weimar or those foreign trends that had been suppressed during the Third Reich, to the subsequent discussions on the role of film authorship and postwar star culture. In her fascinating close readings of *The Murderers are Amongst us* (Wolfgang Staudte, 1946), *Film Without a Title* (Rudolf Jugert, 1948), *Love 47* (Wolfgang Liebeneiner, 1949) and *Epilogue* (Helmut Käutner, 1950), Baer explores how these debates are reflected through the optic of gender; how Staudte, for example, utilizes the female gaze both to highlight and investigate the crisis of representation at the heart of postwar film culture, Susanne (Hildegard Knef) being offered as a model of active female spectatorship that can begin to heal the trauma of the past. Or, Baer shows how Jugert deconstructs the filmmaking process itself, examining the tensions between continuities with the film culture of the Nazi period, epitomised by the performance of Willy Fritsch in *Film without a Title*, and the new phase in production encapsulated in Knef's star persona. Part Two, 'Art on Film: Representing Gender and Sexuality in Popular Cinema', moves away from the more obviously self-reflective 'Rubble films', examples of the *Zeitfilm* (time film) with their explicit and critical representation of contemporary reality in the late 1940s, to the genre cinema boom that followed them. Baer discusses the massive growth in popularity of German domestic production during the decade, offering detailed examinations of Willi Forst's *succès de scandale*, *The Sinner* (1951), Alfons Stummer's *The Forester of the Silverwood* (1955) – one of the most successful films of the most successful genre cycle of the decade, the Heimat film – and Veit Harlan's homophobic *Different from You and Me* (1957). Here Baer looks to the ways gender-relations in the films map onto broader aesthetic debates at the time about the role of documentary realism versus the function of cinema as a form of escapism from the grind of postwar life, as well as the place of cinematic mimesis within an artistic landscape that saw modernist abstract art as a tool of democratic renewal which

could escape what, for its critics at least, were the conservative aesthetics of a mainstream cinema that smacked of the nation's totalitarian past. Particularly strong in this section is the account of *The Sinner* and the ways the film sought to complicate this dominant view, contrasting the potential of a 'realist' gaze, embodied in the film's female protagonist, with that of the male lead, an abstract artist whose view of the world is the product of a sick, damaged psyche, a critique which, as Baer notes, at times seems to underline the very conservatism that this and other films of the period ostensibly reject, given the similarity of such arguments to the Nazis' view of modernist art as 'degenerate'. In Part Three, 'Towards the New Wave: Gender and the Critique of Popular Cinema', we see the popular genre hits of the mid 1950s give way to those films at the end of the decade which marked a transition towards the more critical cinema that would, for international audiences in particular, be the hallmark of German film during the next twenty years. Gender continues to be the main discursive field as the author examines German cinema's rediscovery of the type of *Zeitfilm* that dominated in the late 1940s, flavoured now with the popular film sensibilities of the early 1950s. Here the films investigated are Helmut Käutner's *Engagement in Zurich* (1957) – a piece that revisits the deconstructive narrative strategy of *Film without a Title*, Rolf Thiele's *The Girl Rosamarie* (1958) and Herbert Vesely's adaptation of Heinrich Böll's novella *The Bread of those Early Years* (1962), the first film released after the Oberhausen Manifesto and which, in Baer's view, potentially offered a different path for the nation's film than the one taken. In Vesely's film, the author identifies a critical film that nonetheless reached out to wider audiences, instead of seeing itself as the antithesis of popular 1950s cinema – an approach which, of course, the New German Cinema did in fact increasingly adopt in the 1970s. Finally, the book concludes with an epilogue that looks briefly at the renewed interest in 1950s film since unification, discussing Bernd Eichinger's problematic series of remakes of postwar classics and exploring the renewed discovery of gender issues as a key focus for mainstream filmmaking, particularly in the early 1990s when the industry became obsessed with relationship comedies in what Georg Seeßlin defines as its final "reconciliation with Daddy's cinema" after the hiatus of the New German Cinema (280).

Book Reviews

This is a great book, well grounded in the critical literature and contemporary archival sources. The author has an extraordinary eye for detail in her close readings of the films and a profound understanding of the interplay between the diegetic and extra-diegetic elements that make up the meaning of a given film text, as she ranges from discussion of the use of sound to the marketing strategies employed to sell the films under investigation, all of which is located in a detailed understanding of the broader historical context and the German 'national trauma' of the time. The epilogue is, perhaps, already slightly out of date. Contemporary film can hardly still be said to be focussed on 'ahistorical German landscapes', as it might have been in the early to mid 1990s. However, this is the comment of a pedantic reviewer looking for points to criticise in a well argued book that is a pleasure to read and that will be of use to scholars and students alike.

Understanding Indian Cinema: Culture, Cognition and Cinematic Imagination**By Patrick Colm Hogan**

Texas: University of Texas Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-292-71786-2. 67 illustrations, 293 pp. \$55. (hbk).

Mourning The Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition**By Bhaskar Sarkar**

Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-8223-4411-7. 65 illustrations, iii + 372 pp. £15.99 (pbk).

A Review by Scott Jordan Harris, Independent Scholar

The current high tide of Bollywood influence on Anglo-American culture – most obviously evidenced by the cross-pollination that produced, and the popular success that met, Danny Boyle's *Slumdog Millionaire* (2008) – masks the barriers that prevent most film scholars and students from properly engaging with Indian films. Although Hindi films play in mainstream cinemas throughout Great Britain and, online at least, are freely available on DVD, their audience is predominantly of Asian extraction. We have only to consult the results of the ten-yearly polls conducted by *Sight and Sound* – which ask popular film critics and directors to list their choice of the world's ten finest films – and note the disproportionate dearth of Indian titles, to see that the output of the world's largest film industry has yet to properly penetrate Western thinking on cinema. The release of these two books – which both aim to facilitate appreciation and in-depth understanding of Indian cinema – is, therefore, both timely and much needed.

Patrick Colm Hogan's *Understanding Indian Cinema* is part of the 'Cognitive Approaches to Literature and Culture Series', which aims to incorporate cutting edge research in cognitive science, psychology, linguistics and narrative theory in its illumination of the cultural phenomenon of film. It does it through "both specialized scholarship and interdisciplinary investigation that are deeply sensitive to cultural peculiarities but grounded in an

understanding of cross-culturally shared emotive and cognitive principles" (vi).

As such, it is an ideal instrument to introduce the citizens of one culture to the films of another. Through his text, Hogan relates complex products of Indian tradition, society, religion and geography to universal human means of processing intellectual and sensory input, and there is not a film discussed that, even for the experienced scholar of Indian cinema, will not have some darker areas of its details illuminated by Hogan's readings.

The key question that most Westerners – whether they are general filmgoers, journalistic critics or even academics – have about Bollywood films provides the comic but illuminating title for Hogan's fourth chapter: 'So, What's The Deal With All The Singing?' While the title pinpoints the nub of the Western failure to engage with Bollywood films, its subtitle, 'The Cognitive Universality of the Hindi Musical', sounds a note of hope. This section of the book is a triumph and there can be no student who, having read it, could again view standard Bollywood musical interludes as a barrier to appreciation of Bollywood films.

Hogan begins, as we might expect, by displaying the similarities between musical numbers seen in Hollywood and those seen in Bollywood: his point simply being that while in America the song and dance interlude evolved to be a core component of just one genre, in Bollywood it developed into a central feature of films in practically all genres. From here, the author argues – successfully – that the archetypal Bollywood musical interlude has precedent in Western culture in texts far older and more central to it than Hollywood musicals. His unimpeachable example is the Shakespearean soliloquy:

Shakespeare's soliloquies are shorter than song and dance interludes. But they certainly seem long enough – and mimetically implausible enough – to prompt questioning. This brings us to a further characteristic of the [typical Bombay musical] interlude – its narratively ambiguous state. Unlike Macbeth's or Hamlet's imaginations and worries, we may not know whether we should take the interlude to be part of the story (...) On the one hand, the characters do sing and dance (...) On the other hand,

suppose one of the characters in a song returns home after the interlude and is asked, 'What were you just doing?' He or she will not say, 'Singing and dancing with everyone in the town square'. (163)

Hogan's answer to this difficulty – which often proves insoluble to those suddenly introduced to Hindi cinema and so prevents the intellectual engagement with it that is essential for the film studies student – is his principle of 'paradiegesis'. After recapitulating the basic distinction between diegetic and nondiegetic music, Hogan explains that, "The song interlude (...) cannot strictly be fitted into either category (...) [but] we might refer to narrative segments as 'paradiegetic,' for they are, so to speak, 'alongside' the story without being quite part of the story" (163). This characterisation is inspired. It immediately allows the reader to accept and understand Bombay cinema's musical interludes in a way that Indian audiences naturally understand them. As such, this chapter brilliantly achieves one of the ultimate aims of this book: to allow non-Indian audiences to approach key aspects of Indian film with something approaching the same confidence and clear-thinking that would be intuitive to them had they grown up consuming Indian culture in Indian society.

There is an additional benefit to Hogan's ideas on 'paradiegesis'. In English language – and specifically Hollywood – film the difference between episodes of 'fantasy' and 'reality' within a film's narrative is generally clearly delineated and, as a rule, left un-muddled. English language films that do not observe the standard distinctions between 'fantasy' and 'reality' onscreen are often dismissed as muddled by newspaper critics and avoided by audiences who, having consumed that criticism, consider the film in question strange or difficult. Because of this, many students begin serious film studies having never learnt to engage thoroughly with the concept of varying levels of filmic reality. Any such student will have his or her thinking on this issue expanded and enlivened simply by reading Hogan's discussions of his concept of 'paradiegetic' episodes.

Though I have discussed the book's ability to allow to Westerners to approach Indian cinema with something of the understanding of it that is natural to Indian audiences, no book – indeed,

nothing but full-scale immersion in Indian culture from childhood – could enable a non-Indian audience to see an Indian film as does an Indian audience. Hogan is acutely aware of this and, both explicitly and implicitly, stresses it throughout his short text.

Subsequently, he ensures that his discussion of the films and scenes he chooses to analyse, though often minutely specific, stand not only as self-contained instances of excellent analysis, but also as imitable examples of how to analyse. After following, for example, Hogan's discussion of Krishna parallels in one short series of shots in Ajit Chakrabarty's *Ardhangini* (1959), the reader is not, of course, miraculously equipped with the skills necessary to decode subtle Krishna parallels in all Indian films – but the patterns of interpretation through which he or she may develop those skills have been unforgettably highlighted. *Understanding Indian Cinema* does not simply teach facts (though many facts are to be learnt through reading it): it trains thought processes. Because of this, it is not only a book that teaches the skills necessary to understand and analyse Indian films, but also frequently a book that teaches the skills necessary to understand and analyse films of any origin.

Many of the book's most valuable lessons are given by implication. Hogan seldom stalls his analysis to inform the reader directly of the importance to understanding Indian cinema of familiarity with, for example, the basic workings and history of the caste system or the story and characters of *The Ramayana*, but the necessity of such knowledge is implied upon practically every page. Interestingly, though, one of the crucial events in the formation of modern Indian culture, the Partition of India and Pakistan, is given only cursory attention – and this is why Bhaskar Sarkar's *Mourning the Nation* is such a fitting and instructive companion to Hogan's book.

Sarkar's book is underserved by its subtitle. His study of *Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition* addresses not only Partition's impact upon, and representation in, Indian cinema, but also the concepts of nationhood, and of loss and mourning, with such acuity and vigour that, just as a Hogan's text will appeal to and inform students of all cinema, Sarkar's is likely to impact well beyond the study of its specific subject.

One of the text's strengths is Sarkar's early and continued acknowledgement of the complex enormity of that subject. He compares it, helpfully, to Western attempts to process the trauma of the Holocaust through cinema, and makes several instructive references to Claude Lanzmann, director of cinema's most monumental act of Holocaust memorialisation, 1985's *Shoah*. Such similarities with Holocaust studies – while they make it easier for Western readers to engage with discussion of the impact of Partition – are, however, inherently limited, and it is another of Sarkar's strengths that this, too, is stressed from the outset. He notes that, in Indian cinema, the

overwrought mise-en-scene (...) musical interludes, and modes of editing and sound-image relations emanating from vernacular practices (...) [combine] to consolidate (...) a potent and singularly Indian idiolect for cinematic mourning. The singularity of this cinematic grammar inheres in the difficulty of subsuming it under any universal model of 'cinematic mourning,' just as the singularity of the Anglo-Saxon concept of 'trauma' is indexed by the difficulty of translating it into Hindi. (9)

Sarkar's acute understanding of the discrepancy between Indian modes of thinking, of organizing society and of processing collective trauma, and their equivalents in the West becomes a key thread in the work, allowing him, like Hogan, to train the attentive reader's entire approach to Indian film in general whilst only discussing one Indian film in particular.

The book is split into two sections: these sections corresponding, Sarkar argues, to the two distinct phases of Partition's impact upon, or rather discussion within, Indian film since 1947. The first section he calls 'A Resonant Silence' and the second 'The Return of the Repressed'. Though it is reductive to do so, we can characterise the former as the period in which Partition issues can be inferred from films but are not directly addressed within them; and the latter, though this is again a reductive summary, as the period in which Partition came to be explicitly addressed onscreen.

He argues that during the first period, 'the early years after 1947' (98), Partition was used as a reference point to establish the back

stories of characters, but that very few Hindi films dealt with the experience of Partition directly. Between 1947 and 1962, he points out, 'the average annual production of Hindi films stood around 120' (98) but 'fewer than a dozen' (98) films made in the period dealt explicitly with Partition.

