HITCHCOCK

Past and future

Edited by Richard Allen and
Sam Ishii-Gonzáles

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

HITCHCOCK

This new collection of writings on Alfred Hitchcock celebrates the remarkable depth and scope of his artistic achievement in film. It explores his works in relationship both to their social context and to the traditions of critical theory they continue to inspire. The collection draws on the best of current Hitchcock scholarship. It features the work of both new and established scholars such as Laura Mulvey, Slavoj Žižek, Peter Wollen and James Naremore, and displays the full diversity of critical methods that have characterized the study of this director's films in recent years. The articles are grouped into four thematic sections: "Authorship and aesthetics" examines Hitchcock as auteur and explores particular aspects of his artistry such as his use of the close-up, the motif of the double, and the neglected topic of humor. "French Hitchcock" considers the influential reception of the filmmaker's work by the critics at *Cahiers du cinéma* in the 1950s, as well as the more recent engagement with Hitchcock by French philosopher Gilles Deleuze. "Poetics and politics of identity" investigates how personal and social identity is both articulated and subverted through style and form in Hitchcock's works. The concluding section, "Death and transfiguration," addresses the manner in which the spectacle and figuration of death haunts the narrative universe of Hitchcock's films, in particular his subversive masterpiece, *Psycho*.

Richard Allen is author of Projecting Illusion (1995). He has edited numerous books on the philosophy and aesthetics of film including Hitchcock: Centenary Essays (1999) with Sam Ishii-Gonzáles. He is also author of a forthcoming book on Hitchcock entitled Hitchcock and Cinema: Storytelling, Sexuality and Style.

Sam Ishii-Gonzáles teaches aesthetics and film theory at New York University and the Film/Media Department at Hunter College. He is co-editor of *Hitchcock: Centenary Essays* (with Richard Allen, 1999) and has published essays on Luis Buñuel, David Lynch, and the painter Francis Bacon.

HITCHCOCK

Past and future

Edited by Richard Allen and
Sam Ishii-Gonzáles

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2004
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004.

© 2004 Richard Allen and Sam Ishii-Gonzáles editorial material
© 2004 individual chapters the contributors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-64231-7 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-67637-8 (Adobe eReader Format)
ISBN 0–415–27525–3 (hbk)
ISBN 0–415–27526–1 (pbk)

CONTENTS

List of illustrations viii
Notes on contributors ix
Acknowledgments xiii
Chronology xv

Introduction 1
RICHARD ALLEN

PART I
Authorship and aesthetics 13

1 Hitch: A tale of two cities (London and Los Angeles) 15
PETER WOLLEN

2 Hitchcock and humor 22
JAMES NAREMORE

3 Doubles and doubts in Hitchcock: the German connection 37
BETTINA ROSENBLADT

4 The object and the face: *Notorious*, Bergman and the close-up 64
JOSEPH MCELHANEY

5 Unknown Hitchcock: the unrealized projects 85
SIDNEY GOTTLIEB

PART II
French Hitchcock 107

6 To catch a liar: Bazin, Chabrol and Truffaut encounter Hitchcock 109
JAMES M. VEST

7 *Hitchcock, The First Forty-Four Films*: Chabrol and Rohmer's "Politique des Auteurs" 119
WALTER RAUBICHECK

8 Hitchcock with Deleuze 128
SAM ISHII-GONZÁLES

PART III
Poetics and politics of identity 147

9 Music and identity: the struggle for harmony in *Vertigo* 149
DANIEL ANTONIO SREBNICK

10 The silence of *The Birds*: sound aesthetics and public space in later Hitchcock 164
ANGELO RESTIVO

11 The Master, the Maniac, and *Frenzy*: Hitchcock's legacy of horror 179
ADAM LOWENSTEIN

12 Hitchcock's Ireland: the performance of Irish identity in *Juno and the Paycock* and *Under Capricorn* 193
JAMES MORRISON

13 Hitchcock and hom(m)osexuality 211
PATRICIA WHITE

PART IV
Death and transfiguration 229

14 Death drives 231
LAURA MULVEY

15 Of "farther uses of the dead to the living": Hitchcock and Bentham 243
MIRAN BOZOVIC

16 Is there a proper way to remake a Hitchcock film? 257

SLAVOJ ŽIŽEK

Index 275

ILLUSTRATIONS

3.1	Production still of *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1919)	37
3.2	Hitchcock in *Family Plot* (1976)	38
5.1	Michelangelo's *Captive*	86
5.2	Hitchcock's early minimalist drawing	87
9.1	*Vertigo Prelude* (orchestral reduction)	155
9.2	*The Gallery* (orchestral reduction)	155
9.3	*Madeline's Theme* (orchestral reduction)	157
13.1	Jane Wyman and Marlene Dietrich in *Stage Fright* (1950)	223

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Richard Allen is Associate Professor of Cinema Studies at New York University. He is the author of *Projecting Illusion* (1995) and co-editor of four books on the aesthetics and philosophy of film: *Film Theory and Philosophy* (1997), *Hitchcock Centenary Essays* (1999), *Wittgenstein, Theory and the Arts* (2001) and *Camera Obscura/Camera Lucida: Essays in Honor of Annette Michelson* (2003). He is the author of numerous articles on Hitchcock and is co-editor with Sidney Gottlieb of *Hitchcock Annual*.

Miran Bozovic is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. He is the author of *Der grosse Andere: Gotteskonzepte in der Philosophie der Neuzeit* (1993), *An Utterly Dark Spot: Gaze and Body in Early Modern Philosophy*(2000), and editor of *The Panopticon Writings by Jeremy Bentham* (1995).

Sidney Gottlieb is Professor of English at Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT. He has edited *Hitchcock on Hitchcock: Selected Writings and Interviews* (1995), *Alfred Hitchcock: Interviews* (2003), and *Framing Hitchcock: Selected Essays from the* Hitchcock Annual (2002) with Christopher Brookhouse. He is co-editor with Richard Allen of *Hitchcock Annual*.

