

A COMPANION TO

FILM NOIR



EDITED BY ANDREW SPICER AND HELEN HANSON

WILEY Blackwell

A Companion to Film Noir

A Companion to Film Noir

Edited by

Andrew Spicer and Helen Hanson

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2013
© 2013 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK

The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Andrew Spicer and Helen Hanson to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author(s) have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to film noir / edited by Andrew Spicer and Helen Hanson.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4443-3627-6 1. Film noir--History and criticism. I. Spicer, Andrew, 1953--

II. Hanson, Helen.

PN1995.9.F54C725 2013

791.43'655--dc23

2013006413

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: Telephone © 12 Tribes / iStockphoto; Hat © DNY59 / iStockphoto; Scene from *Timetable* 1956, photo United Artists / Kobal Collection; Background © Adam Smigielski / iStockphoto
Cover design by Simon Levy Design Associates

Set in 10.5/13pt Minion by SPi Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Contents

List of Illustrations	viii
Notes on Contributors	x
Acknowledgments	xviii
Foreword	xix
<i>James Naremore</i>	
Introduction: The Problem of Film Noir	1
<i>Andrew Spicer</i>	
Part I Conceptualizing Film Noir	15
1 The Strange Case of Film Noir	17
<i>Robert Porfirio</i>	
2 Genre, Hybridity, Heterogeneity: or, the Noir-SF-Vampire-Zombie-Splatter-Romance-Comedy-Action-Thriller Problem	33
<i>Mark Bould</i>	
3 A Wet Emptiness: The Phenomenology of Film Noir	50
<i>Henrik Gustafsson</i>	
4 Cinephilia and Film Noir	67
<i>Corey K. Creekmur</i>	
Part II Hidden, Hybrid, and Transmedia Histories and Influences	77
5 Precursors to Film Noir	79
<i>Wheeler Winston Dixon</i>	
6 Crisscrossed? Film Noir and the Politics of Mobility and Exchange	94
<i>Alastair Phillips</i>	

7	Film Noir and Horror <i>Peter Hutchings</i>	111
8	Borderings: The Film Noir Semi-Documentary <i>R. Barton Palmer</i>	125
9	Crime Fiction and Film Noir <i>William Marling</i>	142
10	Film Noir, American Painting and Photography: Questions of Influence <i>Tom Ryall</i>	158
Part III Social, Industrial, and Commercial Contexts		175
11	The Politics of Film Noir <i>Brian Neve</i>	177
12	The Black Typewriter: Who Wrote Film Noir? <i>David Wilt</i>	193
13	Film Noir and Studio Production Practices <i>Geoff Mayer</i>	211
14	Film Noir and Post-Studio Production Practices <i>John Berra</i>	229
15	Selling Noir: Stars, Gender, and Genre in Film Noir Posters and Publicity <i>Mary Beth Haralovich</i>	245
Part IV The Fabric of Film Noir: Style and Performance		265
16	Out of the Shadows: Noir Lighting and Hollywood Cinematography <i>Patrick Keating</i>	267
17	The Ambience of Film Noir: Soundscapes, Design, and Mood <i>Helen Hanson</i>	284
18	In a Lonely Tone: Music in Film Noir <i>David Butler</i>	302
19	Acting and Performance in Film Noir <i>Donna Peberdy</i>	318
Part V Identities and Film Noir		335
20	Film Noir and Subjectivity <i>Christophe Gelly</i>	337

21	Women in Film Noir <i>Yvonne Tasker</i>	353
22	“The Corpse on Reprieve”: Film Noir’s Cautionary Tales of “Tough Guy” Masculinity <i>Gaylyn Studlar</i>	369
23	Ethnicity and Race in American Film Noir <i>Dan Flory</i>	387
24	The Climb and the Chase: Film Noir and the Urban Scene – Representations of the City in Three Classic Noirs <i>Murray Pomerance</i>	405
Part VI Noir in Other Forms		421
25	Radio Noir in the USA <i>Jesse Schlotterbeck</i>	423
26	Television Noir <i>Steven Sanders</i>	440
27	“It Rhymes with Lust”: The Twisted History of Noir Comics <i>James Lyons</i>	458
Part VII New Geographies of Film Noir		477
28	Film Noir in Asia: Historicizing South Korean Crime Thrillers <i>Nikki J.Y. Lee and Julian Stringer</i>	479
29	Bombay Noir <i>Lalitha Gopalan</i>	496
	Index	512

List of Illustrations

3.1	Sam Spade (Humphrey Bogart) inspects the broken railing at the edge of the crime scene in <i>The Maltese Falcon</i>	54
3.2	Karrer (Miklós B. Székely) challenges a stray dog in <i>Damnation</i>	63
6.1	Film noir's double image: François (Jean Gabin) and his trapped reflection in <i>Le Jour se lève</i>	100
6.2	Film noir's double image: Joe (Henry Fonda) and his trapped reflection in <i>The Long Night</i>	103
10.1	George Bellows's <i>The Street</i>	161
15.1	Gilda (Rita Hayworth) pleads with Johnny (Glenn Ford), alternative image	250
16.1	Tony Gaudio uses small lamps and shallow focus for this shot from <i>High Sierra</i>	269
16.2	Lee Garmes uses one powerful arc lamp to create the shadow on the back wall in <i>Nightmare Alley</i>	270
16.3	Cinematographer Arthur Edeson employs a crisp style for <i>The Maltese Falcon</i>	273
16.4	A lamp effect with a moderate amount of fill in <i>Nightmare Alley</i>	276
16.5	In <i>Nightmare Alley</i> , lighting suggests that the lamp in the background is unusually dim	277
16.6	Sidney (Tony Curtis) under the flat lighting of fluorescents, in <i>Sweet Smell of Success</i>	277
16.7	A flattering three-quarter key-light for Angela (Marilyn Monroe) in <i>The Asphalt Jungle</i>	280
16.8	Two side-lights provide harsher modeling on Dix's (Sterling Hayden's) face, associating tough masculinity with the conspicuous absence of glamour in <i>The Asphalt Jungle</i>	280
19.1	Interiority and exterior expression: Joan Crawford in <i>Sudden Fear</i>	325