His forensic examination of classic Hindi films, such as Raj Kapoor's *Awara* (1951) and *Aag* (1948), exposes what he takes to be "the historical hauntings [that] were being projected in these dark melancholic tales" (87), that is: the psychic and emotional wounds inflicted by Partition but here reflected not in storylines about it, but instead about "confusions over paternity, suspicions about illicit pregnancy [and] undercurrents of incestuous longing" (87). The inferences he draws are, like the rest of his work, often provocative, but they are supported by such intense analysis that he never seems to be overstretching his argument.

The second section of the book naturally deals less with the interpretation of subtle indicators of the effects of Partition and more with direct assessment of the way Indian films have depicted and discussed the event, its aftermath and continued influence. Sarkar's focus, though, is not confined to cinema. (There is an entire chapter discussing the enormously significant television miniseries *Tamas* (1987, Dardarshan)). Nor, as ever, is it confined solely to matters of film studies. Here, as throughout his book, Sarkar is able to enlighten the student of Indian cinema by analysing Indian society, and the student of Indian society by analysing Indian cinema.

Both Patrick Colm Hogan's *Understanding Indian Cinema* and Bhaskar Sarkar's *Mourning the Nation* are bold and audacious works; both tackle colossal topics that are often considered incomprehensible in the West; and both achieve their aims of both imparting information about, and shaping a student's approach to, the cinema of India. Neither, though, is of relevance purely to those interested in learning to dissect Indian films: these books would enhance the education of any student of film.

Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Movies

By Dave Saunders

I.B. Tauris, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-84511-948-5, ISBN10: 1-84511-948-7, 17 b/w illustrations, 256 pp. \$18.95 (pkb).

A Review by Joseph Arton, Independent Scholar

In *Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Movies*, Dave Saunders argues that we can learn a great deal about American social history by examining the Schwarzenegger phenomenon. Saunders more than makes his case and the result is a fascinating piece of scholarship. The book's four chapters chart the trajectory of Schwarzenegger's film career from his early, often neglected films, *Hercules in New York* (Arthur Allan Seidelman, 1969) and *Stay Hungry* (Bob Rafelson, 1976) to his last film *Terminator 3* (Jonathan Mostow, 2003). Throughout the course of the book each chapter effectively utilises a form of textual historicism in the tradition of Stephen Prince's *Visions of Empire* (Praeger, 1992).

In the book's opening chapter, 'There's Something About Arnold: Schwarzenegger's American Dreams', Saunders locates the contemporary appeal of Schwarzenegger's Teutonic musclebound body historically in the aesthetics of Leni Riefenstahl as well as in the popular discourse of American racial purists such as Margaret Sanger. Saunders argues that America's need to subsume itself to Schwarzenegger's mechanized male body shows how pervasive the ideology of body fascism still is in contemporary culture (13). It is in his discussion of *Stay Hungry* however that we are first introduced to the relationship between Schwarzenegger's films of the 1970s and the salient political issues of the period. Saunders provides a fascinating description of how *Stay Hungry* reflected the renewal of social values, tradition and historicity in the body politic and the New South's validity as a functioning part of the United States during the mid-late 1970s (36). The chapter also deals with Schwarzenegger's break-through film, the bodybuilding documentary *Pumping Iron* (George Butler, Robert Fiore, 1977). Saunders' background in documentary film scholarship is clearly evident in his useful explanations of the films interventional, dramaturgical tactics and its place in the wider 'reality-fiction' genre (39).

The book's second chapter, 'Machina ex Deus: Rise of the Übermensch', deals with the remarkable escalation of Schwarzenegger's film career in the 1980s as well as the numerous economic, industrial and social factors that paved the way for his pop-cultural conquest (46). Saunders reading of *Conan the Barbarian* (John Milius, 1982), *Commando* (Mark L. Lester, 1985) and *Predator* (John McTiernan, 1987) as the embodiment of primal and old colonial fears re-worked in light of present day national crisis is central focus of the chapter (91). Schwarzenegger's on screen efforts to restore order to the Third World, writes Saunders, found "voice at the helm of a US body politic injured by Watergate, Indochina, the hostage crisis in Iran and an economic affliction of great proportions" (49). In terms of approach Saunders is not really covering new ground here. Indeed, William Kleinknecht's deals with similar issues in *The Man Who Sold the World: Ronald Reagan and the Betrayal of Main Street America* (Nation Books, 2009). However, it is the enormous breadth of sources that Saunders draws from that gives his book distinction. An excellent example of this is in the book's discussion of *The Terminator* (James Cameron, 1984). Here Saunders builds on Sean French's excellent short BFI film guide to the film (*The Terminator*, 1996) as well as uncredited texts such as Per Schelde's reading of *The Terminator* in *Androids, Humanoids, and Other Folklore Monsters: Science and Soul in Science Fiction Films* (New York University Press, 1994). Like French, Saunders writes of the film in terms of the New Bad Future genre and its allegorical depiction of a destructive, relentless and out of control technology. Saunders goes further and locates the film's ideology in a historically specific collective obsession with millennial obliteration shared in the early 1980s by "libertarians, religious fundamentalists, cultists, backwoods militia, New Age devotees and radical anti-federalists alike" (71). Bound within this argument is Saunders' depiction of *The Terminator* as Christ parable dealt with previously by Per Schelde and others. Saunders writes that the reason for Schwarzenegger's enormous appeal during this period wasn't only his films' reassertion of national 'muscle', the leitmotif of Reagan's tenure (49), it was the fact that he connected with American's need for a guiding myth, its need for "roots of religion" (75).

The late 1980s and early 1990s, writes Saunders, marked the start of Schwarzenegger's maturation into "an extraordinarily self-aware product" (124). At this stage Saunders assigns Schwarzenegger with a level of agency that had only been partially realised in the previous decade. The third chapter of the book is nicely titled 'Man of Irony: Or, How Arnie Learned to Grow and Love'. It is certainly clear from looking at Schwarzenegger's filmography that he was moving in a different direction. Unfortunately, Saunders' central thesis at this point feels somewhat stale and underwhelming. By now it is more than clear to the reader that Schwarzenegger changed direction so that his films would continue to capture shifting cultures and reflect contemporary events, whilst maintaining his conservative agenda. Nevertheless Saunders continues to provide additional context to elucidate his argument. At this time writes Saunders, Schwarzenegger was a husband and a father and "knee-deep in family values" (149). His film choices also reflected a softer edge in the body politic (149). Saunders' discussion of *Twins* (Ivan Reitman, 1988) makes the case that Schwarzenegger, along with the director Ivan Reitman, sought to manufacture in Schwarzenegger the image of softer, benevolent paternalism that echoed President George H.W. Bush's call for a "Kinder, gentler nation" (126). As an interesting side note to his discussion Saunders describes the 'real life' relationship between Schwarzenegger and the forty-first President. By tracing themes of fatherliness and patriarchal assertion in *Twins*, *Kindergarten Cop* (Ivan Reitman, 1990) and *Terminator 2* (James Cameron, 1991) Saunders outlines how closely Schwarzenegger's films followed the Republican rhetoric of "family, kids, loyalty, caring and faith" (125).

Whilst *Twins*, *Kindergarten Cop* and *Terminator 2* were big hits for the star the 1990s began to signal the sharp decline of the Schwarzenegger brand. The start of this trend is considered to be John McTiernan's *Last Action Hero* (1993). Drawing on the film's almost wholly negative reviews Saunders describes how *Last Action Hero* represented one of the first considerable miscalculations on the part of the star. The film's attempts to deconstruct and lampoon Schwarzenegger's iconic action roles had the effect of alienating his core demographic, "Joe Six-Pack" (175). Ideologically, Schwarzenegger was also now at odds with

Bill Clinton's popularly elected new Democratic administration. *True Lies* (James Cameron, 1994) was the notable exception to what became a clear downward trend in Schwarzenegger's box office success. The book's fourth and final chapter, 'Fall and Rise: The Will to Power', charts the star's continued missteps in attempting to probe new dramatic avenues whilst recapturing past glories. Saunders' discussion of *Junior* (Ivan Reitman, 1994) as a pro-life, anti-women absurdist comedy is a useful case study of such efforts.

Terminator 3 was Schwarzenegger's final film as an actor and most successful film since *Terminator 2*. It is also the final text dealt with by Saunders. The film marked the return of the T-101 as "the guardian of the future" in the wake of the attacks of September 11 2001 and George W. Bush's call to "answer these attacks and rid the world of evil" (200). Saunders argues how the T-101's return to inspire and protect John Connor once again reflected the Republican cause. Moreover, the film offered Schwarzenegger the chance to be relevant again, at a time when "a template for masculinity striving to assert itself under crisis" was needed (201). Although interesting, the final chapter lacks freshness. The reader is left with the impression that these arguments have been made in previous chapters.

In the book's epilogue however Saunders provides a wonderfully adroit summery of his central thesis. *Terminator 3* represented a return to Schwarzenegger doing what he does best: "packaging himself for contemporary popular consumption in the clothes of eternal myths" (207). By the books conclusion there is little doubt that Schwarzenegger and America's narratives are inexorably intertwined (208). However, his argument that Schwarzenegger's films are almost always a reflection of a right-wing agenda leaves little room for competing discourses. It should also be noted that the book is at times far too polemical and as a result the scholarship suffers. Schwarzenegger is clearly a complex, divisive and highly mediated star. However, by framing his readings of the films historically and covering a remarkable range of topics that include family, politics, warfare and over three decades of American history this is an effective intervention into the existing literature.

Jean-Pierre Jeunet**By Elizabeth Ezra**

Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2008. ISBN: 13 978-0-252-07522-3. 31 illustrations, xii + 159 pp. £14.99 (pbk).

The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience**By Jennifer M. Barker**

London: University of California Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-520-25842-6 (pbk). 15 illustrations, xii + 196 pp. £16.95 (pbk), £41.95 (hbk).

A Review by Alison Frank, Independent Scholar

Jean-Pierre Jeunet is best known for *Amélie*, the most successful French film of 2001. He also achieved a cult following with his first feature, *Delicatessen*, made ten years earlier. Jeunet's *City of Lost Children* (1995) was distinguished for its ambitious use of CGI effects, and led Twentieth-Century Fox to recruit him to Hollywood to direct the fourth in the *Alien* series of films. In spite of this success, or perhaps because of it, Jeunet's work seemed to have been snubbed by scholars as though unworthy of academic study. A handful of articles appeared on individual films, and just one book by Isabelle Vanderschelden, *Amélie*, published by University of Illinois Press in 2007. Once again, it is a University of Illinois publication that comes to fill this gap in research: part of its 'Contemporary Film Directors Series', *Jean-Pierre Jeunet* is the first book to provide a complete survey of Jeunet's work. Author Elizabeth Ezra had already demonstrated her sensitivity to complex themes in *Amélie* in her 2004 article in *French Cultural Studies* ('The Death of An Icon'). This new full-length study applies the same rich and rigorous analysis to the whole of Jeunet's corpus, as it stood at the time of publication.

Ezra immediately acknowledges the critical neglect that has been imposed on Jeunet, and offers two explanations. One is a prejudice in France against the fantastic in film, which can be traced back to the historic privileging of Lumière's work over that of Méliès. Strangely, Ezra notes, the French do admire fantastic films from the English-speaking world. This observation is borne out by French critics who reserved their warmest reception for Jeunet's only American-made fantasy, *Alien Resurrection* (1997),

a film which was considered a failure at the U.S. box office. The other, more logical explanation for scholarly neglect of Jeunet is a specific prejudice against his work because it is perceived to privilege form over content. It is Ezra's contention that, on the contrary, "this form itself contains a great deal of substance" (1). She goes on to analyse in detail the substantial themes that Jeunet addresses through visual and narrative form.

The book is divided into two parts: the first, and by far the longest, is entitled 'Prosthetic Visions' and begins with an introduction to Jeunet's career and some of the major themes that span his work. The remainder of 'Prosthetic Visions' is divided into subsections which examine each of Jeunet's films individually, in chronological order, from his short films of the late 70s and early 80s, to his most recent feature (at the time of Ezra's writing), *A Very Long Engagement* (2004). The second part of the book, by contrast, is no more than a brief appendix. It consists of Ezra's translation of a commentary which Jeunet originally made for the French television programme *Auto/Focus*.

The title of the first part, 'Prosthetic Visions', deserves some attention: since all of Jeunet's work is placed under this heading, it implies a thematic continuity. In the introductory section, before any of the films are examined individually, Ezra explains the multiple resonance of 'prosthetic visions': at base it refers to "the severing of ties with the past and its prosthetic restoration through the medium of film itself and through other mediatic representations" (10). Happily Ezra is adept at illuminating complex ideas through concrete examples, and she goes on to explain how, specifically, Jeunet's films thematize the repression of historical traumas and the necessary return of this repressed past. One manifestation of a problematic relationship with the past is the large number of characters in Jeunet's films who have lost one or both parents. In the case of the clones and human-extraterrestrial hybrids in *The City of Lost Children* and *Alien Resurrection*, some characters cannot be said to even have parents in any conventional sense. Ezra also points to the mixing of historical periods in costumes, sets and props which simultaneously evoke different times throughout the twentieth century: World Wars I and II, the post-war period, and the 1980s and 90s. Ezra suggests that this visual "seepage of the past into the present" (36) stands for both France's collaborationist history

and atrocities committed during the Algerian War. Both of these histories of war had been collectively denied to some degree, but were slowly being brought to light and dealt with during the last two decades of the twentieth century when Jeunet was making his films. Finally, Ezra notes a more literal reference to the past-present relationship as one of mutilation, amputation and prosthesis: a large number of characters in Jeunet's films are deformed in some way. Ezra goes on to explain that media, whether it is media represented in the diegesis of the film, or Jeunet's film as a medium itself, can help to stand in for the rejected past, as a kind of prosthesis. By providing a way for characters in the film (or viewers of Jeunet's films) to confront the past and deal with it, media help to prevent the past from repeating itself.