Sam Ishii-Gonzáles is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Cinema Studies at New York University and teaches aesthetics and film history at NYU, Hunter College. He is co-editor with Richard Allen of *Hitchcock Centenary Essays* (1999) and has published essays on the work of

Luis Buñuel, David Lynch, and the English painter Francis Bacon. His dissertation considers Deleuze's film semiotics in relation to the artistic practice of Fassbinder, Pasolini, and Warhol. It is entitled "Towards a Minor Cinema."

Adam Lowenstein is Assistant Professor of English/Film Studies and Associate Director of the Film Studies Program at the University of Pittsburgh. His essays have appeared in *Cinema Journal*, *Post Script*, and the anthology *British Cinema, Past and Present* (2000). He is author of "Shocking Representation; Historical Trauma, National Cinema, and the Modern Horror Film," forthcoming from Columbia Universtity Press.

Joe McElhaney is Assistant Professor of Film Studies at Hunter College/City University of New York. His book on Hitchcock, Fritz Lang and Vincente Minnelli is forthcoming from Temple University Press.

James Morrison teaches film and literature at Claremont McKenna College. He is the author of a critical study, *Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors* (1998), and *Broken Fever* (2002), a memoir. He has completed a manuscript on Terrence Malick, and is working on a study of Hollywood, mass culture, and the sublime.

Laura Mulvey is Professor of Film and Media Studies at Birkbeck, University of London and Director of the AHRB Centre of British Film and Television Studies. Her essays have been published in *Visual and Other Pleasures* (1989) and *Fetishism and Curiosity* (1996). She is also the author of the BFI Film Classic book of *Citizen Kane*. She has co-directed six films with Peter Wollen as well as *Disgraced Monuments* with Mark Lewis (Channel Four, 1994).

James Naremore is Chancellor's Professor of Communication and Culture at Indiana University and the author of several books on modern literature and film, including *Filmguide to* Psycho (1973), *Acting in the Cinema* (1988), *The Films of Vincent Minnelli* (1993), and *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (1998).

Walter Raubicheck is Assistant Professor of English at Pace University and co-editor of *Hitchcock's Rereleased Films: From* Rope *to* Vertigo (1991).

Angelo Restivo is the author of *The Cinema of Economic Miracles: Visuality and Modernization in the Italian Art Film* (2002). His current work examines cinema, space, and visual culture in relation to the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. He is Assistant Professor in the Department of English, East Carolina University.

Bettina Rosenbladt teaches German language and culture, including film, at Santa Clara University.

Daniel Antonio Srebnick is a musician and composer who lives in New York City. He has scored theatrical productions, films, and numerous television programs, he has also produced several records.

James M. Vest teaches French and Film Studies at Rhodes College in Memphis, TN, where he also participates in the interdisciplinary humanities program. He has authored two books on French literature and culture, *The French Face of Ophelia from Belleforest to Baudelaire* (1989)and *The Poetic Works of Maurice de Guérin* (1992), and has published articles on French literary topics and on approaches to teaching world literature. His essays on Hitchcock's French connections have appeared in *Hitchcock Annual*, the *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association,* and *The French Review.* He is currently completing a book on Hitchcock and France.

Patricia White is Chair of Film and Media Studies at Swarthmore College. She is the author of *Uninvited: Classical Hollywood Cinema and Lesbian Representability* (1999) and a member of the *Camera Obscura* editorial collective.

Peter Wollen is Chair of the Department of Film/TV at UCLA. He was the co-curator of *Addressing the Century: 100 Years of Art and Fashion* (1999) at the Hayward Gallery in London. His recent books include *Raiding the Icebox: Reflections on Twentieth Century Culture* (1992), a revised and expanded edition of *Signs and Meanings in the Cinema* (1998), and *Paris Hollywood: Writings on Film* (2002). His work in film includes co-writing the screenplay for Michelangelo Antonioni's *The Passenger* (1975), *Riddles of the Sphinx* (1977), co-directed with Laura Mulvey, and *Friendship's Death* (1988), which he both wrote and directed.

Slavoj Žižek, a philosopher and Lacanian psychoanalyst, is Senior Researcher in the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Recent books include *The Ticklish Subject: The*

Absent Centre of Political Ontology (1999), *The Art of the Ridiculous Sublime: On David Lynch's* Lost Highway (2000), *The Fright of Real Tears: Krzysztof Kieslowski Between Theory and Post-Theory* (2001), and *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (2002).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Richard Allen would like to thank the main people who made the Hitchcock Centenniel Conference at New York University possible. They are: Mary Schmidt Campbell, Dean of the Tisch School of the Arts, New York University; the conference and academic panel organizing committees comprising Walter Raubicheck and Walter Srebnick of Pace University, and Bill Simon and Anna McCarthy of New York University, who gave both of their organizational skills and scholarly insight; and finally, the staff of the Department of Cinema Studies at New York University: Ken Sweeney, Ann Harris, Ventura Castro, Cathy Holter, Angela Samson, and Julia Perlowski.

The editors wish to thank Sid Gottlieb for his encouragement and support in the production of this volume, Rebecca Barden, Helen Faulkner and Chantelle Johnson at Routledge for their patience and hard work, and, on a more personal note, David Owens and Bridget Sisk.

Permissions

Three of the essays in this volume have been previously published. Peter Wollen's "Hitch: A Tale of Two Cities" appeared in *Paris and Hollywood: Writings on Film* (London: Verso, 2002) and is reprinted with permission of the author. James Naremore's "Hitchcock and Humor" appeared in *Strategies,* vol. 14, no. 1 (May 2001), pp. 13–27 and is reprinted with permission of the editor and publisher, Taylor & Francis. Laura Mulvey's "Death drives" appeared in *Film Studies* (Spring 2000), pp. 5–14, and is reprinted with permission of the editor. In Daniel Srebnick's essay "Music and Identity: The Struggle for Harmony in *Vertigo,*" Bernard Herrmann's score for *Vertigo* is quoted with the permission of Famous Music Publishing.