19.2	Exoteric and esoteric performance in <i>The Blue Dahlia</i> : William Bendix and Alan Ladd	331
21.1	Elsa Bannister's (Rita Hayworth) associations with Asian culture suggest a splicing of geographic and moral mobility in <i>The Lady From Shanghai</i>	362
21.2	Bree Daniels (Jane Fonda) is figured as both emancipated and threatened by modern urban life in <i>Klute</i>	365
22.1	A secretary helps her boss navigate the noir world: Lucille Ball and Mark Stevens in <i>The Dark Corner</i>	371
22.2	A police detective cannot control his violence against an equally aggressive ex-GI: Dana Andrews and Craig Stevens in <i>Where the Sidewalk Ends</i>	377
22.3	An amnesiac veteran searches an unsympathetic American urban landscape for clues to his pre-war identity: John Hodiak in <i>Somewhere in the Night</i>	380
22.4	Mark Dixon needs to talk but he cannot remember his purpose: Gene Tierney and Dana Andrews in <i>Where the Sidewalk Ends</i>	382
23.1	Andrew Morton (Humphrey Bogart) listens respectfully to Jim "Sunshine" Jackson (Robert Davis) as Juan (Pepe Hern) looks on sympathetically in <i>Knock on Any Door</i>	390
23.2	Deckard (Harrison Ford) surrounded by "Oriental" otherness during the market sequence in <i>Blade Runner</i>	401
26.1	Sonny Crockett (Don Johnson) and Ricardo Tubbs (Philip Michael Thomas) in <i>Miami Vice</i>	446
26.2	Dexter Morgan (Michael C. Hall) at his day job in <i>Dexter</i>	454
27.1	Cover image of <i>It Rhymes with Lust</i> by Arnold Drake, Leslie Waller, and Matt Baker	467
28.1	Jang Dong-hwi (man holding knife) as a gang boss in Lee Man-hee's <i>Black Hair</i>	482
28.2	Moon Jeong-sook as a femme fatale in <i>Black Hair</i>	485
28.3	Lee Doo-yong's <i>The Last Witness</i>	487
28.4	Detective Oh's (Ha Myung-joong) hunt for the truth and the murderer turns into an investigation of history	489
29.1	Poster for <i>Johnny Gaddaar</i>	504
29.2	Vikram's preferred reading in <i>Johnny Gaddaar</i>	506
29.3	Prakash playing with chance in <i>Johnny Gaddaar</i>	507

Notes on Contributors

John Berra is a lecturer in Film Studies at Nanjing University. Author of *Declarations of Independence: American Cinema and the Partiality of Independent Production* (2008), editor of the *Directory of World Cinema: American Independent* (2010/2012) and the *Directory of World Cinema: Japan* (2010/2012), and coeditor of *World Film Locations: Beijing* (2012), he has also contributed essays to *The End: An Electric Sheep Anthology* (2011), *World Film Locations: New York* (2011), and *World Film Locations: New Orleans* (2012) as well as articles to *Asian Cinema* and *Science Fiction Film and Television*. His research on American Independent Cinema has focused on the importance of cultural capital to filmmakers operating on the fringes of the industrial mainstream, with an emphasis on how this status is assimilated through film festivals, niche marketing strategies, and the development of new distribution platforms.

Mark Bould is Reader in Film and Literature at the University of the West of England and coeditor of the journal *Science Fiction Film and Television*. He is the author of *Film Noir: From Berlin to Sin City* (2005), *The Cinema of John Sayles: Lone Star* (2009), and *Science Fiction: The Routledge Film Guidebook* (2012), coauthor of *The Routledge Concise History of Science Fiction* (2011), and coeditor of *Parietal Games: Critical Writings By and On M. John Harrison* (2005), *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction* (2009), *Fifty Key Figures in Science Fiction* (2009), *Red Planets: Marxism and Science Fiction* (2009), and *Neo-Noir* (2009). He is an advisory editor to *Extrapolation*, *Historical Materialism*, *Paradoxa*, and *Science Fiction Studies*.

David Butler is Senior Lecturer in Screen Studies at the University of Manchester. He is the author of *Jazz Noir: Listening to Music from "Phantom Lady" to "The Last Seduction"* (2002), *Fantasy Cinema: Impossible Worlds on Screen* (2009) and the editor of *Time And Relative Dissertations In Space: Critical Perspectives on Doctor Who* (2007). His research interests include the use of jazz in film, the relationship between music and image, and the portrayal of the fantastic on screen.

Corey K. Creekmur is an associate professor of English and Film Studies at the University of Iowa, where he also directs the Institute for Cinema and Culture. He recently coedited *Cinema, Law, and the State in Asia* and *The International Film Musical* and contributed an essay on Jacques Tourneur to *Film Noir: The Directors*. His teaching and research interests include American film genres, popular Hindi film, and comics.

Wheeler Winston Dixon is the James Ryan Professor of Film Studies, Coordinator of the Film Studies Program, Professor of English at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, and Editor in Chief, with Gwendolyn Audrey Foster, of the *Quarterly Review and Film and Video*. His newest books are *Streaming: Movies, Media and Instant Access* (2013) and *Death of the Moguls: The End of Classical Hollywood* (2012), *21st Century Hollywood: Movies in the Era of Transformation* (with Gwendolyn Audrey Foster; 2011), and *A History of Horror* (2010). His website, *Frame by Frame*, can be found at blog.unl.edu/dixon/, and a series of videos by Dixon on film history, theory, and criticism, also titled *Frame by Frame*, are available at <http://mediahub.unl.edu/channels/105>.

Dan Flory is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Montana State University, Bozeman and author of *Philosophy, Black Film, Film Noir* (2008). In 2007–2008 he was Visiting Associate Professor of Philosophy at the American University in Cairo. His publications include many essays on philosophy, film noir, and critical race theory, including “Black on White: *Film Noir* and the Epistemology of Race in Recent African-American Cinema,” “The Epistemology of Race and Black American *Film Noir*: Spike Lee’s *Summer of Sam* as Lynching Parable,” “Race, Empathy, and *Noir* in *Deep Cover*,” and “Spike Lee and the Sympathetic Racist.” He has served twice as guest editor for the journal *Film and Philosophy*, and he is currently working on a book about the emotions, race, and philosophical reflection. His most recent work is *Race, Philosophy, and Film*, coedited with Mary K. Bloodsworth-Lugo (2013).

Christophe Gelly is a professor at the Université Blaise Pascal, where he teaches English and American literature and film studies. He has published a book-length study on Chandler, *Raymond Chandler – Du roman noir au film noir* (2009), as well as several articles on Conan Doyle, Joseph Conrad, and film adaptations of nineteenth-century novelists. He currently specializes in film noir theory and adaptation studies.

Lalitha Gopalan is an associate professor in the Department of Radio-Television-Film and affiliate faculty in the Department of Asian Studies and South Asia Institute at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research and teaching interests are in the areas of Film Theory, Feminist Film Theory, Contemporary World Cinemas, Indian Cinema, Genre Films, and Experimental Film and Video. She is the author of *Cinema of Interruptions: Action Genres in Contemporary Indian Cinema* (2002) and *Bombay* (2005) and editor of *Cinema of India* (2010); she also sits on the editorial

boards of *Camera Obscura: Feminism, Culture, and Media Studies* and *Film Quarterly*. She has served on several film festival juries and she is a member of the advisory board of 3rd I Film Festival, San Francisco. She recently co-curated the film series "Cruel Cinema: New Directions in Tamil Film."