The 'prosthetic visions' heading is slightly misleading, however, as Ezra by no means limits her analysis to interpreting the films in light of this idea. Her study is much more wide-ranging, delving into each film with gusto, and invariably coming up with arresting insights about the films' aesthetic achievements and broader relevance. The result is at times a little peripatetic, as one insight may lead to the next in a manner that is more stream-of-consciousness than strictly logical. Yet Ezra's observations are so compelling that one doesn't much care how they are presented, at least not at the moment of reading. This is why the one fault I would find with this study is its lack of conclusion. Ezra's introduction to 'Prosthetic visions' could stand in as a conclusion of sorts, as it already provides a glimpse of Jeunet's major themes and how they run through his work. It would nonetheless be nice to have one final section that brings together the most important ideas that Ezra has discussed, and to comment on Jeunet's corresponding place in contemporary cinema. The book's second part, which features Jeunet's own commentary on his life and work, offers little which the reader does not already know: it would be far better to substitute this material with a few concluding words from Ezra herself.

The relationship between Ezra's book and Jennifer M. Barker's *The Tactile Eye* may not be immediately clear: whereas Ezra's book focuses on the work of an individual director from the end of the twentieth century, Barker's is driven by a particular philosophy, and draws on a broad range of examples from cinema

history to support her argument. The argument itself is not new, but is nonetheless intriguing: that cinema appeals strongly to viewers' sense of touch. As cinema began as a visual medium, and later became audio-visual, theories of cinema have traditionally focused on sight and sound. The traditional privileging of these two senses above touch, taste or smell is not restricted to the cinema, but applies across the arts. The gustatory and olfactory arts of cooking and perfumery are considered minor when compared to the visual and aural arts of painting and music. As for the tactile sense, it is typically suppressed in the presence of art, as one is forbidden to touch the pieces in a museum. As film viewers do not literally touch the screen either, there is all the more reason for the tactile dimension to have been neglected by cinema theory until recent years. As a result Barker, much like Ezra, needs to make a case for the relevance of her topic. She does so in a much more organised fashion than Ezra, and in a slightly longer book, and yet the end result seems to have rather less substance than Ezra's study.

One is likely to be initially well-disposed to Barker's book, however: the topic is alluring, the style is witty and engaging, and the rigorously organised approach is a courtesy to readers, always ensuring that they know where they are in the argument. In addition to its introduction and conclusion, the book comprises three chapters entitled 'Skin', 'Musculature', and 'Viscera'. This appears to be a wise choice of structure for two reasons. First, it promises variety: the book will not only deal with touch at the anticipated level, the skin, but explore other, more surprising dimensions. Secondly, it offers a pleasing metaphor for an increasingly profound exploration of the topic, as the author leads the reader deeper and deeper inside the viewer's physical experience of cinema. The reality of this structure does not quite correspond to the latter expectation, however. After a thoroughly engaging first chapter, the reader will begin both subsequent chapters anticipating similarly compelling arguments for further levels of physical engagement with the film. Unfortunately, these expectations are not borne out.

The first chapter on 'Skin' explores the different ways in which some films draw attention to surface details. Barker employs the term 'haptic' to refer to "a horizontal look along a flat surface"

(37). She situates this focus in relation historical precedent: Egyptian art tended to "privilege surface texture over depth" in contrast to an opposing tendency in the early Christian tradition (37). This idea was one of the most interesting in Barker's book, and I would love to have seen it explored in relation to an even wider range of films. As it is, I can find no fault with the first chapter: it deftly skips from one film to the next, each textual analysis bringing new dimensions to the argument. She examines the avant-garde use of surface effects in Carolee Schneeman's feminist erotic film *Fuses* (1965); the importance of touch in characters' relationship to their environment, and viewers' relationship to the film, in *Pather Panchali* (Satyajit Ray, 1955); the notion of skin as a container under threat in horror films such as *Repulsion* (Roman Polanski, 1965); and the importance of touch to genuine understanding in *Hiroshima mon amour* (Alain Resnais, 1959). Another highlight of this chapter was the inclusion of a thoroughly mainstream film in the discussion: although *Toy Story* (John Lasseter, 1995) was in some respects a counter example, as the film portrays a world of mass-produced smoothness, Barker acknowledges the resonance and relevance of these artificial textures to anyone growing up after World War II.

The second chapter, 'Musculature', argues that films appeal to the audience kinaesthetically: viewers feel as though they themselves are performing the actions that they see performed in the film. Barker goes to unnecessary length to explain all the ways in which the camera copies human movement. Clearly, she knows that the idea of the camera as an invisible spectator is an old one. Her motivation for re-hashing the argument is to establish clearly the muscular link between film and viewer, thereby laying the groundwork for her subsequent points about this physical engagement. Unfortunately, her subsequent arguments are also, at base, quite familiar. She uses the muscular engagement between film and viewer to explain the viewer's feeling of being 'there' in the film but at the same time 'here' in the cinema; she also cites this muscular engagement as the reason why we show physical reactions to the film (shifting away from danger or crying out in surprise, for example). True, Barker does bring something new to the discussion by explaining the viewer's feelings and reactions in terms of muscular engagement with the film, rather

than identification with the characters or absorption in the narrative. The discussion would have felt more relevant, however, if the examples she had chosen offered a deeper understanding of the viewer's relationship with the film, rather than a literal illustration of her point. As an example of the feeling of being in two places at once, she cites Keaton's *Sherlock Jr.* (1924), which shows a projectionist falling asleep and imagining that he has entered the film that is screening. In relation to viewers' physical reactions to the film reminding them that the film is only an illusion, she cites Wile E Coyote, whose gravity-defying plans only fail when he realises that they are impossible. In the first chapter it was more acceptable to present such self-contained examples, which restricted the phenomenon under discussion to the diegesis of the film rather than exploring the viewer's relationship to it. In this second chapter, however, Barker herself stresses the physical relationship between film and viewer, and as a result one expects examples which explore this relationship further, rather than just symbolising it. The one point for which Barker does offer enlightening examples is the way in which action films engage with the viewer on a muscular level. Barker acknowledges that there is no need to argue for the stimulating effect of these films, so instead she offers a nuanced analysis of the precise ways in which films such as *Bullitt* (Peter Yates, 1968) and *Spiderman* (Sam Raimi, 2002) thrill us, sometimes offering us super-human speed and perspective, and at other times tantalising us by withholding them.

Relating 'Viscera' to our cinematic experience is arguably the most difficult task this book undertakes, and yet the least space is devoted to this chapter. The most convincing examples come from *Run Lola Run* (Tom Tykwer, 1998), where filmic rhythms are aptly interpreted as evoking corporeal rhythms. Unfortunately, Barker once again brings in self-contained literal examples to make much less compelling points. She interprets the prologue of the Quay Brothers' *Street of Crocodiles* (1987) as illustrating the way in which a film leads its viewers into interior spaces comparable to the human body. Much more compelling is Barker's argument that stop-motion animation films draw attention to everyday textures; this example seems more suited to the first chapter on surface-level touch, however, and reinforces my belief that this study would have been better had it restricted itself to the haptic. In the chapter's least convincing

example, Barker sees a metaphor for orgasm in the ability, when watching an early hand-cranked mutoscope film, to stop at any point and have a closer look at one image in, for example, an erotic dance routine.

Like Ezra's book, Barker's lacks a conclusion *stricto sensu*, though Barker has the mitigating effect of having been very clear in the direction of her argument throughout. Still, it is bizarre that in Barker's book the section titled 'Conclusion' in fact acts as a final short chapter about breath, introducing new examples and ideas. It seems to me to be acting as an extension to the 'viscera' chapter, which was too short.

In spite of my criticisms about what this book brings, materially, to our understanding of the topic, Barker is skilled and erudite in her engagement with philosophical ideas, and her arguments are nuanced. She cogently draws attention to a relatively neglected dimension of the viewer's experience of film, and in doing so offers some exciting new perspectives which merit further study. I think that where this book fails is in parts where ideas have been allowed to lead and examples forced to follow: it is important to base any theories on evidence that one has first gained from watching the films, rather than interpreting the films to suit pre-conceived ideas.

Being Hal Ashby: Life of a Hollywood Rebel**By Nick Dawson**

Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2009. ISBN-10: 0813125383, ISBN-13: 978-0813125381. 440 pp. \$37.50 (hbk).

The Films of Hal Ashby**By Christopher Beach**

Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2009. ISBN-10: 0814334156, ISBN-13: 978-0814334157. 8 illustrations, 224 pp. \$24.95 (pbk).

A Review by Aaron Hunter, Queen's University Belfast, UK

The publication of Peter Biskind's highly readable *Easy Riders, Raging Bulls* (Simon & Schuster, 1999) helped promote a growing interest in the era often referred as "New Hollywood" – the period of filmmaking in the US from roughly 1967-1980. Biskind's book, a salacious tell-all, comes across at times more like a work dedicated to perpetuating industry gossip and apocrypha than a scholarly or analytical unearthing of facts. Biskind does not construct a theoretical model of how New Hollywood came into being (which has been done on many fronts elsewhere) but rather tells a wildly engaging tale. While there is no singular star or hero of Biskind's book, one figure does come across as the volume's tragic hero: director Hal Ashby. Getting many of the details of Ashby's life and career wrong, Biskind goes to great lengths to depict Ashby as a victim, passed by like many of his contemporaries as Hollywood completed its transformation from independent-minded cinema of the 1970s into blockbuster-fueled studio reconsolidation in the 1980s. Furthermore, Biskind paints Ashby as a victim of his own tragic behavior, particularly his penchant for wild drug binges in the later stages of his career. What Biskind does not explain is why Ashby, whose career was as successful as any of his contemporaries during the 1970s, would have been the subject of not one published book and few scholarly articles, either during his career or after his death in 1988. Biskind's book, as sensationalistic as it was, would be the last extended word on Ashby for a decade.

2009 saw the publication of two volumes on Ashby, both more nuanced in their approach to their subject than Biskind's. Nick Dawson's *Being Hal Ashby* is a biography that traces much that

was unknown about Ashby's life and corrects much that had been misunderstood about this 'Hollywood Rebel.' Christopher Beach's *The Films of Hal Ashby*, "the first critical study of Ashby's filmmaking career" (vii), attempts to establish a framework for understanding Ashby as a New Hollywood auteur, inexplicably overlooked by film scholarship. In so doing, Beach begins to sketch key formal and thematic aspects of Ashby 1970s filmography. Both are long overdue studies of this key New Hollywood figure, but in the end, neither are quite able to answer the question of why to this date Ashby has been so overlooked.

Being Hal Ashby is not a critical biography in that it incorporates no theoretical framework nor offers any sustained analysis of Ashby's films. It is, however, a meticulously researched account of every stage of Ashby's life and his development into a Hollywood director responsible for such films as *Harold and Maude* (1971), *Shampoo* (1975), *Coming Home* (1978), and *Being There* (1979). Dawson conducted several months of research of the Ashby collection at the Margaret Herrick Library in Los Angeles and interviewed many of Ashby's surviving family members, Hollywood luminaries like Warren Beatty and Jane Fonda, and life-long friends and collaborators like Haskell Wexler and Pablo Ferro. The result is a book rich in personal detail. Dawson deals extensively with Ashby's early years in Ogden, Utah, where he was the youngest of four children of a nominal Mormon family who ran a successful dairy operation. The volume fills in the details about his parents' divorce in 1935, and Dawson also takes the time to discuss in some detail the death of Ashby's father, James, by gunshot wound. While not able to prove that it was suicide (he makes a convincing case by examining the sheriff's report and other documents), he does dispel the long-purported rumor that Hal was the first to find his father's body.

More fascinating still is Dawson's examination of Ashby's early years in Los Angeles. He arrived in late 1948 and spent the better part of the next decade trying to establish himself as an assistant film editor, which he did in 1956. He also spent much of the decade working odd jobs and living a beatnik life with a collection of friends who were likewise trying to launch careers in their respective fields. Among them was Sammy Davis, Jr. – not yet a famous member of the Rat Pack – with whom Ashby went on a the road as a 'secretary-cum-manager'. It was during this time

that Ashby witnessed first-hand the biting discrimination and racism of the United States, which would affect him personally and his approach to filmmaking for the rest of his life (34-35).

Dawson does a fine job of exploring just how committed Ashby was to social causes. He quotes Ashby and his frequent collaborators talking at length about how they saw film as a means to explore important issues via a popular medium. Describing their work together on *In the Heat of the Night* (1967), for which Ashby won his sole Academy Award (for editing), Haskell Wexler said, "'We wanted to make a film that would make money, that people would see and that would express our awareness that progress was being made and that human values can supersede bigotry'" (88). Ashby maintained this approach to filmmaking throughout his successful run in the 1970s, so much so that he could arguably be considered the Hollywood director who interrogated social and political issues via film more consistently than any of his peers.