HITCHCOCK CHRONOLOGY

List of Hitchcock films and key biographical dates

1899 Alfred Joseph Hitchcock born August 13 in lower-middle-class district of London's East End. He is the third child of William and Ellen Hitchcock. His father is a prosperous greengrocer, his mother a devout Irish Catholic.

1913 Completes his formal education after four years at a Jesuit school, Saint Ignatius College.

1914 Father dies age 52. Hitchcock lives alone with his mother until his marriage, twelve years later.

1915 Hitchcock begins working at Henley Telegraph and Cable Company. After working as a technician he is transferred to the advertising department. During this period he continues his education by taking evening classes for non-matriculated students at the University of London. He attends lectures on economics and political history as well as art history, drawing, and painting. Hitchcock is given a medical deferment from military conscription due to his weight and because of the involvement of his employers in the war effort.

1920 Hitchcock gets a part-time job as title-card designer for the Famous Players-Lasky, the London branch of an American production company. Within a few months he is offered full-time employment. He leaves Henley Telegraph and Cable for a career in motion pictures.

1922 Hitchcock assists the producer Seymour Hicks in completing *Always Tell Your Wife* after the director falls ill. He is then giving

his own feature to direct, *Number Thirteen*, but it is not completed due to the poor financial situation of the studio (it shuts down shortly thereafter). The studio is taken over by producer Michael Balcon who forms Gainsborough Pictures. Over the next three years Hitchcock will serve as assistant director and co-scenarist on five films directed by Graham Cutts: *Woman to Woman, The White Shadow, The Passionate Adventure, The Prude's Fall* and *The Blackguard*. He takes on additional chores as editor (*The White Shadow*) and art director (*The White Shadow, The Passionate Adventure*). *The Blackguard* is lensed at the UFA studios in Berlin following a deal between Balcon and German producer Erich Pommer. It is during the making of this film that Hitchcock observes the shooting of F.W. Murnau's *The Last Laugh* (1924), a work that will have an enormous influence on his own filmmaking.

1925 After four years of apprentice work Hitchcock completes the direction of his first feature, *The Pleasure Garden*. He begins a nine-film collaboration with scenarist Eliot Stannard.

1926 *The Mountain Eagle*, like his first feature, is shot at Emelka Studios in Munich. There are no known prints of this film in existence. His third feature, *The Lodger*, would later be referred to (by the director himself) as the first "'true' Hitchcock film." Initially shelved, it is re-edited under the supervision of Ivor Montagu. *The Lodger* is a major critical and commercial hit. Hitchcock marries Alma Reville, who he met at Famous Players-Lasky in 1921 and who worked as editor on *Woman to Woman* (1923). Reville serves as assistant director on Hitchcock's first three features.

1927 After shooting *Downhill* and *Easy Virtue* Hitchcock moves from Gainsborough to British International Pictures where he makes his next ten features, beginning with *The Ring*.

1928 *The Manxman, The Farmer's Wife, Champagne*. Birth of his only child Patricia Hitchcock on July 7.

1929 *Blackmail*, shot both as a silent and, first British sound film (two years after the first American sound film, *The Jazz Singer*). Also directs *Juno and the Paycock,* for which Alma Reville writes the scenario. She is credited as scenarist on Hitchcock's next six films.

1930 Certain sections of *Elstree Calling,* and *Murder!*

1931 *Mary*, a German version of *Murder!*, and *The Skin Game.*

1932 *Number Seventeen* and *Rich and Strange*.

1933 Hitchcock produces *Lord Camber's Ladies*, his last venture with British International. Working as a freelance director, he makes

Waltzes from Vienna, at Gaumont-British studios for independent producer Tom Arnold. (He later would consider this one of the lowest ebbs of his career.) While shooting the film he is reunited with Balcon, now executive in charge of production for Gaumont-British. Hitchcock signs a five-picture deal with producer and studio.

1934 *The Man Who Knew Too Much*. First of several collaborations with Balcon and Montagu (producers) and Charles Bennett (screenwriter). It is this series of films which establish Hitchcock's reputation as "Master of Suspense."

1935 *The Thirty-Nine Steps*.

1936 *Secret Agent* and *Sabotage*.

1937 *Young and Innocent*.

1938 *The Lady Vanishes*. Hitchcock wins Best Director prize from New York Film Critics.

1939 *Jamaica Inn*, last film of his "British period": twenty-three films in fourteen years (nine of which are silent). Signs Hollywood contract with David O. Selznick, producer of *Gone with the Wind* (Best Picture Oscar, 1939).

1940 *Rebecca*. Hitchcock's first Hollywood film wins Best Picture Oscar for Selznick. Hitchcock is nominated for Best Director but loses to John Ford for *The Grapes of Wrath*. During his "Selznick period," Hitchcock makes ten films but only three are actually produced by Selznick Pictures (the others: *Spellbound* and *The Paradine Case*). Mostly, Hitchcock is loaned out by Selznick to other producers and studios for increasingly larger fees beneficial to Selznick alone. Hitchcock's second Hollywood film, *Foreign Correspondent* is, also nominated for Best Picture. It is made by the independent producer Walter Wanger.

1941 *Mr. and Mrs. Smith* and *Suspicion*. The latter wins Best Actress Oscar for Joan Fontaine, and begins Hitchcock's four-film collaboration with Cary Grant (the other three are *Notorious*, *To Catch a Thief*, and *North By Northwest*).

1942 *Saboteur*.

1943 *Shadow of a Doubt*. Hitchcock's mother, whose health had been in decline for several months, dies on September 26 while the film is in production. His brother would die a few months later under somewhat "mysterious" circumstances (according to biographer Donald Spoto).

1944 *Lifeboat*. Hitchcock receives his second nomination for Best

Director despite the controversy generated by the film's almost sympathetic portrayal of a Nazi sailor. As part of the war effort, Hitchcock directs two short films for the British Ministry of Information, *Aventure Malgache* and *Bon Voyage*.

1945 *Spellbound.* The first of three films made with Ingrid Bergman (along with *Notorious* and *Under Capricorn*). Hitchcock returns to England to supervise the making of a compilation documentary *The Memory of the Camps* detailing the horrors of the Nazi death camps. Hitchcock writes a detailed treatment and oversees the editing of footage shot by Allied cameraman. The documentary is not completed.