Henrik Gustafsson is a film scholar and postdoctoral fellow with the research project "Border Culture" at the University of Tromsø. His book *Out of Site: Landscape and Cultural Reflexivity in New Hollywood Cinema, 1969-1974* (VDM 2008) is an interdisciplinary study on popular film, fine arts, and cultural memory. Together with Asbjørn Grønstad, he has edited the volumes *Ethics and Images of Pain* (Routledge 2012) and (forthcoming from Continuum) *Cinema and Agamben: Ethics, Biopolitics and the Moving Image*. Recent publications include "Foresight, Hindsight and State Secrecy in the American West: The Geopolitical Aesthetics of Trevor Paglen" in *Journal of Visual Culture* and chapters in various books, including *The Films of Claire Denis: Intimacy on the Border* (I.B. Tauris 2013), *Urban Images: Unruly Desires in Film and Architecture* (Sternberg Press 2011), *Imaging History: Photography After the Fact* (ASA Publishers 2011), and *The San Francisco of Alfred Hitchcock's Vertigo: Place, Pilgrimage, and Commemoration* (Scarecrow Press 2011).

Helen Hanson is Senior Lecturer in Film Studies at the University of Exeter and the Academic Director of the Bill Douglas Centre for the History of Cinema and Popular Culture. She is the author of *Hollywood Heroines: Women in Film Noir and the Female Gothic Film* (2007) and the forthcoming *Hollywood Soundscapes: Film Sound Style, Craft and Production 1931-1950* as well as being coeditor (with Catherine O'Rawe) of *The Femme Fatale: Images, Histories, Contexts* (2009) and (with Ian Gardiner and Jay Beck) of the journal *Music, Sound and the Moving Image*.

Mary Beth Haralovich is a professor in the School of Theatre, Film & Television at the University of Arizona in Tucson, where she teaches film and television history. Her studies of Hollywood film promotion focus on the heterosexual imperative of film posters, the value of diverse female images to film promotion, and the implementation of film promotion in local US film markets. Her work-in-progress is *Marked Women: Local Promotion of 1930s "Scandalous Woman" Films*. Her publications include studies on *Marked Woman* (1937) and other 1930s' proletarian women's films, heterosexual flirtation in the promotion of *A Free Soul* (1931), the challenges for US promotion of Marlene Dietrich's *Blonde Venus* (1932), and the promotion of *Mildred Pierce* (1946) as murder mystery. In addition, she has written on 1940s' A and B Sherlock Holmes film series, films of 1950, color in Douglas Sirk melodrama, 1990s' masculine star images of Tom Hanks and Tom Cruise, and the film social history method. In television studies, she has published on masculinity and war veterans in *Magnum, p.i.* (1980-1988) and geo-politics of civil rights in *I Spy* (1965-1968). Her essay on 1950s' suburban family comedies has been reprinted many times. Haralovich serves on the editorial board of *Feminist Media*

Studies for University of Illinois Press, is coeditor of *Television, History, and American Culture: Feminist Critical Essays* (1999), and is a founder of the International Conference on Television, Video, New Media, Audio and Feminism: Console-ing Passions.

Peter Hutchings, Professor of Film Studies at Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, is the author of *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film* (1993), *Terence Fisher* (2002), *The British Film Guide to Dracula* (2003), *The Horror Film* (2004), and the *Historical Dictionary of Horror Cinema* (2008) as well as being coeditor – with Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich – of *The Film Studies Reader* (2000). He has also published numerous journal articles and book chapters on horror cinema, British film and television, science fiction cinema and television, and the thriller.

Patrick Keating is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at Trinity University in San Antonio, where he teaches courses in film and media studies. He is the author of *Hollywood Lighting from the Silent Era to Film Noir* (2010), which won the Best First Book Award from the Society of Cinema and Media Studies. He is editing a book of essays on the history of Hollywood cinematography and working on a manuscript about camera movement and the representation of modern space. The latter project has received a grant from the Academy Film Scholars program. Recent publications include essays on the film theorist Rudolf Arnheim, the Mexican cinematographer Gabriel Figueroa, and the structure of Hollywood narrative. He holds a PhD in Film Studies and an MFA in Film Production.

Nikki J.Y. Lee holds a PhD in Cultural Studies from Goldsmiths College, University of London. She is a lecturer in Asian Media at Nottingham Trent University. Her research interests cover transnational East Asian film genres, stars, and industries with a focus on South Korean cinema. She has published several articles on Korean films and directors, including “Localized Globalization and a Monster National: *The Host* (2006) and the South Korean Film Industry,” in *Cinema Journal*. She is coeditor of a forthcoming volume, *The Korean Cinema Book* (British Film Institute/Palgrave Macmillan).

James Lyons is Senior Lecturer in Film Studies at the University of Exeter. He is the author of *Selling Seattle* (2004) and *Miami Vice* (2010) and coeditor of *Quality Popular Television* (2003), *Multimedia Histories: From the Magic Lantern to the Internet* (2007), and *The Rise of the American Comics Artist: Creators and Contexts* (2010).

William Marling is Professor of English at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. In addition to many articles and chapters in collections, he is the author of *How “American” Is Globalization?* (2006), *The American Roman Noir* (1997), *Raymond Chandler* (1988), *Dashiell Hammett* (1985), and *William Carlos*

Williams and the Painters (1983). He has been a distinguished foreign Chair in Spain, France, Austria, Japan, and Lebanon.

Geoff Mayer is a reader and associate professor at La Trobe University, where he is Head of the School of Communication, Arts and Critical Enquiry. He teaches Film History and Film Genre. He is author of *Film as Text* (1991), *Media Studies: Narrative, Audience, Values and Process* (1991), the *Guide to British Cinema* (2003), *Roy Ward Baker* (2004), and the *Historical Dictionary of Crime Films* (2012), coauthor of *New Australian Cinema: Sources and Parallels in American and British Film* (1992) and *Encyclopedia of Film Noir* (2007), and he is coeditor of *The Oxford Companion to Australian Film* (1999) and *The Cinema of Australia and New Zealand* (2007). He also contributed a chapter on the American director Joseph H. Lewis to *Film Noir: The Directors* (2012), edited by Alain Silver and James Ursini. Geoff was a consultant and on-camera film historian on the 2011 documentary *Stunt Love*. This film traced the remarkable Hollywood career of Australian-born director, actor, writer, and producer J.P. McGowan and the films he made with his American wife, actor Helen Holmes. He is currently writing a critical and historical dictionary of the action film from 1912 to 2012 with particular emphasis on the film serial and serial form.

Brian Neve teaches politics and film at the University of Bath. He is author of *Elia Kazan: the Cinema of an American Outsider* (2009) and *Film and Politics in America: a Social Tradition* (2000), and he is a coeditor of *"Un-American Hollywood": politics and film in the Blacklist era* (2007). He is a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of American Studies*. His book on the life and film work of Cy Endfield is forthcoming from Wisconsin University Press.

R. Barton Palmer is Calhoun Lemon Professor of Literature at Clemson University, where he also directs the Global Cultural Studies as well as the Cinema and Cultural Studies programs. Palmer is the author, editor, or general editor of more than forty volumes on various film and literary subjects. Among his numerous publications on film noir are: *Hollywood's Dark Cinema: The American Film Noir* (1994), *Perspectives on Film Noir* (1996), and *Joel and Ethan Cohen* (2004).