While Dawson details Ashby's dedication to imbuing his films with social value and relevance, he spends little effort interrogating the films' success as political vehicles. He does report some of the contemporary criticism of Ashby's political approach (for instance, how both Pauline Kael and Vincent Canby criticized *Coming Home* for "pulling its punches politically and trying to please too many people" (199)). However, his reluctance to engage in his own sustained critical analysis of the films is one of the book's drawbacks. Ashby's films inspire fervent loyalty among some fans, and filmmakers as divergent as Judd Apatow and Alexander Payne have openly avowed Ashby's influence on their filmmaking. At the same time, academic film scholarship seems to have deemed Ashby's films little worthy of study. How his films can inspire such dichotomous reactions is something Dawson seems at once to want to rectify by means of his book, but is also unwilling to engage in any analytical sense.

Where Dawson excels, however, and where his book is potentially most useful, is in its reconstruction of Ashby's later career, after his final success with *Being There*. Ashby released four more feature films and two full-length concert films in the 1980s, none of which were able to replicate his 1970s successes. According to conventional wisdom – which Biskind perpetuates – this collapse

is due to two related factors: Ashby's increased drug use, particularly cocaine, and his growing paranoia and ill temper. Dawson returns repeatedly to Ashby's drug habit. Based on his telling, while Ashby was a daily pot smoker throughout most of his life, he only briefly dabbled with cocaine during the mid-seventies, stopping after it became clear to him on the set of *Bound for Glory* (1976) that it was affecting his work. After that, there is little evidence, documented or anecdotal, that Ashby maintained a regular cocaine habit. Dawson even dispels the notion that Ashby's infamous collapse while shooting the Rolling Stones concert film *Let's Spend the Night Together* (1983) was due to cocaine abuse, a story explicitly detailed by Biskind.

Whether a filmmaker of the 1970s was using cocaine seems of little consequence when the drug was so prevalent during the era. However, Ashby's demise as a filmmaker of talent and power has often been chalked up to this factor, and Dawson details a more pedestrian cause: producer malfeasance and studio mistreatment. He explains in intricate detail – relying on interviews, court documents, legal correspondence – how Ashby's relationship with studios and producers transformed as the 1970s became the 1980s and New Hollywood came to its close. This part of the book will be fascinating for any student of Hollywood, regardless of interest in Ashby himself. Ashby's treatment at the hands of unscrupulous producers – riddled with broken deals and ill treatment – is a virtual minuet in miniature of how the era that flowered between *Bonnie and Clyde* (Arthur Penn, 1967) and *Raging Bull* (Martin Scorsese, 1980) came to its end. In 1978 Ashby entered a three-picture deal with Lorimar, which stipulated his creative control over many aspects of his filmmaking. One fruit of this relationship was *Being There*, but things soon went south as Lorimar continually changed aspects of the deal, often going behind Ashby's back to make secret arrangements with studios, deals over which Ashby was supposed to have approval. The culmination of these events was Lorimar's taking away from Ashby his film *Lookin' To Get Out* (1982), while at the same time threatening to sue Columbia to have Ashby fired from *Tootsie* (Sydney Pollack, 1982). Much like contemporaries Robert Altman and Martin Scorsese among others, Ashby would spend the 1980s struggling with producers who wanted to attach his name to their projects while being unwilling to give him the kind of creative

freedom in both shooting and editing that he had become accustomed to. Unlike those others, however, Ashby never got a second chance when the 1990s independent scene again made room for his distinctive, off-beat style of filmmaking.

Christopher Beach would unpack this style. His slim volume attempts a precise delineation of Ashby's formal and thematic approaches and an interrogation of whether those approaches hold up enough across his body of work to constitute the consistent style of an auteur. The 1970s, perhaps more than any other decade in Hollywood history, is still regarded as an era of strong directors; regardless of whether one accepts the basic premises of an auteurist film criticism, the auteur concept still colors film scholarship's characterization of the era. Thus it might make sense on first glance that Beach would set himself such a task (his first chapter is titled, 'Hal Ashby: New Hollywood Auteur'), but I'm not sure this is the most fruitful approach to a director like Ashby. Beach seems hesitant as well, admitting that, based on many of the criteria posited for recognizing a director as an auteur, "Ashby's status as an auteur is indeed questionable" (5), but he presses on with this line of argument.

There are two distinct problems with this critical strategy. First, Ashby was not an auteur. As Beach reiterates several times, Ashby not only relied on strong collaboration, he celebrated it. He remained resolute throughout his career that filmmaking was a collaborative, communal art form, and he worked best when everybody on his crew was contributing ideas for the project. He continually praised production designers, cinematographers, and editors, for their imaginative contributions to his films. Beach is aware of this, and he both praises Ashby for this method of filmmaking practice and elicits comment from Ashby's former colleagues about how fruitful it was (like Dawson, Beach makes significant use of the Ashby archives and extensive interviews). Yet even as he explores Ashby's collaborative filmmaking, he continues to rely on an auteur paradigm to guide him. This points to the second problem, not of Beach's making: the difficulty of evaluating a filmmaker of this era who is not easily ensconced within an auteur framework.

Beach's volume works best when he sticks to close analysis of the films. He focuses most of his attention on Ashby's 1970s output,

paring up the films from that era into thematic chapters: Ashby's early filmmaking attempts - *The Landlord* (1970) and *Harold and Maude* (1971); his approach to the military - *The Last Detail* (1973) and *Coming Home* (1978); his critique of the media - *Shampoo* (1975) and *Being There*. He then includes a chapter on Ashby's use of music in his films, and concludes with an overview of the difficulties of Ashby's final years as a filmmaker.

Throughout each of the thematic chapters, he weaves discussions of Ashby's formal approach to filmmaking, paying particular attention to such elements as framing, editing, average shot length, and Ashby's continual embrace of new technology. This structuring allows Beach to roam back and forth between thematic and formal analysis as well as to bring in examples from many films to complement the two at the centre of each chapter. Unfortunately, beyond the effort to claim Ashby as an auteur, there is no overriding theoretical framework to the analysis. The result being that the book can come across as something like an extended checklist of everything that is good or worthy about Ashby and his films. This is certainly a valuable first step in any potential rehabilitation of Ashby's critical reputation, but it might have been helpful to include a consistent critical thread working to tie the analysis together in support of a more substantial central thesis.

Beach's most helpful contribution might be his chapter on Ashby's use of music. Eschewing traditional film scores, Ashby relied heavily on soundtracks for his films – sometimes gravitating towards the music of one performer, as with Cat Stevens in *Harold and Maude*, at other times using songs from a wide variety of artists, as in *Shampoo* or *Coming Home*. Beach helpfully breaks Ashby's use of music into what he calls three levels: narrative enhancement, historical placement, and aesthetic enhancement (123). He then engages in an informative critique of how Ashby – both as director and editor – braids these three functions throughout his body of work in such a way that a film's soundtrack engages in a constantly shifting and elusive dialogue with the film's form and narrative. This shifting is due to how Ashby ties music to both the film's narrative and its editing, sometimes concordantly, sometimes independently. Beach also briefly touches on Ashby's willingness to elide a clear break between diegetic and nondiegetic music in his films. Of the music

in *Harold and Maude*, he writes, "Ashby had little interest in the kind of sonic realism created by maintaining strict diegetic and nondiegetic boundaries" (135). I would like to have seen more about this strategy. It occurs in all of his 1970s films and is key evidence of Ashby's role as a formal innovator. It also links directly to other postmodernist aspects of Ashby's filmmaking that remain poorly understood. However, Beach is content to call attention to this one instance and move on.

These two texts complement each other nicely. Dawson's exhaustive account provides key insight not only into Ashby's life, but also into the times he lived through, one of the more turbulent eras in Hollywood history. Beach, on the other hand, begins the necessary work of outlining just what made Hal Ashby's films so important in their day and worthy of continued study today. However, neither of them is able to elucidate just why Hal Ashby has been overlooked for so long. This is, in part, because they both still view the era through the paradigm of the auteur, as does most of film studies in general. Ashby is not the only New Hollywood director who will not slot easily into such a discourse; Sidney Lumet, Alan Pakula and Sydney Pollock, among others, are also in the awkward position of having made valuable films without meeting any auteurist standard. It seems that room must be made for a counter-narrative – one that need not replace the auteur framework, but can perhaps co-exist with it. Until such a framework is constructed, however, Hal Ashby will continue to flitter about the margins of the New Hollywood canon, misunderstood because current definitions are too narrow to contain him.

Steven Spielberg and Philosophy: We're Gonna Need a Bigger Book

Edited by Dean A. Kowalski

Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-8131-2527-5.
viii + 274 pp. \$27.99 (hbk).

Scenes of Love and Murder: Renoir, Film and Philosophy

By Colin Davis

London: Wallflower Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-1-905674-63-3. vii + 159 pp.
£16.99 (pkb).

A Review by Chelsea Wessels, University of St Andrews, UK.

'It only takes one character to say "man is not an island" for somebody to jump up and declare the film philosophical...'
Daniel Frampton, *Filmosophy*

The relationship between film and philosophy is constantly being redefined, with approaches ranging from what Frampton describes as the "oil and water" combination, where the separate disciplines are placed together but without connection, to a more fluid approach that uses philosophy to create a dialogue with film texts (*Filmosophy*, Wallflower Press, 2006). Coming from different backgrounds at very different subjects, Steven Spielberg and Jean Renoir, the collection *Steven Spielberg and Philosophy: We're Gonna Need a Bigger Book* and Colin Davis's *Scenes of Love and Murder: Renoir, Film and Philosophy* have little in common beyond the broad categorization of dealing with film and philosophy. However, approaching both in the same review offers an interesting context for considering the different modes of access in combining film and philosophy.

The essays in Kowalski's collection cover the usual suspects from Spielberg's filmography: *Jaws* (1975), *Minority Report* (2002), *Schindler's List* (1993), *A.I.* (2001), *War of the Worlds* (2005), and *E.T.* (1982). Each film serves as a test case for a different philosophical concept, becoming a representative example for laying out a philosophical argument. While this makes the book perfectly suited for a beginning philosopher looking for concrete examples of ideas such as a Levinasian ethics of alterity (covered

in an essay by John W. Wright), the broader questions at stake here are disconnected from film – it often feels arbitrary that the book uses film (or, more specifically, Spielberg) to approach these concepts. Kowalski makes it clear in the introduction that he doesn't see film, especially popular film, as *doing* philosophy but claims that "it cannot be denied that movies raise philosophical questions and sometimes offer suggestions about their answers (...) The real question, then, is to what extent a popular film *begins* to do philosophy" (4). In this way, it seems that the book begins with a kind of bias against film studies as a discipline, by situating films not as objects of study in their own right but rather as a starting point for entertaining basic philosophical discussions.

However, while the approach of Kowalski's book is perhaps less generous towards the actual films it discusses, it certainly meets the mark in reaching an intended audience with little background in philosophy but an interest in basic philosophical arguments illustrated by clear examples from Spielberg's most popular films. In this way, Spielberg is the perfect vehicle, because his body of filmic work echoes recurring themes and provides a clear starting point for questions of moral obligations, friendship, ethics, and human nature. Each contributor provides appropriate background information on both the films and the philosophical concepts, which renders the essays accessible and informative.

The value of a book like this doesn't lie in its contributions to the field of film studies, since the discipline as a whole remains secondary to philosophy throughout. What makes this book interesting is the way that it works with popular film in order to engage philosophical concepts at a level that is approachable to readers outside a strictly academic audience. At the same time, this means that for readers with a background in either film or philosophy the arguments made in the book aren't particularly groundbreaking. This isn't necessarily a criticism, as I believe the intention of the collection is clearly to appeal to and inform an audience new to the intersection of film and philosophy.

Colin Davis's *Scenes of Love and Murder: Renoir, Film and Philosophy*, on the other hand, is vastly different in terms of topic, approach, and audience. Davis's project involves using ideas drawn from Aristotle, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, and

Stanley Cavell (among others) in order to illuminate particular themes in Renoir's films. While the obvious themes from the title are love and murder, Davis focuses on the way that these reflect a particular political reading of Renoir's skepticism. In this way, Davis reveals the way that the "themes of desire, violence, shared values and social justice crystallise around the founding questions of philosophical scepticism" (26). This allows him to not only provide careful readings of individual films such as *La Chienne* (1931), *La Grande Illusion* (1937), and *La Règle du jeu* (1939), but also to engage with larger philosophical arguments about friendship, community, and otherness.

What sets Davis apart in this realm is an approach that combines film and philosophy in order to create an argument that draws on both a solid foundation from film studies and a clear understanding of past and current philosophical issues and writers. On the other hand, his book is clearly aimed at a purely academic (or Renoir fanatic) audience, which perhaps limits the appeal in a mass market. In terms of the readership of *Scope*, however, with a clear interest in film and television studies, the arguments posited by Davis are thought-provoking and relevant, without trying to re-invent the wheel. What I mean by this is not that Davis treads on familiar territory, but rather that he takes well known material by Renoir and creates a new understanding of how to read Renoir's work that doesn't make any radical departures in its conclusions, perhaps, but draws on new and interesting approaches to reach them.

Davis's approach engages with various philosophical concepts and authors in order to create a cohesive and focused argument around the themes of love and murder in Renoir's films. While this kind of thinking could just as easily be used to consider Spielberg, or what Kowalski terms 'popular films,' Kowalski's book seems to lack this particular thrust entirely. Therefore, if my evaluation leans toward favoring Davis, it should be clear that it isn't because his subject seems more 'respectable' or 'academic.' Rather, if we're going to talk about film *and* philosophy, Davis offers a more developed response in terms of combining these two disciplines to the question of how films work with philosophy or – not to sound repetitive, but in order to avoid prioritizing – how philosophy works with film.