1946 *Notorious*. Hitchcock's first film with costume designer Edith Head. She collaborates with him again on *Rear Window* and all but four of the director's final thirteen works.

1947 *The Paradine Case.* Hitchcock's last film with Selznick.

1948 *Rope.* Hitchcock's first color work and arguably his most experimental. The feature was meant to consist entirely of ten-minute long takes. It begins a four-film collaboration with James Stewart (the others are *Rear Window*, *The Man Who Knew Too Much,* and *Vertigo*). *Rope* is made for Hitchcock's own production company Transatlantic Pictures, formed in collaboration with Sidney Bernstein. The company produces only two films, *Rope* and *Under Capricorn*, neither particularly successful.

1949 *Under Capricorn*.

1950 Hitchcock decides it is too risky to produce and finance one's own films. In the fifties he becomes an independent filmmaker signing multi-picture contracts with several different studios: Warner Bros. Paramount, Universal. *Stage Fright* is the first of five films made for Warner Bros.

1951 *Strangers on a Train*. Hitchcock's first genuine commercial success since *Notorious*. It is his first collaboration with cinematographer Robert Burks. Burks will shoot twelve of the next thirteen films. The exception is *Psycho*, which is shot with Hitchcock's television cameraman, John Russell.

1953 *I Confess*.

1954 *Dial M for Murder,* Hitchcock's experiment with 3-D, and *Rear Window*. Hitchcock receives his fourth nomination for Best Director for *Rear Window*. It is the first of six films made for Paramount and the first of four consecutive collaborations with the scriptwriter John Michael Hayes. It is edited by George Tomasini who will serve

as editor on nine of the next ten Hitchcock films (the exception being: *The Trouble with Harry*).

1955 *To Catch a Thief, The Trouble with Harry*. The latter features music by the composer Bernard Herrmann. He will work on the next eight films, including *The Birds,* which has no musical score but which lists Herrmann as "sound consultant." *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*, a half-hour television series debuts on CBS. Hitchcock directs three episodes: "Revenge," "Breakdown," and "The Case of Mr. Pelham."

1956 *The Man Who Knew Too Much* and three episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "Back for Christmas," "Wet Saturday," and "Mr. Blanchard's Secret."

1957 *The Wrong Man* and three episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "One More Mile to Go," "Four O'Clock," and "The Perfect Crime." In Paris, Eric Rohmer and Claude Chabrol publish the first book-length study of the auteur.

1958 *Vertigo* and three episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "Lamb to the Slaughter," "A Dip in the Pool," and "Poison."

1959 *North by Northwest* and three episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "Banquo's Chair," "Arthur," and "The Crystal Trench."

1960 *Psycho*. Released by Paramount but shot at Universal. Due to reluctance on the part of his studio, Hitchcock offers to shoot it on a small budget and a short production schedule using members of his television crew. He also agrees to waive his usual salary ($200,000 plus bonuses) for 60 percent ownership of the negative. Paramount agrees, convinced that *Psycho* is minor Hitchcock. Instead, the film becomes the most commercially successful black-and-white motion picture since Griffith's *Birth of a Nation* (1915). Hitchcock receives his fifth, and last, nomination for Best Director. Directs two episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "Incident at a Corner," and "Mr. Bixby and the Colonel's Coat."

1961 Two episodes of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*: "Horse Player" and "Bang! You're Dead."

1962 *Alfred Hitchcock Presents* is transformed into *Alfred Hitchcock Hour*. (Title change coincides with the show's return to CBS after a two-year run on NBC.) Hitchcock directs only one episode: "I Saw the Whole Thing." This version will run for two more years on CBS, then return to NBC for one final season. Show ends its run, after ten seasons, in 1965.

1963 *The Birds*. The first film of a multi-picture deal with Universal. Hitchcock makes his last six films for this studio. He also becomes a

major stockholder in the company during this period, trading his rights to *Psycho* and the television series for 150,000 shares.

1964 *Marnie*. Hitchcock's last collaboration with Burks, Tomasini, and Herrmann. (Burks and Tomasini both die shortly after their work on this film is completed. Herrmann is hired to compose the music for *Torn Curtain* but is eventually fired. They never speak after this.)

1966 *Torn Curtain*.

1968 Hitchcock receives lifetime achievement award (Irving G. Thalberg Memorial) at the Oscars.

1969 Hitchcock develops *Kaleidoscope*, an Antonioni-esque experiment to be shot on location in New York City, but Universal does not back the project. The studio convince Hitchcock to make an international spy thriller: *Topaz*. It is a critical and commercial failure.

1972 *Frenzy.* Shot in London on a relatively small budget (and away from the prying eyes of the studio). Hitchcock originally asks Vladimir Nabokov to write the script. Nabokov declines. The screenplay is written instead by the playwright Anthony Shaffer (*Sleuth*). The film is a commercial success, finishing among the top money-makers of the year.

1976 *Family Plot*. Hitchcock's final film, made when he is 75 years old. The director has a pacemaker installed shortly before the beginning of production.

1978 Hitchcock begins work on his fifty-fourth feature to be called *The Short Night*. There is extensive preparation on the script but due to the filmmaker's declining health the film is never made.