Donna Peberdy is a senior lecturer in Film and Television Studies at Southampton Solent University. Donna's research interests include acting and performance, masculinity and sexuality in American cinema. She is the author of *Masculinity and Film Performance: Male Angst in Contemporary American Cinema* (2011) and coeditor of *Tainted Love: Screening Sexual Perversities* (2013). Subjects of recent articles and chapters in contributed volumes include acting in Wes Anderson's films (*New Review of Film and Television Studies*), Tom Cruise and the performance of bipolar masculinity (*Men & Masculinities*), Michael Douglas's "ordinary" masculinity (*Pretty People: Movie Stars of the 1990s*), Sean Penn and the performance of homosexuality (*Millennial Masculinity: Men in Contemporary American Cinema*), celebrity

autoerotic asphyxiation and playing with the self (*Celebrity Studies*), speech affectations (*Film Dialogue*), and film acting in the 1980s and 1990s (*Behind the Silver Screen: Acting*).

Alastair Phillips is Reader in Film Studies in the Department of Film and Television Studies, University of Warwick. His research interests lie in the fields of international film history, culture, and aesthetics with special emphasis on French and Japanese filmmaking; histories of exile and emigration within Europe and between Europe and Hollywood; and the representation of place and landscape in historical and contemporary world cinemas. His books include *Rififi: A French Film Guide* (2009), and (with Jim Hillier) *100 Film Noirs* (2007). He has recently coedited (with Ginette Vincendeau) *A Companion to Jean Renoir* (2013).

Murray Pomerance is a professor in the Department of Sociology and Director of the Media Studies Working Group, at Ryerson University. He is the author of *Michelangelo Red Antonioni Blue: Eight Reflections on Cinema* (2011), *The Horse Who Drank the Sky: Film Experience Beyond Narrative and Theory* (2008), *Johnny Depp Starts Here* (2005), *An Eye for Hitchcock* (2004), and *Ludwig Bemelmans: A Bibliography* (1993). Forthcoming are *Hitchcock's America* (Polity Press) and *The Eyes Have It: Cinema and the Reality Effect* (Rutgers), as well as an edited volume, *The Last Laugh: Strange Humors of Cinema and the coedited Hollywood's Chosen People: The Jewish Experience in American Cinema* (both Wayne State). He has edited and coedited numerous books including *A Family Affair: Cinema Calls Home* (2008), *City That Never Sleeps: New York and the Filmic Imagination* (2007), *Cinema and Modernity* (2006), *American Cinema of the 1950s: Themes and Variations* (2005), *A Little Solitaire: John Frankenheimer and American Film* (2011), *From Hobbits to Hollywood: Essays on Peter Jackson's Lord of the Rings* (2006), *Where the Boys Are: Cinemas of Masculinity and Youth* (2005), and *Sugar, Spice, and Everything Nice: Cinemas of Girlhood* (2002).

Robert Porfirio received a MA in Film from UCLA and completed his doctorate at Yale University with his seminal dissertation, *The Dark Age of American Film*, in 1979. He is a coeditor of *Film Noir: The Encyclopedia* (2010) and *Film Noir Reader 3* (2002) and has contributed to the other three volumes in the *Film Noir Reader* series. He also contributed to *The Noir Style* (1999) and wrote the foreword to *The Philosophy of Film Noir* (2007). He was formerly assistant professor of American Studies at California State University, Fullerton, where he taught the first accredited course in film noir beginning in 1973. Porfirio recently returned to Southern California after three years in southern France.

Tom Ryall is Emeritus Professor of Film History at Sheffield Hallam University. His books include *Anthony Asquith* (2005), *Britain and the American Cinema* (2001), and *Alfred Hitchcock and the British Cinema* (1996). He has contributed various articles on British and American cinema to collections such as *Film Noir: The Directors*

(2012), *A Companion to Hitchcock Studies* (2011), *The British Cinema Book* (2009), *The Cinema of Britain and Ireland* (2005), *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies* (1998), and he has written for journals such as *Screen*, *Sight and Sound* and the *Journal of Popular British Cinema*.

Steven Sanders is Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at Bridgewater State University. He has written numerous articles on film noir including “Sunshine Noir: Postmodernism and *Miami Vice*,” in Mark T. Conard (ed.), *The Philosophy of Neo-Noir* (2007) and “Something More Than Noir,” in Steven Rybin and Will Scheibel (eds), *Going Home: Essays on Nicholas Ray in Cinema Culture* (SUNY Press, forthcoming). He has edited three volumes in The Philosophy of Popular Culture series published by the University Press of Kentucky, including *The Philosophy of Science Fiction Film* (2008), and he coedited *The Philosophy of TV Noir* (2008) (with Aeon J. Skoble) and *The Philosophy of Steven Soderbergh* (2011) (with R. Barton Palmer). He is the author of the chapter on Orson Welles in *Film Noir: the Directors* (2012) and four entries in *Film Noir: the Encyclopedia* (2010). He has published a monograph on *Miami Vice* (2010) and is coeditor, with Aeon J. Skoble and R. Barton Palmer, of *Michael Mann and Philosophy* (forthcoming). He is currently coediting, with R. Barton Palmer, a selection of interviews with filmmaker Michael Mann and completing what he calls “a memoirist’s novel.”

Jesse Schlotterbeck is an assistant professor of Cinema at Denison University. His work on film noir also appears in *M/C – A Journal of Media and Culture*, the *Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance*, and *Film Noir: The Directors* (2012).

Andrew Spicer is Reader in Cultural History in the Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education at the University of the West of England where he is Director of Research. He has published widely on British cinema and on film noir; he is author of works including *Film Noir* (2002), *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema* (2003), *Sydney Box* (2006), the *Historical Dictionary of Film Noir* (2010), and editor of *European Film Noir* (2007). He is coauthor of *The Man Who Got Carter: Michael Klinger, Independent Production and the British Film Industry, 1960–1980* (2013) and coeditor of *Beyond the Bottom Line: The Producer in Screen Studies* (Continuum, forthcoming), and he is preparing a monograph on Sean Connery for “The Film Stars” series (BFI/Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming).

Julian Stringer is Associate Professor in Film and Television Studies at the University of Nottingham. He has published widely on East Asian cinema and is coeditor, with Chi-Yun Shin, of *New Korean Cinema* (2005) and, with Alastair Phillips, *Japanese Cinema: Texts and Contexts* (2007). He recently organized a conference on Moving Images and the Digital Eco-City at ZED pavilion, Shanghai Expo (October 2010), and acted as joint organizer of a conference (with Tsinghua University) on film and television in the 3D age at the China National Film Museum, Beijing (January 2011).