Book Reviews

Ultimately, these books reveal the growing trend towards actively engaging the intersections between film and philosophy and the ways these two disciplines – philosophy and film studies – can inform each other. Kowalski's collection offers an excellent point of entry for those outside these particular disciplines, and uses Spielberg's films as clear examples of basic philosophical concepts and arguments. For readers more entrenched in academia, and particularly those with an interest in Cavell or Renoir, Davis provides a fascinating approach to considering larger themes in the work of Renoir and their connections to broader philosophical questions.

The Cinema of Naruse Mikio: Women and Japanese Modernity**By Catherine Russell**

Duke University Press, 2008. ISBN: 0822343126. 488 pp. £16.99 (pbk), £69.00 (hbk).

Forest of Pressure: Ogawa Shinsuke and Postwar Japanese Documentary**By Abé Mark Nornes**

University of Minnesota Press, 2007. ISBN: 0816649081. 288 pp. \$25.00 (pbk), \$75.00 (hbk).

A Review by Stephen Potter, University of Edinburgh, UK

Born into a poor family in Tokyo in 1905, Naruse Mikio entered the film industry in 1920 when he joined Shochiku studios as a prop man. Over the next decade he could only look on as his script ideas were rejected and his contemporaries – among them Ozu – were given their opportunities to direct features. His chance to direct finally came in 1930, and he would go on to make a total of eighty-nine films in a directing career that would continue until two years before his death in 1969, a career which began in black-and-white silents and would end in lavish Tohoscope. Despite a number of his films appearing in the annual Kinema Jumbo top-ten polls, he seems to have been valued by his employers as much for his reliability in bringing in projects on time and within budget as for the quality of his films.

Since the 1980s a number of critics have advanced the claims of Naruse Mikio to be considered a master of classical Japanese cinema to rank alongside Ozu, Mizoguchi and Kurosawa. But as Catherine Russell's new book, *The Cinema of Naruse Mikio*, makes clear, Naruse's career was not one of uninterrupted success; indeed he would often be sidelined or overlooked by his studios, and perhaps as a result seems to have been unable to decline even the most unpromising of assignments. By all accounts he was a taciturn and rather unprepossessing man; however, Russell's interest lies not in Naruse the man but in his work and its relationship to Japanese society. Her aim is "to indicate how [Naruse's] cinema participates in and contributes to

Japanese modernity as a cultural movement" (xiii), with her methodology "based on the extent to which the films expose the contradictions of everyday life, their representation of women's roles in family and society, and the narrative construction of women's agency and subjectivity" (xiii).

Why has Russell chosen Naruse? A number of reasons might be put forward: he is seen as a director of 'women's films', films about women, often based on source material written by women, and made for female audiences; most of his films have contemporary settings among the new urban working and lower middle classes; his work is often considered 'materialist' (as opposed to the 'transcendence' of, say, Ozu's films) in the sense that it deals with the real everyday concerns – food, shelter, money – of everyday people rather than more lofty pursuits and pleasures; and the sixty-seven films that are extant provide a rich corpus for study. In short, Russell's approach, perhaps encouraged by Naruse's materialism, is to take the narrative of each film at face value; that is, to consider it as though it were the report of an actual or at least a plausible occurrence, and to dissect this for signifiers of modernity. The films' status as commodities is wilfully disregarded; and Russell's lack of Japanese means that she must rely on subtitles and translations of secondary material (and hence she privileges action over speech in the films). This methodology treats Naruse's work as "a case study or sample of a complex historical-cultural formation" (27) but ultimately comes across as a confusing jumble of rather disparate elements.

A further weakness of this approach is that in order to designate some concept or relationship as belonging to modernity, one must be able to distinguish it from those that are premodern. It is salient to note here that for his *Arcades Project* (Belknap Press, 2002) – that sprawling, unfinished and extraordinary work, frequently cited by Russell – Walter Benjamin was careful to select contemporary texts that describe the *novelties* of nineteenth century Parisian life, that is, texts that internally distinguished the modern from what had gone before. While one could propose a general definition, more or less universal, of the historical experience that is modernity – say, life in an increasingly industrialized, urbanized and technologized society – everywhere local peculiarities distort and continuously undermine

any attempt at a definitive classification into modern and premodern. Russell seems content to consider modernity from her vantage point – which might coarsely be described as the Americo-European experience – and so risks mistaking the specifically Japanese experience of modernity. One need only consider the bare facts to understand how different that experience could be. The rapid modernization that followed the Meiji Restoration of 1867 was instigated to counter foreign influence in Japan. This was done, paradoxically, by introducing American and European models of industrialization into what was essentially a feudal society governed by an aristocratic oligarchy. This was followed by a series of unique experiences: war, natural disaster, imperial adventure, catastrophic military defeat, and enemy occupation to list only the most obvious and traumatic. The historical specificity of modernism, especially when viewed from the perspective of the distant observer, always already troubles any definition of modernity.

With these limitations, and the scale of her ambition, it is perhaps inevitable that the results of Russell's study are tentative, subjective, sometimes banal and often contentious. This is not to say that her book is without interest; however, this interest is often anecdotal and incidental, arising as much from the interesting times through which Naruse lived. So does Russell contribute anything to our appreciation of Naruse and his work? Certainly, by conscientiously working her way through all of his extant films rather than just the accepted classics from the 1950s she seems to confirm Noël Burch's description of Naruse's career as "uneven" (Noël Burch, *To the Distant Observer*, University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies Electronic Reprint Series, 2004: 186). Indeed, for whole sequences of films from the 1930s and 1940s Russell's plot descriptions merge into a welter of melodrama and car-crashes, and one senses that even her enthusiasm for her project flags from time to time. As a filmmaker, Naruse's particular skills seem to have been his ability to determine shot set-ups in advance (hence his filmmaking efficiency) and his apparently seamless editing (although he had abandoned any modernist experiments with editing by the end of the 1930s, settling instead into a rather conventional style).

One thing that emerges clearly from Russell's account is the degree to which the quality of Naruse's films is dependent on the

quality of the source material (he seems to have had a particular affinity for the writings of Hayashi Fumiko - 1903/4-1951). Russell's discussion of architecture in the films feels like an afterthought, and curiously she concentrates on Naruse's use of traditional domestic architecture, rather than the modern urban spaces more evocative of modernity. She adds little to what others have said before – namely that the rectilinear aspects of the traditional Japanese house and the conventions by which this space is occupied both constrain the filmmaker to certain perspectives and offer dramatic possibilities by camera placement or actor movement that disturb those conventions. Likewise, her attempts to align Naruse's late films with the new wave directors of the 1960s are unconvincing: while for Naruse a car accident signals plot development, in Oshima's *Boy (Shonen, 1969)* or Godard's *Week End (1967)* it can set in motion a chain of events that threatens to cast down the whole of society.

Perhaps the true representation of modernity in Naruse's films can be found in the recurring figure of the salaryman. Although he lies – or more often paces restlessly – on the margins of Russell's study and his abject relations with his employer suggest a continuation of pre-Restoration feudalism, his alienation seems uniquely modern, and one can sense this in Naruse's films. This is alienation from work – what do these men do all day in their identical office blocks? – and also from society in general and their families in particular. Although well aware of the diversions and distractions that modernity offers, he lacks the time, money and energy to secure them. This alienation seeps too into the figure of the salaryman's wife, who, unable to understand her husband's work in anything but financial terms, is inevitably disappointed with the meagre wages he brings home and the life they lead. And, finally, perhaps there is something of the disappointed salaryman in the figure of Naruse himself, who would too often find himself obliged to make conventional and rather dull pictures. And yet there remain hints of the path he might have followed, the films he might have made. His most 'transcendental', Ozu-like film, *Sound of the Mountain (Yama no oto, 1954, one of Naruse's own favourite films)* is considerably more successful than Ozu's Narusian melodrama *Tokyo Twilight (Tokyo boshoku, 1957)*; it deals with sexual identity and politics more profoundly – and disturbingly – than in any film of Ozu's; and, with the mysterious shot of a lantern in the night rain, it

contains an image as strange and compelling as the much-discussed shot of the vase in Ozu's *Late Spring* (*Banshun*, 1949).

If one can discern the traces of Japanese modernity in the films of Naruse, it is exposed in all its brutality in the series of documentaries made by the collectives that clustered around the charismatic presence of Ogawa Shinsuke (1936-1992). In *Forest of Pressure: Ogawa Shinsuke and Postwar Japanese Documentary* Abé Mark Nornes has written a fascinating account of the career of Ogawa and his collaborators, placing them in the context of Japanese documentary filmmaking – and of Japanese society more generally – in the years since 1945.

In the immediate post-war decades Japanese documentary struggled to break free of occupation censorship, of stylistic conservatism and, as the nation began to recover economically, of the financial lure and ethical compromises of the public relations film (a genre that perhaps achieved its apotheosis in Ichikawa Kon's *Tokyo Olympiad* (1965)). In 1964, after some time spent working for a PR film company – his urge to experiment was not appreciated – Ogawa, in common with many young Japanese filmmakers at that time, sought independence. He had made his first films with his university film society in the 1950s. One of these, about the education of children in a mountain village, involved extensive research, study trips to the village, and socialising with villagers to gain their trust, to understand their living conditions and to collaborate in making the film, while often leaving the actual business of filming to others. His thoughts now returned to this experience, and he hit upon the idea of a documentary about university students that would be made with their collaboration. Together they established Jieiso, essentially a film society devoted to the production and – crucially – the distribution of the film. Jieiso established a nationwide network of sympathisers who would organise screenings and raise funds, and would go on to make two further films, with increasingly politicized content. Its final film, documenting clashes between riot police and protestors, and shot by film crews in the thick of the action, prefigures the next step in Ogawa's – and Jieiso's – progress.

Sanrizuka is an agricultural region to the west of Tokyo which had been chosen as the site for the city's new Narita airport. The

development was opposed by often violent protests which pitched farmers and sympathetic students against the agents of state capitalism. Sanrizuka would be home for the next nine years to Ogawa Pro, the new production company formed in 1968 by members of Jieiso (the irony of a film collective that is named for an individual has not gone unremarked). Rejecting the bland – and fraudulent – 'objectivity' of the PR film, Ogawa Pro made no secret about where its allegiances lay. While filming police operations for *Summer in Sanrizuka* (*Nihon kaiho sensen – Sanrizuka no natsu*, 1968) one of Ogawa Pro's crews had been attacked by riot police and arrested. In jail they filed affidavits with the court; as translated by Nornes these are by turns bizarre, funny and horrific. It is worth quoting at length to show just what was at stake for the filmmakers:

At this time I protested, "Why are you using this kind of violence? Tell us exactly why, please!" The plainclothes police said, "Aren't you disturbing the execution of public affairs? Eh?" I replied, "We didn't throw rocks. We only photographed what was going on." And three plainclothes police shouted "What? Aren't you always making movies with the [protestors]? You have to do things from an objective position. You've gotta shoot from an objective position." [As they spoke they were] shoving my body and hitting my arm with metal batons. Since the reason for this violence was not at all clear I said "Who can judge objectivity and what standards to use violence?" And as I said this, about 70-80 riot police came from the road and one of them said, (...) "Don't talk dirty, you bastard!" and I was punched in the face, thrown against a fence, and kicked repeatedly around my knees. (66)

However, in time even this position proved unsatisfactory. Ogawa Pro's response was to deepen the relationship with the villagers and their land by living and working alongside them. In the later Sanrizuka films the protests are relegated to the background, and they instead display an appreciation of "village time" (116), attuned to the rhythms of village life and the villagers themselves, and captured in a corresponding aural and visual long-take aesthetic. This heightened awareness was hard won – it took years of living and working alongside the villagers – but it would result in complex, rewarding and wholly unique

documentaries that, in the words of Burch, "display a remarkable *material* understanding of the concrete modes of behaviour and discourse specific to those who work the land" (Burch, 2004: 361, Burch's emphasis).

Whether coincidence or not, this development in Ogawa Pro took place at around the same time as the Japanese New Left imploded as its failures at Sanrizuka and elsewhere became apparent. This left Ogawa Pro without an audience – and without an income. In 1975 the decision was made to relocate to Magino village in Yamagata province in the north-east of Japan: there they would learn to grow their own food and live collectively (and frugally), and make films about their experiences. But these changes would lead to unrest; and the mood was not improved as filmmaking was all but abandoned while the collective went to astonishing lengths in its study and written documentation of rice cultivation. Eventually, however, they would return to filmmaking, with *"Nippon": Furuyashiki Village (Nippon koku: Furuyashiki-mura, 1982)* taking the FIPRESCI critics' prize at the 1984 Berlin Film Festival, and their approach continued to develop with the use of professional actors alongside locals – often playing their own ancestors – in re-enactments of village life and history.