1980 Hitchcock dies April 29, a few months after receiving a knighthood.

INTRODUCTION

Richard Allen

On October 13–17, 1999, the Department of Cinema Studies at New York University, of which I was then the chair, organized a large-scale conference, "Hitchcock: A Centennial Celebration," to mark the centenary of Alfred Hitchcock's birth on August 13, 1899. The conference comprised both a large number of academic panels devoted to various aspects of Hitchcock's work and plenary sessions featuring a number of Hitchcock's film collaborators: the screenwriters Jay Presson Allen, Evan Hunter, Arthur Laurents, and Joe Stefano; and the actors Patricia Hitchcock, Janet Leigh, Eva Marie Saint, and Teresa Wright.[1] *Hitchcock: Past and Future* presents a selection of the academic papers presented at the conference. Some have been extensively revised and expanded, while others are printed here more or less as they were given at the time. The Hitchcock centenary seemed an opportune moment to reassert the significance and value of cinema as a form of artistic expression through a consideration of one of the medium's most widely celebrated and influential practitioners. Hitchcock is an exemplary figure in this context because he embodies what has always been at stake in defending film as an art form once it is conceded that film, given its thorough dependence on technical equipment, can actually be an art form. This is the relationship that the medium bears to a mass audience on account of its dependence upon technology and technical development to which stylistic innovation is, as Hitchcock recognized, partially wedded. Filmmaking at the highest technical standard requires on-going capital investment in order to be sustained

on a consistent basis, and hence it presupposes a large and regular stream of revenue that only a mass audience can provide. Hitchcock's films demonstrate, perhaps better than the works of any other director, the achievements that are possible in film as a medium for reflecting upon the conditions of human existence in a context where the production of art is explicitly concerned with maintaining commercial appeal. The auteurist critics of *Cahiers du cinéma* were the first to recognize Hitchcock's exemplary status in this regard. Furthermore, while successive generations of ideological critics have sought to point out the ways in which Hitchcock's films inhabit narrative conventions that reproduce certain cultural stereotypes, they have nonetheless singled Hitchcock out for the self-conscious way in which he inhabits these conventions and calls into question the patterns of human behavior and interaction they reproduce.

It is worth reminding ourselves at this time what can be achieved in cinema, in particular in popular cinema, and what can be achieved by its study, even at the risk of further canonization of an already canonized figure.[2] For the idea of the study of films as works of art – that is, as objects valued in their uniqueness or specificity for what they are and for what they say – is under threat by certain contemporary scholars who seem intent on reducing the study of film to an analysis of how they are received by audiences, circulate in culture, and reflect or resonate with other kinds of cultural forms and social processes. Even when the valorization and explication of film as an art form is not explicitly dismissed as an elitist enterprise, it is nonetheless eschewed in favor of defining the medium in terms of social "effects" and the kind of "pleasures" it solicits, pleasures that are in principle equally available from numerous kinds of cultural objects. Either way, what is abandoned is the role of aesthetic judgment in discriminating exactly what is valuable about films and how they contribute to human culture, whether their value lies in formal qualities alone, or whether it lies in the cognitive function of films, their capacity to reflect upon, and to move their audience to reflect upon, the culture of which they are a part.

This is not the place to diagnose the pervasive skepticism about textual meaning, about the objectivity of value judgments, indeed about the possibility of human agreement itself that underlies the denigration of the study of cinema as an art form in the university just as it threatens humanistic understanding in general, suffice it to say that "Hitchcock: A Centennial Celebration" was conceived as an antidote to such a skepticism and the devaluation of the art of film it engenders.[3] I cannot claim, of course, that all the participants at the conference – the contributors to this volume in particular – share my diagnosis of the state of film studies or my conception of the role of Hitchcock and Hitchcock Studies as a possible antidote to it. There was, nevertheless, a spirit of celebration at the conference regarding Hitchcock's achievements in film, or what was achieved under Hitchcock's name, and it is reflected in the tone of

many of the scholarly essays in this collection. For while they are undoubtedly methodologically diverse in a manner that reflects the range of papers that were presented at the conference, they are characterized by a concern to explicate, and, yes, to celebrate, the expressive and representational possibilities and parameters of Hitchcock's work, even as some of them seek to qualify an authorially-based understanding of it.

We have divided the material into four parts, although certainly some of the papers could be placed in more than one of these subdivisions. Part I consists of papers that investigate central topics in Hitchcock's aesthetics and reflect, as a result, upon Hitchcock's overall profile as auteur and some of the characteristics that distinguish the various phases of his career. Peter Wollen, in an essay of broad compass entitled "Hitch: A Tale of Two Cities (London and Los Angeles)," situates Hitchcock's identity as a filmmaker between the cultural polarities embodied in the contrast between London and Los Angeles. Although Hitchcock began his filmmaking career in Britain and made nearly half of his fifty-three films there, he worked for an American studio with American stars and always aspired to the ideal of technical perfectionism achieved in Hollywood filmmaking, as well as the power it wielded over a mass audience. Yet, as Wollen points out, Hitchcock's characteristic artistic preoccupations – his music-hall sense of humor, his view of murder as one of the fine arts, his preoccupation with sexuality as forbidden fruit, and his abiding interest both in the thriller genre and in aesthetic experimentation – were all bequeathed by the culture in which he was raised. While Hollywood amply provided him with the technical resources to realize his artistic concerns in a way that his home country could ill afford, Hitchcock remained thoroughly of the English middle-class in his habits and manners. Firmly ensconced in Bel-Air, Hitchcock consistently returned to British material and to British collaborators for inspiration.

James Naremore's groundbreaking paper "Hitchcock and Humor" addresses a central aspect of the filmmaker's work that has been thoroughly neglected in the critical literature.[4] Naremore demonstrates that Hitchcockian humor combines the orchestration of extreme anxiety with deflationary moments of comedy, often represented in the diegesis itself through iconoclastic laughter in a manner that is characteristic of the gallows humor or black humor theorized by Freud and celebrated by André Breton. Naremore notes some of the key practitioners of black humor who influenced Hitchcock – such as De Quince, Poe, Wilde, and O'Henry – and finds the fullest realization of this aesthetic in the short-story format of Hitchcock's television series. Hitchcock's television work, Naremore argues, is central to understanding his œuvre, for in this new medium Hitchcock was free to abandon the format of the wrong man narrative, which typically liberated the hero from the taint of villainy and restored the conventional moral

order, in favor of "morbidly satiric" tales that were devoid of innocent characters and that frequently invited viewers to identify with the point of view of the criminal mind. In this way, Hitchcock prepared the ground for *Psycho*, a film that Naremore describes as "Hitchcock's most brilliant and frightening exercise in black humor."