He is currently working (with Nikki J.Y. Lee) on *The Korean Cinema Book* for the British Film Institute/Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaylyn Studlar is David May Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Director of the Program in Film & Media Studies at Washington University in St Louis. She has also taught at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor and Emory University. She is the author of *Precocious Charms: Stars Performing Girlhood in Classical Hollywood Cinema* (2013), *This Mad Masquerade: Stardom and Masculinity in the Jazz Age* (1996), and *In the Realm of Pleasure: Von Sternberg, Dietrich, and the Masochistic Aesthetic* (1992) as well as being the coeditor of four volumes and author of over three dozen articles. Her numerous essays on Hollywood film include “*Double Indemnity*: Hardboiled Film Noir,” in *Film Analysis* (2005) and “A Gunsel is Being Beaten: Gangster Masculinity and the Homoerotics of the Crime Film, 1941–1942,” in *Mob Culture: Hidden Histories of the American Gangster Film* (2005).

Yvonne Tasker is Professor of Film Studies and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities at the University of East Anglia. Her publications include *Soldiers’ Stories: Military Women in Cinema and Television since WWII* (2011), *Working Girls: Gender and Sexuality in Popular Culture* (1998), and *Spectacular Bodies: Gender, Genre and the Action Cinema* (1993). Her edited collections include: *Fifty Contemporary Film Directors* (2001), *Action and Adventure Cinema* (2004), and, with Diane Negra, *Interrogating Postfeminism: Gender and the Politics of Popular Culture* (2007). Her anthology (coedited with Diane Negra) entitled *Gendering the Recession* is forthcoming with Duke University Press.

David Wilt is a professorial lecturer in Film Studies at The George Washington University and a Systems Librarian at The University of Maryland Libraries. He is the author of *Hard Boiled in Hollywood: Five “Black Mask” Writers and the Movies* (1991) and *The Mexican Filmography, 1916–2001* (2004) and the coauthor of *Doing Their Bit: Wartime American Animated Films, 1939–1945* (1987, revised edition 2004) and *Hollywood War Films 1937–1945* (1996). He has also contributed chapters to *Mondo Macabro* (1997), *The Columbia Companion to American History on Film* (2004), *Film and Comics* (2007), and *Latsploitation, Latin America, and Exploitation Cinema* (2009). His primary research interests include the sociopolitical context of popular culture, Mexican cinema, film history, and paracinema.

Acknowledgments

Helen Hanson would like to thank the College of Humanities at the University of Exeter for funding a research leave that enabled work on the *Companion*. She would also like to thank her colleagues (past and present) in English and Film Studies for their intellectual support and encouragement, in particular Jo Gill, Fiona Handyside, Will Higbee, Joe Kember, Song Lim, James Lyons, Steve Neale, Dan North, and Mark Whalan. Personal thanks are due to Shirley and George Wickham; to Jude, Dave, Isabelle, and Daniel Hill; to Don, Liz, Ed, and Sue Hanson, to Eddie and Dan Sangha, and most especially to Phil Wickham.

Andrew Spicer would like to thank the Faculty of Arts, Creative Industries and Education at the University of the West of England (Bristol) for funding a period of research leave to edit the *Companion*. He would like to thank his partner, Joyce Woolridge, for helping with the final compilation and proofing of the *Companion*, for completing the index, and for her unstinting support throughout. Sean was extremely patient during the whole process of putting this book together and, together with his companion Chocolate, helped in the final preparation of the manuscript. A big thanks from Daddy!

Both editors wish to thank Jayne Fagnoli, Executive Editor of Arts at Wiley-Blackwell, for her enthusiasm throughout the completion of this project and to thank Allison Kostka and Felicity Marsh for their assistance in production.

Foreword

Film noir is the most amorphous yet fascinating category in cinema. I call it a “category” because cycles and movements are more short-lived, and genres, though much less stable than historians make them seem, are somewhat easier to delineate. We usually associate noir with certain black-and-white, Hollywood pictures of the 1940s and 1950s – movies about private eyes seduced by femme fatales, domestic women threatened by killers, criminal gangs planning robberies, and outlaw couples on the run. Famous titles include *Double Indemnity* (1944), *Murder, My Sweet* (1944), *The Killers* (1946), *Gun Crazy* (1950), and *The Killing* (1956). These are core examples; a couple of them were in fact among the first American movies dubbed “noir” by the French, who had invented the term in the 1930s to describe “poetic realist” pictures such as *Le Jour se lève* (*Daybreak*, 1939). But what about *Treasure of the Sierra Madre* (1947, the story of three ragged prospectors searching for gold), *Reign of Terror* (1949, a costume adventure set during the French revolution), *Cronaca di un amore* (*Story of a Love Affair*, 1950, an Italian art film with a detective protagonist), *Dr. No* (1962, the first James Bond movie), and *2001* (US 1968)? Each of these has also been described as noir by at least one respected writer on the subject. (The writers in question are Raymond Borde, Etienne Chaumeton, Raymond Durgnat, Jim Hiller, and Alastair Phillips.) They may seem like far-fetched instances, but the idea of noir – born of criticism, subject to different uses, and capable of change or evolution over time – is rich and flexible enough that anyone who has seen enough films can think of unusual suspects that might, at least arguably, be listed under the noir rubric. My own picks would be *A Cottage on Dartmoor* (1930, as skillful and troubling a murder story as anything by Hitchcock); *Wanda* (1971, the rawest and most truthful criminal-couple-on-the-road movie ever made), and *Variety* (1983, a sort of female, avant-garde *Vertigo*).

One way of trying to contain film noir is to define it, as Paul Schrader did in 1972, as a Hollywood movement occurring between 1941 and 1958 which was influenced by American pulp fiction and émigré directors from Germany. This approach has the advantage of confining the topic to a historical period with its own nexus of

fashions and systems of production; we can then invent another term, “neo-noir,” to account for the considerable number of later pictures that have close connections or affinities with the original group. But as several writers in this book show, neat boundaries and distinctions are difficult to maintain. Film noir has never been exclusively American; we can find excellent examples not only from France but also from other countries in Europe, Latin America, and Asia. By the same token, film noir can’t be easily limited to a historical period. Some have tried to claim that the 1941 version *The Maltese Falcon* was the first film noir; but while *Falcon* certainly influenced subsequent films, it was influenced *by* earlier ones, several of which are now regularly called noir. It should also be emphasized, as it is in this collection of essays, that noir has never been exclusive to film. Most of the famous early examples were adapted from novels, and during the 1940s and 1950s we can find noir radio drama, noir jazz (known to Hollywood as “crime jazz”), and noir comic books.

None of this means that film noir is a figment of the critical imagination. It’s safe to say that before 1941 noir was an emergent, little-known cultural category accurately describing certain French films and French popular literature; between roughly 1945 and 1950, when the French began writing about American film noir, it was a dominant category, its characteristic moods and themes affecting many different kinds of movies and other media; after 1958 it became a residual category, with films of the type appearing sometimes more, sometimes less frequently. But by 1970 the term “film noir” was known to filmmakers and cinephiles everywhere – critical writing about it proliferated, and it soon became available to the industry as something close to a genre or brand name.