In his book Nornes skillfully manages to plot a course through the convoluted politics and theoretical discourse surrounding documentary filmmaking in post-war Japan. He came to know the members of the collective in the years leading up to Ogawa's death from cancer in 1992 at the age of 55 (Nornes would become involved with the Yamagata International Documentary Film Festival, one of the legacies of Ogawa's time in the province). While treading warily around the sensitivities of former Ogawa Pro members, Nornes does not shrink from the controversies that surround the man. We catch glimpses of Ogawa the mythomane, fabricating his biography to bolster his radical credentials; Ogawa the autocrat, the first among equals, encouraging junior members to make their own films before stepping in to assert his authority; Ogawa the prodigal, who at his death left Ogawa Pro with debts which Nornes puts at ¥100m; and Ogawa the fellow-traveller who shied away from the less picturesque – and more desperate – plight of the urban poor. But then there are the films themselves, which now more than ever

Book Reviews

deserve – demand – a wider audience, but which are currently unavailable on DVD (there was a mini-retrospective curated by Mark Cousins at the Sheffield Doc/Fest in 2008 which offered a tantalising sample of the work).

And what of Sanrizuka and the struggle? To quote from one of the video postcards sent to us by Chris Marker, the conscience of filmmaking, reflecting on the Narita protests a decade later in *Sunless* (*Sans soleil*, 1983): "Concretely it has failed. At the same time, all they had won in their understanding of the world could have been won only through the struggle."

Anatomy of Film. Sixth Edition.**By Bernard F. Dick**

New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. ISBN: 0-213-48711-8. 157 illustrations. 448 pp. \$46.95 (pbk).

A Review by Monika Raesch, Suffolk University, USA

A book dedicated to the author's students, *Anatomy of Film* seeks to introduce students to the film studies discipline and succeeds fully in doing so, though there may be some minor issues. The author Bernard F. Dick rightfully argues in his 'Preface' that his goal can only be achieved by continuously updating the materials to enable students to relate and to learn from their own film viewing experiences. Throughout the book, he successfully connects recent films that students know with those from the past to enrich the readers' knowledge beyond their understanding of contemporary film and he does so in a way that students are not overwhelmed. It also permits readers new to the discipline to feel knowledgeable simply by knowing many of the contemporary films he discusses. Addressing newcomers to film studies in this manner makes this book very accessible, relatable, and overall easy-to-read.

The ten chapters provide a well-rounded overview of various approaches to film studies. Chapter one, 'Understanding the Medium', successfully introduces students to important concepts and historical facts, such as the meaning of the terms 'text', 'movies' and 'cinema'. This also underscores the fact that the use of language is key to successful film analysis. One has to be precise with one's vocabulary to communicate effectively. Also, key directors of the early film period are mentioned, including the Lumière brothers, Méliès and Porter. The book covers key films and directors throughout film history, which adds to the book's success of being an appropriate introductory read in an academic setting. Throughout the first chapter, Dick implies that film is a complex field of study that requires in depth consideration of a variety of factors before evaluating a movie. The downside of this chapter is that it mentions Bollywood, defines an establishing shot, and provides a brief summary of the evolution of independent film - all in twenty pages. This lack of focus makes it challenging if not impossible to apply all the information to one

specific film course. Rather, it most likely provides information that is covered in a variety of film classes, introductory as well as advanced or special topic courses in a Film Major.

Chapter two, 'Graphics and Sound' is unconventional as in other introductory film texts not as much time is dedicated to the analysis of opening and closing credits of a movie. Also, such information is not usually provided at the beginning of a book. It might be more effective to first engage the reader to learn about a film's (other) macro and micro elements, followed by a consideration of the various titles to determine how they relate to these stylistic choices. Dick provides us with a lot of different examples of opening title sequences, but as a reader I find myself relating the information he provides to my academic (not general audience) knowledge of the films as a whole and of other examples at my disposal. His statements gain significance only via these relations. It may be more beneficial to read this portion on graphics at a later stage when it can be connected with other major elements that make up a film.

The pairing of graphics and sound in one chapter is also rather unique, and I cannot see the benefits of it as the two topics are hardly interconnected. Each element can be seen as a separate chapter. Nevertheless, the author's analysis of the use of sound in *M* (Fritz Lang, 1931) is well chosen, and he provides various relevant terminology, even though 'diegetic' and 'non-diegetic' are never introduced. Instead, definitions of the terms 'synchronization' and 'asynchronization' are provided, which are somewhat misleading as they overlap with the meanings of the former, diegetic and non-diegetic. A more successful example of introducing this film terminology is David Bordwell's *Film Art: An Introduction* (McGraw-Hill, 1996) one of the most popular introductory texts in the discipline.

'Film, Space and Mise-en-Scene,' the title of Chapter three, creates an expectation that is not met as the author dedicates the first thirteen pages to an explanation of camera terminology. The title does not suggest this focus. Nevertheless, the section is particularly successful as the author provides a blend of vocabulary, definitions and film examples, some of which are also illustrated by movie stills. A production or theory class on cinematography can easily use this section. Editing terminology

and technique, along with a segment on Sergei Eisenstein's work - which is essential for any discussion on montage editing - is a logical part to the chapter. This second part is as engaging as the former section. While the final part of this chapter is entitled 'mise-en-scene,' Dick continues to discuss camera terminology, such as "tight framing" (88), "shallow focus" (93), and "handheld camera" (95). While the content fits well with the other parts of the chapter, I had expected to be reading about lighting, props, setting, costume and other such aspects of the frame, given the chapter title. Overall, while the chapter's content is essential for the book, the chapter title and some headings raise unmet expectations in readers.

Chapter four approaches the use of colour from various viewpoints, including a brief historical overview of the development of black and white and colour film; using colour as a symbol; a close study of 'The Visual Style of *The Hours*'; and the concept of lighting. The last section covers essential terminology, such as three-point lighting and high-key lighting. Somewhat awkwardly, the next segment of this chapter focuses on special effects, which is not necessarily a logical progression from the previous content. While visual/lighting effects are a part of special effects, primarily audiences expect to read about explosions, gun shots, CGI and stunts.

Chapter five, 'Film Genres', is divided into various segments, with each introducing one genre. Dick provides an array of popular genres, such as Western, crime, film noir, combat film, comedy (and its various sub-genres), horror and science-fiction, and some others which mainstream audiences might not have heard of, including reflexive and woman's film. In each of the sections Dick mixes a historical overview of the development of the genres with close studies of important movie examples; codes and conventions; and some advantages and disadvantages of a genre studies approach. Especially the problematic of taking a genre approach, which is expressed in the musical section by pointing out what qualifications a film must meet in order to be classified a musical - *8 Mile* (Curtis Hanson, 2002) is not a musical despite its musical performances - raises the text beyond that of a casual film conversation (125). Equally important, the author emphasizes the fact that genres evolve over time (128). However, while the chapter provides some suggestions to the

pros and cons of genre studies, it does not provide an in-depth summary of genre viewpoint. This is not a shortcoming of the book as it is an introductory text, but needs to be noted for the prospective reader/user. For instance, John Hartley, David Bordwell and other theorists who have written on genre theory are not mentioned. Also, the respective genre summaries provide basic knowledge but do not provide concepts or other terminology. For example, documentary modes are not introduced in the chapter's documentary section. They are alluded to by the provided examples that illustrate different techniques. Similarly, the ethical and moral code of non-fiction filmmaking is only suggested when discussing the theory of agenda setting; here, fittingly Al Gore's *Inconvenient Truth* (2006) is examined.

The segment dedicated to myth in Chapter six, 'Film Subtext', is a great introduction to a complex theoretical concept. Naturally, the text does not reach as much depth as Barthes' *Myth Today* (in *Mythologies*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972) but is very successful as an introduction to the study of myth in film. Using a reading of *The Matrix* (Andy Wachowski, Larry Wachowski, 1999) trilogy is very attractive for current readers because it relates this abstract concept to mass audiences. The section on 'Intellectual Associations' (219-230) can be used as a starting point for other theoretical concepts, such as semiotics and film adaptation. It permits instructors to integrate the text in a variety of ways, enabling them to suit their particular student body. The case study of *The Shop Around the Corner* (Ernst Lubitsch, 1940) targets the readers very well, as most are familiar with the most recent film adaptation *You've Got Mail* (Nora Ephron, 1998), starring Tom Hanks and Meg Ryan. Dick's explanations of 'leitmotif' are very successful when he discusses musical associations (230-237). The placement of certain sub-topics, such as musical associations, is the only aspect that could be considered unsatisfactory in this book. The success of each chapter depends on a course's specific aims, objectives, and content and determines whether the book can be read chronologically or whether reading assignments need to be more segmented.

Chapter seven turns the focus on the arguably most important person involved in the creation of a film - the director. The author

successfully summarizes the history of the auteur concept and the significance it holds in the film industry in five pages. The complexity of the auteur theory as Janet Staiger illustrates in her essay 'Authorship Approaches' (*Authorship and Film*, Gerstner, D. and Janet Staiger eds., Routledge, 2003) is not reached, but this chapter provides readers with Sarris's three principles of how to determine if a director is an auteur (240). An instructor can link the remaining sections of the chapter, such as 'Repetition' and 'Variety,' to the auteur concept; as such these sections are well placed within the chapter. The choice of the discussion of the work of four directors (Billy Wilder, Edward Dmytryk, Sidney Lumet and David Mamet) could be more diverse. This can be accomplished by including a current popular director who students are attracted to.

The title 'Film and Literature' suggests Chapter eight covers film adaptation. As adaptation has been alluded to in other parts of the book and as it is an important area of film studies, it is only fitting to dedicate a chapter to this aspect of film studies. However, the brief summaries on concepts such as the "flashback" (270) and "implied author" (274) do not permit a student to fully grasp the meaning behind the work of adapting a text. The case studies of classic literature, including Jane Austen's *Emma* and Amy Heckerling's version *Clueless* (1995) provide great insight into the academic study of adaptation. Dick also provides case studies on plays and short stories which provides an appropriate mix of materials. The chapter concludes with a very brief section on screenwriting. Possibly it is too short to be of much use, and as *Anatomy of Film* is aimed at introducing readers to the area of film studies, it does not (necessarily) need to cover the actual processes of filmmaking.

Chapter nine returns to the book's focus on introducing readers to film studies very precisely by focusing on 'Film Analysis'. The chapter consists of analyses of various popular and acclaimed films, including *Raging Bull* (Martin Scorsese, 1980), *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (Ang Lee, 2000), and *Pan's Labyrinth* (Guillermo del Toro, 2006), to name just a few (323-343). This chapter applies all theoretical aspects the reader has been introduced to in the previous chapters and concludes with a list of key research questions that are useful for any reader who aims at analyzing a film but feels lost or stuck. Positioning these

applications here is structurally very successful because the final chapter adds further complexity to film analysis, leaving the reader with a preview of 'advanced film studies'.

A particular successful chapter is Chapter Ten, 'Film Theory and Criticism', in which the history of film criticism is discussed from a variety of viewpoints. Concepts including auteurism, semiotics and feminism are (further) explained. The author provides a case study of *Citizen Kane* (Orson Welles, 1941), one of the most important movies in film history and one that many film students have watched on their own already. Students are able to understand how the same film can be analyzed in a variety of ways, with each way being of equal value. This seems particularly effective, as students are usually required to write research papers or reviews. They need to learn that a specific viewpoint is essential and that a variety of approaches are needed to discuss a film in depth; Dick's text provides excellent material to cover these factors.

'Appendix one' provides a list of films and directors the author uses in the book. Additionally, pictures that are deemed to be of 'historical and cultural significance' by the Library of Congress's National Film Registry are marked with a star. It is possible that at the beginning of a course, students can identify the films they have already seen and can revisit the list at the end of the course. Also, it is a general guide for anybody who wants to immerse oneself in the subject matter to follow the list to which films should be watched to create a well-rounded knowledge base from which to evaluate other films. Some movies and directors included in the list are *All that Heaven Allows* (Douglas Sirk, 1955), *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom* (Steven Spielberg, 1984), Spanish auteur Pedro Almodovar, David Lean, Robert Yemekis, Sidney Lumet, Martin Scorsese, Francois Truffaut, Gillo Pontecorvo, and Fritz Lang. This selection represents the blend of mainstream, foreign, and classic works that Dick alluded to covering in his 'Preface' and in 'Chapter one'. He succeeded to do this throughout his book. A glossary of Motion Picture Terms is also provided at the end of the book, which is a standard, effective technique to enable readers to remind themselves quickly of a term and a definition.

In 'Appendix two', students are provided with further suggestions on how to approach the at first daunting task of writing about a film. Dick reiterates that one should focus on one film and narrow one's subject matter down even further. He suggests various approaches to writing about Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960): one centers on the motif of doubles - "characters who are mirror or reverse images" (408). Another approach uses film adaptation to evaluate the film by comparing it to its source text, Robert Bloch's *Psycho*(409). A sample student paper is also provided. While these parts are very successful, the very brief section on citation is less satisfactory precisely because it is very brief. Students are only informed how to cite a book (fittingly, the example is *Anatomy of Film*) and a journal article. Websites, films, or special features on a DVD are not included, yet they are just as essential. Citation of online resources is provided in the four page short 'Appendix three' in which the author provides an array of internet information. This information is limited to such an extent that it might be considered useless by some, as it does not cover all the basics on how to use the internet in film studies. The author provides two citation formats, MLA and CMS, which again suggests to the student reader that attention must be paid to the smallest detail.

Overall, this book is an effective introductory book for someone new to the field of film studies and students who want to receive a complete overview and an understanding of the complexities of this particular field of studies. The film facts Dick uses throughout the book all engage, fascinate, educate, and permit readers to read an entire chapter (or even more than one) easily in one sitting. This reviewer uses sections or chapters of the text as introductory background material in two of her classes.

Playing with Memories: Essays on Guy Maddin.