Bettina Rosenbladt's contribution to the volume, "Doubles and Doubts in Hitchcock: The German Connection" undertakes a detailed examination of the murderous double in Hitchcock's works by probing the origins of this figure in German expressionist film and its literary forbears. Through a close reading of *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1919) and *Nosferatu* (1922), she shows how a doubling motif is sustained in both films through the interweaving of uncanny themes and elliptical narrative form. She suggests that they embody different iconographic traditions, both of which profoundly influenced Hitchcock. In the first, the figure of the double is given a psychological connotation through the pervasive mood of uncertainty and foreboding created by the use of light and shadow; in the second, the figuration of the double is given a more objective metaphysical weight by being connected with forces of nature. Through detailed interpretations of *The Lodger* and *Shadow of a Doubt*, Rosenbladt argues that "while the double increasingly loses much of its obvious otherness," it also "gains in uncanniness by its very likeness to other characters in the film and to ourselves." She also traces a distinct shift between the early works, where the films' complex doubling seems mainly to entertain the audience with Hitchcock's directorial brilliance and legerdemain, and the later work, in which complex doubling motifs prompt us to reflect upon the role of the family and the situation of women in modern America.

Joe McElhaney's essay "The Object and the Face: *Notorious*, Bergman, and the Close-Up" takes as its point of departure two seemingly opposed statements on Hitchcock made by Jean-Luc Godard over a forty-year period. While Godard, in 1957, celebrates Hitchcock's capacity, amidst a transparently fictive narrative, to document the human face and the emotion it registers in a manner akin to the neorealist filmmakers, he later (in *Histoires du cinéma*) claims that Hitchcock creates a world of structures and surfaces devoid of human content, and thus what we remember in his films are close-ups not of people but of objects. Through a detailed examination of Hitchcock's use of the close-up in *Notorious*, McElhaney argues that the key to the filmmaker's aesthetic lies in the expressive tension created between the subjectifying and objectifying aspects of the cinematic close-up that is dramatized in the way in which Hitchcock's camera engages Bergman's star persona. Bergman is an actress whose star persona, like that of the great silent film actresses, is embodied in her face. Yet it is a face that is antithetical, in its expressivity and mobility, to the glamorous, yet forbidding, mask-like persona of a Garbo. The pathos of *Notorious* lies in the manner in which Bergman's face, as it becomes related in a series of close-ups to a network of

deadly gestures and objects, is increasingly drained of expression, as if de-natured or object-ified. In this way, the expressive dimension of Bergman's face is registered by Hitchcock's camera through its very occlusion. In conclusion, McElhaney compares Bergman's work with Hitchcock to her later films with Rossellini in order to challenge the conventional opposition (repeated by Godard) between neorealism and Hitchcock.

This part concludes with Sid Gottlieb's carefully researched essay on "Unknown Hitchcock: The Unrealized Projects," which draws attention to the remarkable range of ideas and plans for films that, for one reason or another, never came to fruition. Gottlieb surveys several projects that Hitchcock extensively developed, yet which remained unfilmed. He argues that they are of particular interest for the light they shed upon the director's enduring concerns: his improvisation and creativity; his attempts to refashion himself at various times during his career; his approach to collaboration, especially in pre-production; and finally, his attempts to negotiate the external constraints placed upon his productivity. Can these unrealized works give us insight into the films that Hitchcock did succeed in making? While Gottlieb resists categorizing Hitchcock as an "artist of the incomplete," the nature and range of his unrealized projects and ideas do suggest the extent to which the projects that were actually realized on film do themselves manifest degrees of incompletion, as Slavoj Žižek's discussion of alternative endings to Hitchcock's films in the final essay in the volume attests.

The French reception of Hitchcock has been of signal importance in critical assessments of the filmmaker's work, and the essays in Part II analyze different facets of this reception. In "To Catch a Liar: Bazin, Chabrol and Truffaut Encounter Hitchcock," James Vest focuses upon the extraordinary encounters between the cineastes of *Cahiers du cinéma* and the laconic director on location in the French Riviera to shoot footage for *To Catch a Thief* in the summer of 1954. As Vest points out, for the young critics of *Cahiers*, Hitchcock was a pivotal figure in their polemic on behalf of the director as auteur. Their mentor, André Bazin, was more skeptical both about auteurism and about the status of Hitchcock himself; nonetheless, he allowed eleven articles on the director to be published in a three-year period, and was the first to interview him for the magazine. Bazin was shocked both by the director's attitude on set and by Hitchcock's evasion of his questions, and the younger cineastes faired no better in subsequent interviews. It was Truffaut who most ingeniously handled the unresponsive filmmaker by concluding that the director himself was a Hitchcockian creature, a dissembler, who must be compelled to confess like his characters. Yet while Hitchcock initially made light of the claims of his French admirers, he nonetheless increasingly assumed the mantle of auteur that seemed expressly created for him. In this way, the ground was prepared for the series of interviews (or confessions) that resulted in Truffaut's book *Hitchcock* as well as the subsequent critical valorization of Hitchcock as master auteur.

Complementing Vest's historical study, Walter Raubicheck in "*Hitchcock, the First Forty-Four Films:* Chabrol's and Rohmer 'Politique des Auteurs' " undertakes a detailed re-evaluation of Claude Chabrol's and Eric Rohmer seminal 1957 monograph on the director. He argues that the central thesis of their work – "form does not embellish content, it creates it" – arises from a critical dialogue with André Bazin, who cannot account for Hitchcock's distinctive genius from the standpoint of his realist aesthetic. For Bazin, Hitchcock's style betrays an excessive allegiance to a constructivist school of montage and visual expressionism that imposes an interpretation upon "reality" rather than allowing this reality to (ambiguously) unfold, as it does in the mise-en-scène aesthetic of Welles. While Chabrol and Rohmer do not reject Bazin's aesthetic in the sense that their focus is nearly always on the content of the shot and how it is photographed rather than the relationships between shots, they conceive of realism in the cinema as something that arises from the organization of the material elements of film rather than as something that is "conditioned by the location of objects in space and time." Hitchcock's visual style, then, is not characterized by "shallow virtuosity" but a masterful blending of form with content in a manner that will provide a model for their own filmmaking practice.