Film noir has particularly strong hold on contemporary culture. No other type of popular cinema, with the possible exception of noir’s close cousins horror and dystopian science fiction, is more often taught in classrooms or written about by scholars. The western and the musical comedy, which were the most commercially successful and arguably the most distinctively American films produced in Hollywood’s classic studio era, have now almost disappeared from movie screens. We live in an intensely urban or suburban society that makes the western seem remote, and we’ve lost the studio infrastructure that made the best singing and dancing movies possible. Although noir has never been the biggest box office attraction in movies (except, perhaps, in the case of Christopher Nolan’s Batman trilogy of 2005–2012, which is influenced by the “Dark Night” graphic novels), it continues to manifest itself across all the media: a couple of twenty-first century examples are Sara Gran’s pitch-black novel *Dope* (2005) and Nicholas Winding Refn’s violent film *Drive* (2011). Where critical discourse is concerned, noir continues to be of interest because of its anti-utopian qualities (the best film noirs tend to be told from the point of view of criminals or deeply flawed characters); its disorienting narratives; its mesmerizing play of style; and its complex treatment of gender, sexuality, and race. You will find all these matters discussed in Andrew Spicer and Helen Hanson’s excellent anthology. This discussion, like the fascination of film noir itself, is likely to continue for years to come.

Introduction

The Problem of Film Noir

Andrew Spicer

The winter sun was going down on Surfers Paradise. It was my ninety-eighth day on the wagon and it didn't feel any better than the ninety-seventh. I missed my hip flask of Johnny Walker, my ex-wife Jean, my pet dog Somare and my exorbitant salary as Deputy Commissioner of Police. I wasn't sure any more I was cut out to be a writer of controversial exposés of police corruption. At the moment I couldn't lift the lid off a can of beans. I wanted to be twelve years old again and the best spin bowler in Southport High. I wanted a lot of things . . . So did my landlady, including the rent.

This is the voice-over narration of Michael Stacey as he shambles along the shoreline of a sun-drenched beach in a crumpled white suit en route to his shabby boarding house after having been sacked following a rigged inquiry. Asked by an old school friend and state senator to locate his missing daughter, Cathy, Stacey finds himself enmeshed in a right-wing plot led by his former army associates. In an apocalyptic finale in which their attempted coup is overthrown, Stacey realizes he has been used as a pawn by the state authorities to gain intelligence about the conspirators. In the final scene, Stacey bids Cathy farewell and comes to an elegiac acceptance of middle age.

The mode of narration, characterization, and plot mark *Goodbye Paradise* (Carl Schultz, 1983) as a film noir, as it was recognized and received at the time of its release in Australia. However, such an acknowledgment raises a number of significant issues that have important implications for the ways in which we need to understand film noir and this introduction will review some of those significances and how the contributors to this *Companion* have sought to address them. The voice of its world-weary “hero” Stacey (Ray Barrett) is, for instance, clearly indebted

to Raymond Chandler's private eye Philip Marlowe: a sharp, skeptical intelligence that is nevertheless underpinned by a strong sense of honor, a desire to protect the innocent and a sustaining belief, constantly undermined, that the world can be put right. But for the reference to cricket, it might have come from a 1940s' American film noir, and yet the film's screenwriters, Bob Ellis and Denny Lawrence, both admirers of Chandler, saw in his excoriating exposé of the venality and cupidity of Southern California a template for their own attack on the contemporary avaricious decadence of Surfer's Paradise on Queensland's Gold Coast in Australia where the film is set, that "strange, bright place that Australians went to instead of dying." The moral ambiguities, alienation, and existential absurdity that characterize film noir provided a recognizable framework within which Ellis and Lawrence could craft their story of greed, corruption, and duplicity. Extreme low angles, hand-held camerawork, and point-of-view shots are used to capture Stacey's disorientation and bewilderment as he stumbles through a series of unexpected encounters in a film that melds realistic and surrealistic elements to depict a situation at once familiar and absurd.

Although *Goodbye Paradise* works self-consciously with a concept, style, and mode of narration – film noir – derived from American popular culture, it does so in order to explore critically preoccupations and issues that are distinctively Australian, exhibiting what Ellis called its "cultural exactitude." *Goodbye Paradise* presented a deliberately different image of Australian masculinity, a new and more critical cultural image to Australians themselves and to international audiences. It can be understood within an Australian strain of hard-boiled crime thrillers that included *The Empty Beach* (Chris Thomson, 1985).¹ However, it was also clearly one of a number of noir-inflected Australian political thrillers made at this time – including *The Killing of Angel Street* (Donald Crombie, 1981) and *The Year of Living Dangerously* (Peter Weir, 1982) – which creatively reworked American models such as *The Parallax View* (1974), depicting a paranoid society riven by conspiracy theories, the fear of extremist groups, foreign invasion, and the covert actions of administrations addicted to secrecy and the suppression of freedom of thought and action.² Understood by its producers as something of a risk, *Goodbye Paradise* occupied what seems to be the characteristic cultural space of films noir, ambiguously positioned in the liminal region somewhere between commercial filmmaking and art house. That liminal positioning is part of film noir's enduring fascination – as popular culture that is entertaining *and* astringent, encoding a critical sensibility with a long historical and global reach.

An International Genre?

The presence of film noir in Australia should not surprise us. Jennifer Fay and Justus Nieland argue that film noir is the product of the uneven development of modernity as a global force, a critical category that casts doubt on the ability of

capitalism to deliver just and humane societies. The various national forms of film noir that they identify – in Europe, Latin America, and Asia (I would like to add Australasia) – are local instances of this transnational phenomenon that exhibits a complex process of adaptation and assimilation, attaining a particular coherence at certain moments.³ However, such national manifestations need to be carefully identified and delineated. In Chapter 29 of this *Companion*, BOMBAY NOIR, Lalitha Gopalan locates not an overarching Indian film noir but a “Bombay Noir” that derives specifically from the urban milieu of Bombay. These dark and destructive crime/gangster films express a dystopian vision of city life, a critical and fugitive form of filmmaking in which key films often disappeared from circulation, offering a starkly different picture from the glamour of Bollywood, the dominant image of Indian cinema internationally. Nikki J.Y. Lee and Julian Stringer (Chapter 28, FILM NOIR IN ASIA) adopt a similarly circumspect approach, distancing themselves from the specious unity of a commodified “Asian noir” in favor of the label “Film Noir in Asia,” which recognizes the existence of “historically specific characteristics of multiple regional film industries.” Lee and Stringer exemplify the productiveness of this term through a detailed investigation of post-war South Korean cinema, analyzing the characteristics of a loose group of crime films that show the incorporation of American and European thrillers into local practices, enabling indigenous filmmakers to probe the “dark hidden secrets of Korean social history.”