Edited by David Church

Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2009. ISBN: 9780887557125. 280 pp.
CDN \$29.95 (pbk).

The Young, the Restless, and the Dead: Interviews with Canadian Filmmakers, Volume 1.

Edited by George Melnyk

Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-1-55458-036-1.
150 pp. £12.99 (pbk).

A Review by Rachel Walls, University of Nottingham, UK

Playing with Memories: Essays on Guy Maddin and *The Young, the Restless and the Dead: Interviews with Canadian Filmmakers, Volume 1* are two recent publications that are testament to the diversity and originality of Canadian film. The predominant focus of these volumes is on feature film making with negligible attention to animation or documentary, the forms for which Canada is traditionally best known. This is, however, a noteworthy indication that Canada's achievements in feature film are now significant, and the association of Canada primarily with animation and documentary is outdated. In this review essay, I intend to provide an in-depth consideration of Church's collection of essays on Guy Maddin, one of Canada's most unusual filmmakers. I subsequently turn my attention to Melnyk's smaller volume of interviews (which also includes an interview of Guy Maddin by the editor).

Guy Maddin has been described as "the most mainstream experimental filmmaker and the most experimental mainstream filmmaker" (Melnik, 42). He has produced numerous short films, including the critically acclaimed *The Heart of the World* (2000), and nine features to date, with a tenth, *Keyhole*, forthcoming in 2011. His best known features are perhaps *The Saddest Music in the World* (2003) starring Isabella Rossellini, and the 'docufantasia' tribute to his home town, *My Winnipeg* (2007). His work is not limited to cinema and crosses media boundaries. *Dracula: Pages from a Virgin's Diary* (2002) adapted a stage ballet production initially for television and its critical success

subsequently led to a theatrical release. *Cowards Bend the Knee* (2003) was an art exhibit at the Power Plant Contemporary Art Gallery in Toronto. The film was viewed through ten peepholes each showing six minutes of the film. *Brand Upon the Brain* (2006) premiered at the Toronto International Film Festival with live orchestral accompaniment from the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and narration by Louis Negin. Maddin himself provided live narration at a number of *My Winnipeg* screenings, at international venues such the British Film Institute that this author was fortunate enough to attend. Winnipeg has had a starring role in most of Maddin's filmmaking, its abandoned buildings and industrial spaces transformed by potato flake snow showers and Vaseline smeared lenses. Yet despite his loyalty to local roots, Maddin has captured the imagination of international audiences with his potent concoctions of all but forgotten film techniques, bizarre biographical details, transgressive romances and absurd comedy.

David Church's edited collection on Guy Maddin features both new and previously published work. It is a treat for any Maddin fan, bound to peak the interest of those less familiar with his work, and a useful resource for academics and budding filmmakers wishing to expand their knowledge and gain inspiration for writing and practice. Readers should be prepared for essays as unusual and entertaining as Maddin's films. Academic meditations are mixed with personal pieces from Maddin's friends and collaborators.

Playing with Memories begins with a foreword by film critic Geoff Pevere and a thorough introduction by Church. The book includes essays by Donald Masterson, Geoff Pevere, Will Straw, Steven Shaviro, William Beard, David L. Pike, Stephen Snyder, Carl Matheson, George Toles, Mila Pribisic, Dana Cooley, Darrel Varga, Saige Watson, and Lee Easton and Kelly Hewson. It is brought to a conclusion with a 2005 interview of Guy Maddin by William Beard. The volume includes a filmography of Maddin's works, an adequate four page selected bibliography, and a comprehensive index. There are also twenty-nine images, two of which show Maddin on set, but predominantly of iconic moments from Maddin's films. The photographs are pleasantly reproduced in a glossy sixteen page section two thirds of the way through the volume and function as a convenient visual aid to readers,

reminding/introducing scenes described in one or more of the essays. Of the contributions, those written by Pevere, Straw, Shaviro, Beard, Pike, Toles, and Varga have been previously published in some form. Beard and Pike have updated their earlier work and the essays by Masterson, Snyder, Matheson, Pribisic, Cooley, Watson, Easton and Hewson have been written especially for the volume. There are consequently contrasting perspectives of Maddin's work from different times in his career. The earliest is Pevere's 'Guy Maddin: True to Form', first printed in 1992 shortly after Maddin's critical success with *Careful* (1992). The majority of essays, however, are written from a post *My Winnipeg* (2007) perspective.

Geoff Pevere's light-hearted foreword sets the friendly and humorous tone adopted throughout the rest of the volume. Pevere puts Maddin and his work in an assuredly Canadian framework, although subsequent contributors take diverse stances on the importance of Maddin's national identity. In his introduction, David Church focuses on memory as a central motif of Maddin's work, in line with the promises of the collection's title. He suggests that the "movies of Guy Maddin are an uncanny amalgamation of personal obsessions and private memories made public" and that "Maddin's libidinal and mnemonic overinvestment in 'dead' cinematic styles serves a personally, and perhaps even culturally, revitalizing function, rendering memory into material form as a sort of necrophilic art" (2-3). Church's introduction summarises Maddin's biography and his major filmic works, before returning to the theme of memory with a consideration of the recurring amnesiac characters in Maddin's films and with further meditation on Maddin's 'necrophilic aesthetic'. He then succinctly describes the work of the other contributors.

The titular focus on memory is well chosen. Maddin's interest in representing his own memories, his narrative concern with amnesia and his formal preoccupation with nearly-forgotten filmic styles are striking elements of Maddin's work noted by many of the contributors to this volume. Will Straw's 'Reinhabiting Lost Languages: Guy Maddin's *Careful*' and Dana Cooley's 'Demented Enchantments: Maddin's Dis-eased Heart' most thoroughly explore Maddin's use of formal devices from cinema's early history. Straw suggests Maddin shares his obsession "with the secondary trappings of older modes of production" (61) with Andy

Warhol and Reiner Werner Fassbinder. He suggests that *Careful* (1992) is an example of "the new baroque, an aesthetic which favours the ceremonial and the artificial over the reverential" (61). Dana Cooley also uses notions of baroque or neo baroque and Benjamin's related writings on 'Trauerspiel' (sorrow play) in her analysis of *Archangel* (1990) and *Cowards Bend the Knee* (2003). She suggests that "Maddin adeptly exploits the very resources which Benjamin paradoxically identified as the "forgotten futures" of film" (172). Of all the articles, Cooley is perhaps most focused on memory, addressing the combined effect of amnesiac characters and formal qualities that cause the audience "to perform something of the tremulous nature of memory" (184).

Saige Walton's chapter 'Hit with a Wrecking Ball, Tickled with a Feather: Gesture, Deixis and the Baroque Cinema of Guy Maddin' also considers Maddin's feature films in relation to Benjamin's conception of baroque, but Walton's particular interest is the emotional impact of his work. Walton's emphasis on the 'sensuous proximity' of Maddin's films builds on the earlier work of Shaviro and Beard on affect and melodrama. Walton, Shaviro and Beard are all concerned with the coexistence of the sublime and the ridiculous in Maddin's work, how the distancing effects of irony are reconciled with displays of extreme emotion. Beard suggests irony and melodrama are not mutually exclusive: "as to Fassbinder, the pervasive and acidic ironies of his films serve ultimately to augment affect, not to disable it" (83). Walton finds a solution in the Deleuzian notion of baroque, emblemized by the "fold", "where inside and outside, surface and depth, affect and artifice might not be oppositional structures for Maddin, but aesthetically intertwined, even entangled, just as they are for the baroque" (211). Carl Matheson is also concerned that many viewers have trouble connecting with Maddin's films at an emotional level. He suggests that to view Maddin's creations as nightmares makes them more compelling, although he admits that *My Winnipeg* is Maddin's "most accessible and intimate film" and does not require the "emotional door" of Matheson's "nightmare of obsession hypothesis" (141).

Many contributors refer to postmodernism in their attempt to make sense of Maddin's art. Masterson refers to George Toles suggestion that although skeptics have seen Maddin's work as

"postmodern parasitism on earlier forms of cinema, (...) feeling is central to the whole enterprise" (34). Beard suggests Maddin's employment of melodrama reminds us of how "true and satisfying expression of underlying fatality in life (...) is *beyond reach* in our environment (...) beyond reach in the postmodern Western world" (93). In contrast, David L. Pike sees Maddin's use of melodrama, along with his Proustian themes and surrealist aesthetic as evidence of the filmmaker's consistent engagement with modernism. Pike explicitly deals with Maddin's memories of childhood. Indeed, he analyses Maddin's unfilmed treatment *The Child Without Qualities* (published in Maddin's 2003 book *From the Atelier Tovar: Selected Writings of Guy Maddin*, Coach House Press, 2003), turning to the passage from which the title of *Playing with Memories* is taken (also used as an epigraph by Church): "Sometimes he intentionally separated himself from his favourite toys, and played with memories of them. And then played with the memories of the memories". Pike suggests this might account for Maddin's multiple strategies of distancing memories from the viewer, as well as the "undeniable desire for the emotional connection intimated by them" (109).

Pike notes Maddin's allegiance to industrial Winnipeg and Manitoban history but doesn't engage with his Canadian identity. Straw, Beard, and Hewson and Easton are each concerned with how Maddin's films engage with nationality. Beard states "Maddin's cinema can be seen as a form of distinctly Canadian melodrama. More than once the director has expressed his contempt for Canadian cinema, but of course that does not mean that he is not part of the phenomenon" (90). Straw, on the other hand, while noting that "Maddin's own responses to analyses of his work carry no automatic claim to truth" (65), follows the directors suggestion that his allegiances are generational as much as place based, and concludes by drawing a parallel between Maddin and his Winnipeg peer John Paiz. In their fabulously titled, "'I'm not an American, I'm a nymphomaniac": Perverting the Nation in Guy Maddin's *The Saddest Music in the World*", Hewson and Easton use as a starting point the experience of teaching *Saddest Music* on an "introductory film course with an obligatory "national" segment" (224). Rather than suggesting to their students that this is an example of the national cinema, they aimed to "complicate the relationship between film and nation and unsettle those viewing habits which drive many of us to

extract some national essence out of a cinematic product" (224). They describe their subsequent realisation that "neither we nor our students had recognized the provocative effects of Maddin's ironic treatment of those signifiers of nation" (225) and proceed to use Jason Morgan's concept of perversion chic to read the film as unsettling the nation and its heterosexual foundations.

Although Hewson and Easton are the only contributors to look at the intersections of sexuality and nation in Maddin's work, a number of others pay attention to the director's striking sexual narratives. Pike examines Maddin's claim that he has a fine instinct for the "boner quotient" (99) with reference to camp and the "closeted fifties" (100). Stephen Snyder, whose hosted Winnipeg Film Group screenings attended by Maddin, writes of films viewed by the group that evidently left their mark on Maddin. Buñuel's representation of insatiable desire is cited as a central inspiration. Subsequently, Snyder seems to be leaning towards a Freudian analysis of Maddin's films, considering castration in *Archangel* and preoccupation with the mother figure in *Brand upon the Brain* and *My Winnipeg*. However, as Snyder emphasises in his conclusion, both Buñuel and Maddin "retreat from Freud as they explore the idea that castrations, or evasions of consummation, are self-willed by their characters" (131). Darrel Varga's Nietzschean examination, 'Desire in Bondage: Guy Maddin's *Careful*', also refers to "the claustrophobic closets of repressed desire" (198) that are represented in Maddin's filmic landscapes.

The particular role of women in Maddin's narratives of desire and obsession are touched on by Snyder, Matheson and Pribisic. Snyder writes, "if Maddin and collaborator Toles have been reproached for a latent misogyny in their films, critics might do well to notice that their female figures often represent the deepest human ideals of freedom" (126). Matheson suggests that in Maddin's films, "women are attractive and exciting until they are possessed, at which point they become dull and otherwise featureless dead weights" (134). Pribisic comments on Maddin's particular interpretation of female sexuality in his treatment of *Dracula: Pages from a Virgin's Diary* (2002) - Maddin's filmic interpretation of Mark Godden's 1998 Royal Winnipeg Ballet production. This film is little addressed by other contributors, perhaps because it was an unusual project for Maddin and one he

was, allegedly, reluctant to take on. Despite his reservations, the end result was what Beard describes, in the interview at the conclusion of *Playing with Memory*, as Maddin's "most straightforwardly beautiful movie" (255). Pribisic uses Béatrice Picon-Vallin's theorisation of the 'theatre film', and Linda Hutcheon's recent work on adaptation as a theoretical framework for her investigation into how Maddin made *Dracula* his own. While not explicitly relating *Dracula* to Maddin's other works, her conclusion emphasises the theme of memory and so connects her analysis with others in the volume:

His films and his originality turn out to always already be 'palimpsestuous,' for in Maddin's work we see all things he saw and remembered; we are taken on a ride, with his camera as a time machine; we discover layers, resonances and repetitions with subtle differences.. (168)

The collection closes with a humorous and illuminating interview of Guy Maddin by William Beard. Maddin's passion for his work and conviction in his approaches is evident. He is, as always, the brazen entertainer, regaling Beard with anecdotes about his homoerotic understanding of Icelandic Glima wrestling and the filming of a male prostitute's sizeable phallus for a scene in *Cowards Bend the Knee*. Readers might conclude, then, after reading this interview and reflecting on the rich analyses that precede it, that of all the things that can be written of Maddin, he is indisputably a great storyteller.