While Vest and Raubicheck usefully remind us of the original and productive encounters between Hitchcock and his Parisian admirers, Sam Ishii-Gonzáles, in "Hitchcock with Deleuze," focuses on a more recent French reading of the director: the commentary on Hitchcock found in the philosopher Gilles Deleuze's two-volume study of cinema published in France in 1983 and 1985, respectively. Deleuze positions Hitchcock between the two representational systems that characterize the history of the medium: the movement-image (of classical cinema) and the time-image (of modern cinema). According to Deleuze, Hitchcock invents a new kind of image that he calls the "mental-image" or "relation-image" which makes the process of thought itself the object of signification. Hitchcock renders palpable percepts and affects, and in so doing he paves the way for the modern cinema of Antonioni, Godard, Resnais, *et al.* What is not clear in Deleuze, however, is the development or evolution of the mental-image in the filmmaker's work. Ishii-Gonzáles argues that this image develops over a period of years and reaches its perfection in the fifties, particularly in *Rear Window*, *The Wrong Man,* and *Vertigo*. It is in this trio of films most of all that we can understand Deleuze's claims for Hitchcock as avatar of both the classical cinema of perceptive, affective, and active montage and the modern cinema of time.

Part III explores the representation of personal and political identity in Hitchcock's works. This topic has been of central importance for critics who write from the standpoint of contemporary critical theory and for whom Hitchcock's films become an occasion to investigate the relationship between the

social and aesthetic construction of identity, whether it is understood in the broadest terms (the idea of personal identity as a whole) or whether it is conceived more narrowly, say, in terms of a gendered subject or a subject defined by sexual orientation. Daniel Srebnick's essay, "Music and Identity: The Struggle for Harmony in *Vertigo,*" approaches the topic of the formation of identity in more narrowly aesthetic terms, arguing that Bernard Herrmann's music for *Vertigo* provides a sonic evocation of the struggle for identity dramatized in the film. Herrmann contrasts music that has a stable tonal center, embodied in the main "love theme," with densely chromatic sequences that lack tonal stability and create a sense of musical dissonance. The listener struggles to find a stable or predictable harmonic structure (whether tonal or atonal) where the ear can rest. In this way, the score at once cues and expresses the psychological struggle of James Stewart's character Scottie Ferguson as he strives to reconcile the dictates of reason with those of desire. While this musical tension characterizes the overall architecture of Herrmann's score, it is exemplified, for Srebnick, in the ascending and descending E flat minor/major 7th arpeggios that open the film and later accompany Judy's transformation into Madeleine. These arpeggios, which pull the listener in opposing directions simultaneously, provide an aural evocation of Scottie's acrophobia and thereby express his deeper fear of ascending to the place where the narrative secret might be revealed and his own identity resolved.

In "The Silence of *The Birds*: Sound Aesthetics and Public Space in Later Hitchcock," Angelo Restivo takes as his point of departure Slavoj Žižek's psychoanalytic diagnosis of a shift in Hitchcock's work towards films whose formal construction undermines the fictions of subjective and social cohesion that are sustained in his earlier films. He asks: can we characterize the filmmaker's stylistic innovations in a manner that links them to wider developments in the social field and thereby provide a more precise historical grounding for Žižek's psychoanalytic claims? Restivo suggests that in his postwar films Hitchcock undertakes a reconfiguration of cinematic space by deploying "acousmatic" or disembodied sound (a concept first described by Michel Chion). Since the source of "acousmatic" sound is invisible, it has the potential to undermine the distinction between what is inside the legible, visible, public space of action and what is outside it. By reconfiguring, in this way, the relationship between social and psychic space, Hitchcock's films not only respond to the emergence of television but to the wider postwar shift in capitalist economy from modes of production to modes of consumption. As Restivo demonstrates through an analysis of the extraordinary sound design for *The Birds,* the reconfiguration of cinematic space in Hitchcock's works of this period do not merely reflect the changes taking place in culture at large but are themselves actively engaged (both formally and thematically) with these issues.

Adam Lowenstein's essay, "The Master, The Maniac, and *Frenzy*: Hitchcock's Legacy of Horror," challenges the assumption, enshrined in negative critical reactions to the film, that the explicitness of *Frenzy* is an aberration in Hitchcock's work, a departure from a restrained aesthetics of suspense that is assumed by many critics to distinguish his œuvre from the maniacal world of post-Hitchcockian horror that the film seems to herald. Instead, Lowenstein argues, *Frenzy* combines restraint and suspense with moments of terror in a manner that is characteristic of other Hitchcock works such as *Sabotage* and *Psycho*. But whereas *Sabotage* unwittingly violates audience sympathies in its moment of terror, *Frenzy* is designed to "foreground outrage," and while *Psycho* relies on artful suggestion at the moment audience sympathies are betrayed by the sudden murder of its heroine, *Frenzy*'s depiction of sexual violence is graphic and unadorned. *Frenzy* thus makes explicit the manner in which surface decorum in Hitchcock is always subtended by incipient violence. Lowenstein argues persuasively that while British critics, especially, felt that the film was dated in its portrayal of London, its apparent anachronisms serve to represent archetypes of British class identity that serve a deeper artistic purpose. For what *Frenzy* suggests in its systematic exposure of the brutality that lurks beneath the veneer of social propriety is nothing less than a critique of British national identity itself in which the proverbial stiff upper lip is revealed as a veneer of cynicism and hypocrisy, and the working-class milieu of Covent Garden, so often nostalgically or idealistically portrayed, is a place where murder is the real work that is done.