This emphasis on the internationalism of film noir is part of the revisionist impulse that drives this collection. It challenges a major strand of the construction of film noir that defined it as an exclusively American phenomenon. The title of Raymond Borde and Etienne Chaumeton’s founding text, *Panorama du film noir américain 1941–53* (1955) enshrines this conception, “a group of nationally identifiable films sharing certain common features (style, atmosphere, subject) sufficiently strong to mark them unequivocally and give them, with time, an inimitable quality.”⁴ In the most influential text in Anglo-American criticism, “Notes on *Film Noir*” (1972), Paul Schrader argues that film noir was the inevitable development of the American gangster film that had been delayed by the war, the product of a number of particular social and cultural factors that produced the definitive American noir cycle of 1941–1958, which constituted a “specific period of film history.”⁵ Alain Silver and Elizabeth Ward’s *Film Noir: An Encyclopedic Reference to the American Style* (1979), which defined the noir “canon,” had the same unequivocal emphasis: “With the Western, film noir shares the distinction of being an indigenous American form. . . . It is a self-contained reflection of American cultural preoccupations in film form. In short, it is a unique example of a wholly American film style.”⁶ In addition to Lee and Stringer and Gopalan, several contributors to the *Companion* take issue with this national exclusivity as a serious distortion of film noir, which, as James Naremore, whose *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (1998/2008) has been the most important and influential recent study, argues, operates as “something like an international genre.”⁷

What is Film Noir?

However, the dispute about film noir's geographical reach forms part of a much more protracted debate as to whether film noir is a genre with a tightly defined corpus of films; an artistic movement; a distinctive visual style; a prevailing mood or tone expressing alienation, paranoia, and moral ambivalence; a specific period of film history (1940–1958); or a much more diffuse phenomenon whose boundaries are highly permeable. Naremore argues that the term “belongs to the history of ideas as much as to the history of cinema . . . it has less to do with a group of artefacts than with a discourse – a loose, evolving system of arguments and readings that help to shape commercial strategies and aesthetic ideologies.” For Naremore, film noir is both “an important legacy and an idea we have projected on to the past.”⁸ His formulations are extremely helpful because they register the complexity and capaciousness of the term, and its double sense of film noir as a body of American films from a particular period – those black-and-white murder mysteries from the 1940s including *The Maltese Falcon* (John Huston, 1941), *Double Indemnity* (Billy Wilder, 1944), *Murder, My Sweet* (Edward Dmytryk, 1944), and *Laura* (Otto Preminger, 1944) that had such an impact on the French critics who gave them the label “film noir” – and a shaping discourse that constantly redefines the meaning of those films. It is a discourse that has significance within the academy, the history of ideas, film history, and within the industry itself in the production, marketing, and consumption of neo-noirs such as *Goodbye Paradise*, which work with a loose concept of film noir and have a relationship, however indirect, with this central body of films.

The chapters in Part I engage with these broad issues. Robert Porfirio, whose 1979 doctoral thesis was one of the first major Anglo-American studies, argues in Chapter 1 (THE STRANGE CASE OF FILM NOIR) that this core or “classic” period (1940–1959), is best regarded as a movement rather than a genre. Only with the arrival of neo-noir did this looser association of motifs and ideas solidify, self-consciously, into a genre. In common with other film movements, film noir possesses a recognizable body of films exhibiting shared stylistic characteristics, sufficiently capacious to allow distinct personal variations, that marked a radical aesthetic break – with, in this case, the classic Hollywood style. Porfirio argues that conceptualizing noir as a movement, though it raises problems, enables discussion to be grounded in the analysis of a real material context, examining how specific conditions in the American film industry were transformed by the impact of both external (mainly German) émigrés and internal, domestic émigrés (those involved with the Popular Front). Film noir thus became a way in which both groups could register their profound dissatisfaction with Hollywood studio practices and with current American values, which, in turn, can be related to a more widespread response to broader traumatic sociopolitical conditions: the Depression, World War II, and the Red Scare, though always strongly mediated by the film industry where effects are delayed or oblique.

Mark Bould's take on the vexed issue of how to categorize film noir (Chapter 2, GENRE, HYBRIDITY, HETEROGENEITY), is to problematize the whole notion of genre itself, situating the dispute about noir's status and boundaries within a more general

debate about the nature of genres and developments in genre theory. Bould argues that discussion needs to move beyond the currently fashionable notion of hybridity, in which noir becomes part of a series of proliferating hyphenates (e.g. tech-noir or horror-noir), to a reconceptualization of the fundamental characteristics of genres themselves, which, Bould argues, do not exist as homogeneous, bounded categories but are fluid, heterogeneous, and unstable, shifting over time as the discourses surrounding them mutate. Bould adduces the striking example of *The Lost Weekend* (Billy Wilder, 1945), which was initially seen as central to defining and delineating film noir but which has now dropped off the map or is seen as a marginal case. Film noir thus needs to be recognized as the product of the claims of various material agents (writers, producers, distributors, marketers, readers, fans, critics) whose unstable heterogeneity needs to be accepted, keeping the canon fresh.

Henrik Gustafsson (Chapter 3, A WET EMPTINESS) has a rather different orientation: “rather than defining what film noir is, establishing its center and origin, it might be more helpful to ask what it does, how it engages and affects us.” Taking his cue from Borde and Chaumeton, who argued that above all else film noir sought to disorientate viewers, Gustafsson argues that film noir constructs an unstable world in which subjective experience is foregrounded, undermining the rational space of classic Hollywood cinema. Drawing on American and European examples, including the Hungarian Bela Tarr’s *Kárhozat* (*Damnation*, 1987), Gustafsson explores noir’s preoccupation with fringe areas, wastelands, margins, and watery locations, the Surrealist’s *terrain vague*, in which alienated, isolated individuals attempt to navigate their imperiled ways through an indifferent universe. He suggests that this mode of attention to film noir should invite critics to “steer away from stable epistemological categories such as genre, iconography or period style toward the more elusive phenomenological notions of atmosphere, affect, and encounter.”

Redefining Film Noir: Cultural Contexts

Moving from the general to the particular, the chapters in Part II explore, and in the process start to redefine, the ways in which film noir has been understood in its “classic” phase, whose boundaries are 1940–1958. Wheeler Winston Dixon’s *PRECURSORS TO FILM NOIR* (Chapter 5) challenges this conventional periodization. He identifies a group of pre-Code crime films from the early 1930s, including *Night World* (Hobart Henley, 1932) and *Heroes for Sale* (William Wellman, 1933), which are arguably “more noirish than noir” as their themes and characterization were not so constrained by later ministrations of the Hays office. These films anticipate the themes, characterization, and plots of the “classic” period – although their visual style tends to be a flat, harsh, direct realism, rather than the expressionist-inflected aesthetic of the 1940s – but they were unknown to the French critics who first identified the category and have not established themselves as part of the noir canon. Of course, to label them precursors implies their subordination to the canonical films of the 1940s, but acknowledging their existence should prompt a reconsideration of

how film noir is understood customarily as an historical phenomenon that emerged as a response to war and post-war changes.