A similarly entertaining, if less comprehensive, interview of Maddin by George Melnyk is included in *The Young, the Restless, and the Dead: Interviews with Canadian Filmmakers*, Volume 1 edited by George Melnyk. *The Young, the Restless, and the Dead* is a neat little book, which might appeal to Canadian film fans keen on trivia more than scholars. Its 'fun' layout includes frequent illustrations - photographs of filmmakers, stills from their films and reproductions of original storyboards. Amusing or significant quotes are reproduced in bold in the margins, which is a little distracting if you're trying to read the main body of text but useful for readers in a rush.

The choice of interviewees seems rather arbitrary and somewhat uneven. One wonders if the promised subsequent volumes will

achieve more balance. The concept behind the series is to include fresh interviews of young filmmakers and the restless - that is, established and still-working filmmakers - alongside previously published interviews with late filmmakers. This volume features only one young filmmaker, Michael Dowse, and only one deceased filmmaker, Jean Claude Lauzon. Lauzon is also the only French Canadian. Indeed, the book shows a marked bias to those who made their names, or are now based, in Western Canada.

The interviewers and interviewees are as follows: Bart Beaty interviews Michael Dowse; Peggy Thompson interviews Blake Corbett, Andrew Currie and Trent Carlson of Anagram Pictures; George Melnyk interviews Guy Maddin; Jacqueline Levitin interviews Mina Shum; Kalli Paakspu interviews Lynne Stopkewich; George Melnyk interviews Gary Burns; Peggy Thompson interviews Anne Wheeler and Claude Racine interviews Jean Claude Lauzon (originally published in French in *24 Images*, no 61 Summer 1992. Jim Leach, trans.) Most of the interviewers are academic but many are also filmmakers. Peggy Thompson is a scriptwriter and is unique among the contributors as having collaborated with her interviewee, Anne Wheeler. A close relationship is evident in the piece and in the lengthy and affectionate introduction to Anne's works which precede it. This introduction is an anomaly and other contributors include the interview only.

George Melnyk includes a brief introduction at the beginning of the volume, musing on the advantages and disadvantages of the interview as a resource, advocating the advantage of academic rather than journalistic interviews and the importance of publishing interviews in accessible and durable book form. He subsequently introduces the interviewees. He states his belief that the interview is a "valid interlocutory statement in its own right, useful to scholars and non-scholars alike" (viii). The interviews in Melnyk's volume are certainly accessible, and the relevant expertise of the participating interviewer leads to some insightful questions about filmmaking process and the filmmaker's experiences and ideals. Despite the scholarly status of the interviewers, most of the interactions are light-hearted and not overly academic. Indeed, they might be excessively friendly, with no real push to challenge or provoke the filmmaker into

Book Reviews

revealing new information or to establishing their place in international film studies.

The book consequently might be seen as insubstantial by some scholars. However, as a teacher of Canadian film I imagine this is the sort of book which might capture the interest of new scholars with its attractive presentation and the personal insights that the interview format elicits. Despite the uneven selection of subjects, *The Young, Restless and the Dead* compliments Melnyk's earlier and more comprehensive book *Great Canadian Film Directors* (University of Alberta Press, 2007). Like Church's *Playing with Memories*, Melnyk's books are worthwhile additions to a Canadian film scholar's library and will hopefully increase attention to Canadian film both in Canada and beyond.

TV China**Edited by Ying Zhu and Chris Berry**

Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-253-22026-4. 259 pp. \$24.95 (pbk).

Transnational Television in Europe: Reconfiguring Global Communications Networks**By Jean K. Chalaby**

London: I.B. Tauris, 2009. ISBN: 987-1-84511-954-6. Xviii +278 pp. \$34 (pbk).

A Review by Bärbel Göbel, University of Kansas, USA

Today's media landscape is rapidly expanding and crossing borders via multinational and transnational corporations, formatted programming, advanced technologies, and the World Wide Web. Still, most of the academic writing that addresses non-English markets tends to stay within much disputed theoretical applications of nation states. Those scholars who have utilized a political economy approach where issues of co-productions, and multi-lingual aspects of television production are concerned, such as Jean K. Chalaby, offer television and film scholars new methods and models that address the rapidly shifting nature of media production and consumption. Jean K. Chalaby has assembled, through many interviews and diligent research, a detailed work on *Transnational Television in Europe*, its technical and regulatory origins, financial and cultural viability, and current state.

Chalaby traces the complicated beginnings of satellite and cable technology in Europe, in which most nations had a firm hand on the media in the 1980s, "and when governments expected public broadcasters to make a strong contribution to national culture" (7). Chalaby contextualizes the ever-present fear of cultural imperialism and corporate power in tracing the internationally shared endeavors to make use of the new technology, formulate successful programming, and shifting regulations across most of the West and North European countries in the 1980s and early 1990s respectively.

Chalaby describes in Part one, 'Impossible Beginnings', the obstacles international television had to overcome. The long list of quickly failing companies, programs and networks parading past the reader in the opening of the book demonstrate that different linguistic markets, individual regulations, national strategies all had to make way for new intellectual conceptualization of the transnational media space. In addition, legislatures had to keep up with the changing technologies, support deregulation, enlarge signal range and attract pan-European advertisers, if pan-European television was to be successful.

Part two - the 'Coming of Age of Pan-European Television - of *Transnational Television in Europe* marks an important change in the industry via slow but steadily changing "regulatory, commercial and technological environment(s)" (57). Chalaby refers to this as pan-European television's coming of age. Probably one of the most interesting discussions in this book is the detailed information on newly formed European commission and joint ventures producing for example 'Television without Frontiers' (1989), which removed national regulation to limit or prohibit the cross-border transmission of TV programming, as well as the 'SatCab' Directive (1993). The latter, enabling 'Television without Frontiers' led to the conception of legislation permitting "the free flow of cable and satellite channels [and] (...) a common market for broadcasting" (58). One issue had been the question of how to attract financially strong advertisers for uneven demographics in a pan-European audience. Companies with more experience in this sector began to show an interest in European satellite and cable television models and in the process reversed the declining economic future of pan-European television.

Chalaby shifts his focus to these successful stations and brands in Part three of his book, titled 'Transnational Television in Europe'. The culturally rather unspecific but successful programming of news, financial news, documentaries and children's programming is discussed to trace how Disney, CNN, and other major players profit from the new pan-European market. The key, Chalaby argues, lies in the fact that even when ratings are comparatively low, these stations can provide advertisers with highly specific and homogenous audience demographics which are of higher

value to the advertising companies and the stations themselves also provided strong brand equity.

Chalaby then begins a thoughtful analysis of his findings, supported by a wealth of interviews and inside information. Rather than re-theorizing effects of cultural imperialism he sees transnational television as connecting markets, audiences, and industries. He sees no conflict between the global and the local but rather a constant communication between the two, in which they adapt to each other changing as necessary. He argues that border-crossing television's success is fueled by exactly this "global efficiency and local flexibility" (225).

Students and scholars of television markets, technology and international programming will find this work especially fruitful. Albeit Chalaby's wealth of information can, at times, become overly detailed and pushes theoretical implications to the side lines this is nevertheless an important study that provides information about how multinational media conglomerates worked with national legislatures to re-shape the television landscape in Europe from a national to a transnational model. Its strength lies in Chalaby's straightforward prose, clear and precise organization of materials and meticulous presentation of collected data.

While Chalaby does seem to be mostly interested in the actual structures of television industry and its flow of power and finances, his theoretical understanding and new way of interpreting these media movements is ever present between the lines. As he argues early on, scholars need to rethink the national again, especially after its late revival, and replace "methodological nationalism" with what Chalaby terms "methodological cosmopolitanism" (3). While I do not necessarily agree with this, as national brands and stations are still clearly reaching the largest and most profitable audiences, in the case of international exchange his argument holds. This is a must-read for media scholars and political economists alike, and all those interested in transnational television and media.

While the national is declining steadily as a functioning concept for television industry analysis, many specifically national programs, stations and national industries, are linked into the

idea of national brand. In the case of China, a country that still limits foreign media in its own country, there is more than a brand to be considered. Although one could argue that the programs designed for diasporic Chinese communities do indeed market Chinese-ness to its viewers and thus utilizes the national as a brand. While much of the focus in cinema and media studies on China has been connected to its cinematic output as illustrative of the idea of a national cinema, Chris Berry and Ying Zhu's new book *TV China* illustrates that the medium of television is as equally important to understanding Chinese culture as its cinematic representations, if not more, since film viewing has declined rapidly in the PRC. The work also has a very detailed and useful appendix of the history and key moments of Chinese television.

The main focus of the introduction is to familiarize the reader not only with the prior, whilst limited, research of Chinese television, Greater China's tri-fold nature (mainland, Hong Kong, Taiwan), but to make clear the magnitude and importance of study of television programming that has the potential to reach an audience of 1.2 billion people, roughly ninety two percent of the Chinese population. The collection of essays, as Zhu and Berry openly admit, covers little of Hong Kong and Taiwanese television, but seeks to open discussion and present a coherent argument, rather than valuing quantity over quality of research.

The volume is divided into four parts, each containing three essays. The individual sections are coherent and the essays' build upon each other's research and theories. The first section, 'Institutions', reviews government policies, Chinese television history and development and transnational influences on the Chinese television market. The first three essays by Joseph M. Chan, by Junhao Hong, Yanmei Lü and William Zou, and by Karin Gwinn Wilkins discuss regulation and importance of the regional market in East Asia, review the history and 'opening' of CCTV, China's main television station and its progress during recent reforms, and analyze the changes in Hong Kong television since the return of Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China. Wilkins's essay also leads directly into the next section. While tracking changes in the television system and tracing both progress and resistance of CCTV and the government to the reform, these essays provide a strong overview of Chinese

television and its potential for the international and global market place.

The second section titled 'Programming' draws from different television genres, each essay focusing their research on one particular theoretical issue. Chris Berry addresses the documentary channel (Jishi Pindao) and how the channel provides a 'public sphere' to Chinese citizen in an era of consumerization. His argument is rooted in Foucault's construct of power and describes markets' needs to conform to socio-political circumstances. Hsiu-Chuang Deppman discusses the Taiwanese series *Meteor Garden* (2001, CTS), an adaptation of a Japanese manga. Her analysis of the appeal of famous guest stars and the program's success in other regions is discussed in part through Koichi Iwabuchi's concept of 'cultural proximity'. The program is an excellent vehicle to address identity and youth culture. Xinyu Lu discusses the Chinese New Year's Eve special and its position within the media landscape and Chinese culture. Lastly, Lu examines how changes reflect the need to cater to new audiences and a marketizing China. Her discussion of how the 'mirrored' China appears in these yearly specials, the citizens, their social position etc. tell the story of how the nation perceives itself through the lens of TV. All three works in this part speak to the interrelationships of the global, local and regional in television.

Only one of the essays in the book's third section entitled 'Reception' uses a reception theory methodology. Albeit the essays here are less connected than in the rest of the work they individually provide insight into journalism in the PRC, formation of and advertising strategies for a middle class in China, and family viewing practices. Haiqing Yu's looks at the balancing act of television journalists and specifically coverage on AIDS and ARS. Television journalists in the PRC have to mediate between viewers, the state and financial interests. The production practices here discussed in turn inform the reader of where audience is placed within the flow of news programming. Janice Hua Xu traces the 'infomercials' addressing a lifestyle 'consumer' based audience and argues that a creation of a class-system is visible in such reflection of individual socio-economic groups. Finally, Tongdao Zhang presents findings on changing family viewing practices in the PRC, drawing on both prior existing and his own research material. Zhang calls for a multi-method

approach in which qualitative and quantitative research are combined to better speak to not only viewing patterns but their connection to the social environment, the shifting cultural experience etc.

'Going Global', the fourth and final part of *TV China*, discusses the transmission of Chinese language programming in foreign territories. Amy Lee's essay discusses the circulation of Chinese imagery in post-1997 Hong Kong television programming, and the creation of a shared culture and cultural experience via television transmission that generates a cross-border cultural unity and at the same time creates a viable immigrant identity specifically for the Chinese. While this essay makes you wonder how many American Chinese have access and make use of these programs to begin with, her argument stands for the existing viewership, however large or small it might be. Cindy Wong answers some of these questions presenting an overview of U.S. access to Chinese television in her more empirically organized study of Chinese television in Philadelphia. She also clarifies which programs are shown and how they are perceived in her direct social environment. Her work seems to contradict Lee's earlier statements, as Wong sees a clear dominance of Hong Kong related, not migrant related, narrative and in part presents too small a U.S. audience as a reason for this programming. She demonstrates the effects of some of the obstacles in creating a Chinese identity, and maintenance thereof versus cultural adaptation. These internal tensions are addressed even more directly in Ying Zhu's final essay, discusses the two-part audience of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and the Mainland on one side and pan-Chinese or diasporic Chinese audiences on the other. Investigating linguistic parameters and global circulation of Chinese language programming, she argues that linguistic-markets may complicate the exchange of culture and flow of power. The production language is shifting from Cantonese to Mandarin, which begs the question if this is simply a marketing strategy to generate different markets for different linguistic power structures?

The work does not claim to be all-inclusive or evenly balanced, but, to the best of my knowledge, it presents the most information about, analysis and overview of the Chinese television landscape today and in the past. As the most significant

part of television research still addresses U.S. broadcast, it is vital to pay attention to markets that have such potential as China does. I only wished for more information on transnational transmission technology and regulation, as I feel that this important aspect of reaching global audiences was not only underrepresented, but also left out. This collection of essays is, however, an important addition to the television scholar's or student's library.