In "Hitchcock's Ireland: The Performance of Irish Identity in *Juno and the Paycock* and *Under Capricorn*," James Morrison argues explicitly against the commonplace assumption that Hitchcock is an a-political, if formally experimental director, by offering an extended meditation on the topics of national identity and colonialist domination in Hitchcock's two explicitly Irish-themed films: his 1930 adaptation of Sean O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock* and his 1949 version of Helen Simpson's novel *Under Capricorn*. Both films, Morrison suggests, present national identity or allegiance as a species of performance or theatricality that challenge any essentialist conception of national affiliation. In *Juno and the Paycock*, Hitchcock consciously foregrounds O'Casey's own preoccupation with the delusory narcissism of Irish nationalism and presents it as the mirror image of English imperial domination. In *Under Capricorn*, the Irish protagonists are at once portrayed as complicit with, yet also subject to, colonial authority. Furthermore, through the use of long takes, Hitchcock at once suggests what the all-encompassing gaze of colonial authority excludes, (what remains off-screen), and conveys a sense of the impermanence or fictiveness of the colonial mansion that forms the central location of the film. In these ways, Hitchcock enacts a critique of Irish national identity through the experimental form in which his work is cast.

To conclude this part of the volume, Patricia White, in "Hitchcock and Hom(m)osexuality," interrogates from a lesbian perspective the growing body of queer theoretical writing on Hitchcock exemplified in D.A. Miller's seminal analysis of *Rope* and Lee Edelman's recent work on several Hitchcock films including *Rear Window*. The discourse of queer theory parallels the feminist critique of the authority of heterosexual masculinity and the male author. Yet by pre-empting the critique of gender oppression with the diagnosis of homophobia and the displaced, aestheticized expressions of homosexual desire that are complementary to it, queer theory reproduces the very indifference to female desire that was the original object of feminist critique, and re-establishes, albeit on different terms, the authority of the male author. White borrows Luce Irigaray's neologism "hom(m)osexuality" to diagnose the way in which male subjectivity, embodied in male-centered discourse, defines the field of sexuality, and the manner in which these queer readings of Hitchcock uphold the authority of masculinity, even as that masculinity is reconceived as an anal–homosexual form rather than a phallic–heterosexist one. In the final part of her chapter, White develops a counter-discourse to this masculinist definition of the field of sexuality by locating the presence of lesbian desire in Hitchcock's *Stage Fright*. As in *Rebecca*, the ostensible narrative is that of one woman trying to prove the guilt of another in a manner that restores patriarchy. But like that earlier film (based on a novel by Daphne du Maurier), *Stage Fright* simultaneously produces a counter-narrative about the obsession of one woman for another. This lesbian desire is invoked by the extraordinary presence of Marlene Dietrich, whose authorship of her own self-display for a female gaze far exceeds the control of Hitchcock, the male author.

The three chapters comprising the final part contemplate the manner in which the spectacle and figuration of death haunts the narrative universe of Hitchcock's films, in particular in his subversive masterpiece *Psycho*. Commencing with Godard's epigram "The cinema is death 24 times a second," Laura Mulvey, in "Death Drives," undertakes a subtle meditation on the death of cinema and the role of death in narrative film through a close analysis of Hitchcock's 1960 work prompted by a viewing of Douglas Gordon's video installation, *24-Hour Psycho*. For Mulvey, *Psycho* represents a turning point in the history of cinema, as well as Hitchcock's œuvre. While conventional narrative film is characterized by a fairy-tale plot whose forward-looking trajectory results in the formation of the couple that returns us to the place where it began (the family home), Hitchcock characteristically combines this plot with the story of a crime and the unmasking of a criminal in a spectacular death that coincides with the romantic union. In this way, even Hitchcock's more "conventional" films link the spectacle of death with the formation of the couple in a manner that undermines the facile optimism of romance. However, in the first part of *Psycho*,

Hitchcock strips away the armature of romance entirely by figuring the forward momentum of the romance plot as a "death drive," an ineluctable movement towards death and hence towards stasis that is given a literal rendition in the frozen shot of Marion's eye that closes the sequence. The second part involves a backward movement towards the realm of the uncanny embodied in the enclosed space of the maternal home where we arrive finally at the conflation of the inanimate with the animate in the form of living deadness that is, for Mulvey, the origin and condition of cinema itself.

In a learned and ingenious contribution to Hitchcock scholarship, "Of 'Farther Uses of the Dead to the Living': Hitchcock and Jeremy Bentham," Miran Bozovic identifies a progenitor of *Psycho*'s Norman Bates, and by extension Alfred Hitchcock, in the utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham, who lived from 1748 to 1832. Bentham requested that his dead body be dissected so that it might have the greatest value for the living. Dissection, as Bozovic points out, had been legally restricted to the corpses of villains. This created an acute shortage of corpses that encouraged body theft, and, in the notorious case of Burke and Hare, murder itself. However, Bentham also made a still more radical suggestion. He proposed that after dissection his body be preserved and displayed as an "auto-icon," that is, as the best representation of Bentham himself. Indeed, Bentham went so far as to imagine a theater of preserved corpses in which dialogues between great figures of the past (including Bentham himself) would be staged "in person." Bozovic discovers in Norman Bates a figure that combines Bentham's novel idea of a theater of corpses with the older, delinquent "wild utilitarianism" of Burke and Hare who killed people in order to use their dead bodies. Norman's fate, he concludes, is rather like that of Burke whose body was preserved as a reminder of his crimes, although Norman is, in effect, stuffed while still alive, condemned to sit and stare vacantly like the preserved corpse of his mother with which he has become irrevocably assimilated.

The failure of Gus Van Sant's recent so-called shot-by-shot remake of *Psycho* prompts Slavoj Žižek to reflect upon what is unique or irreducible about Hitchcock's work. In his essay "Is There a Proper Way to Remake a Hitchcock Film?" he makes three proposals. First, Hitchcock's films are distinguished not by their narrative content but by patterns of visual, formal, material gestures or motifs (which Thomas Leitch has referred to as Hitchcock moments)[5] that cut across different narrative contexts, such as the motif of falling, or of the women who know too much, or the spiral. In Lacanian terms these motifs are not symptoms that mean something but *sinthoms*, gestures or patterns that are at once laden with emotional significance but semantically opaque. Secondly, as Žižek has argued elsewhere, a defining feature of the director's work is the inscription of an uncanny fantasmatic gaze, "the blind spot in the field of the visible from which the picture itself photo-graphs the spectator," and, in this context, he notes that