This line of inquiry could be extended productively in the other direction, questioning the supposed watershed of 1958 (*Touch of Evil*, Orson Welles) or 1959 (*Odds Against Tomorrow*, Robert Wise), by taking a fresh look again at the 1960s and such films as *Why Must I Die?* (Roy Del Ruth, 1960), *Blast of Silence* (Allen Baron, 1961), *Mickey One* (Arthur Penn, 1965) or *Seconds* (John Frankenheimer, 1966), which cannot quite be called neo-noirs because they lack the temporal and conceptual distance, the self-consciousness, that is integral to that term.⁹

In Chapter 6, *CRISSCROSSED*, Alastair Phillips investigates the history of noir's construction as both an idea promoted by French critics and a filmmaking practice. First used by French reviewers to describe the qualities of a number of poetic realist films produced in France during the 1930s, including *Le jour se lève* (*Daybreak*, Marcel Carné, 1939), film noir designated both a culturally specific form and a way of seeing that was unique to that mode. This double valency as both idea and practice subtends the ways in which American film noir was identified and perceived. In the process of analyzing its early history, Phillips challenges the conventional linear history that posits the expressionist style of the 1940s' films noir – with their high contrast chiaroscuro lighting, oddly angled compositions, and decentered, subjective narratives – as deriving from the influence of German expressionism mediated through the work of various European exiles and émigrés – including Robert Siodmak, Douglas Sirk and Billy Wilder – who imported this mode of filmmaking onto American soil. In contradistinction, Phillips traces the crisscrossing patterns of a two-way exchange between Europe and America, a complex story of cultural negotiation and assimilation. For Phillips, film noir was “an active site of experiential (and experimental) negotiation between the European migrants and the world they found themselves within,” adapting and reworking styles already established in American cinema but in distinctive, and influential ways. Film noir was thus an international form from its inception, but this ancestry was disavowed, as noted, by Borde and Chaumeton and subsequent commentators in favor of a construction that posited the uniqueness of the American cycle.

This European influence was also apparent in the horror films of the 1930s which have been seen as part of the cultural mulch from which film noir emerged. Peter Hutchings's analysis (Chapter 7, *FILM NOIR AND HORROR*) argues that this supposed influence rests on the problematic assumption that horror is a known, identifiable, and separate category whose coherence can be invoked in order to delineate the apparently more problematic category of film noir. Like Bould, Hutchings argues that genres are not fixed and coherent entities but loose, shifting clusters between which critics can forge connections. Hence noir's ability to absorb numerous films that have a clearly established generic identity and the instability of certain groups of films, such as those by Val Lewton or the female gothic films of the 1940s, which are thought either to be distinct from film noir or to be part of it. Hutchings argues that tracing these connections requires sensitivity to different institutional and historical contexts and that generic categorizations are constantly changing, terms mutate through critical reappraisal.

In Chapter 8, *BORDERINGS*, R. Barton Palmer also examines unstable classifications and porous boundaries through his consideration of another problematic group of films, the semi-documentaries, deeply influenced by wartime documentaries and neo-realism. They, like Lewton's horror films, are another borderline case having close affinities with, and also significant differences from, films noir, with film-makers regularly moving between the two modes. Palmer analyzes the strange marriage of psychologism and realism that they exhibit, considering in detail *He Walked by Night* (Alfred Werker, 1949), which was based on an actual case but which, in its treatment, was also strikingly expressionist at certain moments through its concentration on the deracinated, alienated sociopath (played by Richard Basehart), whose fate commands more interest than the actions of the forces of law and order that seek to quell him.

Film noir was recognized by Borde and Chaumeton as indebted to indigenous sources as well as European ones and they cited hard-boiled fiction as its central and "immediate" influence. In Chapter 9, *CRIME FICTION AND FILM NOIR*, William Marling argues that this customary focus on hard-boiled fiction needs to be widened to include the newspapermen (Jack Lait, W.R. Burnett, Ben Hecht, and John Bright) who were instrumental in creating a mass public for the representation of crime. The subsequent developments in crime fiction – detective fiction (e.g. Dashiell Hammett and Raymond Chandler), stories that concentrated on sex and violence (notably James M. Cain and Horace McCoy), or stories with a focus on irrationality and psychosis (Jim Thompson or Cornell Woolrich) – were each addressed to different reading publics which can now accommodate a taste for authors who are highly allusive and intertextual, including Elmore Leonard and James Ellroy. Marling's delineation of the history of crime fiction's changing relationship to film noir is complemented by Tom Ryall's account, *FILM NOIR, AMERICAN PAINTING AND PHOTOGRAPHY* (Chapter 10), which argues for the importance of considering a range of indigenous sources. Building on occasional comments in existing scholarship, Ryall analyzes the subject matter and visual style of painters – the Ashcan School, notably John Sloan and George Bellows, and also Edward Hopper and Reginald Marsh – and that of the news photographer Weegee, to provide a coherent and detailed analysis of the rich native cultural context from which noir emerged.

Redefining Film Noir: Social and Industrial Contexts

As a critical mode of filmmaking, film noir has often been associated with a left-wing agenda that made it distinctive within Hollywood.¹⁰ In Chapter 11, *THE POLITICS OF FILM NOIR*, Brian Neve revisits Thom Andersen's notion, first proposed in 1985, of "film gris," a group of thirteen crime melodramas written and directed by some of Porfirio's "internal émigrés" – Abraham Polonsky, Joseph Losey, Jules Dassin, Cy Endfield, and Robert Rossen – loosely associated with the Popular Front. Analyzing these films within their specific contexts of production, Neve reveals a creative use of a popular form, the crime film, capable of containing a corrosive critique of corporate capitalism and of appealing to a broad public. Their momentum was halted

by the anti-Communist purges and the blacklist, and their makers eventually forced into exile or marginalized. David Wilt's investigation of who wrote film noir (Chapter 12, *THE BLACK TYPEWRITER*) also acknowledges the importance of the social and political context, including the deleterious effects of the blacklist, but focuses on the varied assortment of screenwriters who were involved, a far wider range than that of the pulp fiction and hard-boiled authors conventionally thought to dominate the practice. Wilt has a particularly valuable section on women writers, whose significant presence was put under threat as the studios took to employing an increasingly male writing staff.

The concentration on film noir as a retrospective category "invented" by the French has obscured the ways in which it was a recognized mode of filmmaking in Hollywood going under various different labels: "psychological thrillers," "morbid dramas," "blood freezers," or "red meat" stories.¹¹ In Chapter 13, *FILM NOIR AND STUDIO PRODUCTION PRACTICES*, Geoff Mayer analyzes the industrial and institutional practices that shaped the development of film noir that he sees emerging as part of a gradual shift within the crime genre that was taking place in the 1930s. He contrasts the influential but short-lived A feature cycle (1944–1949) produced by the majors, with the more prolonged B feature sequence that continued throughout the 1950s as a low-cost form of filmmaking attractive to the Poverty Row studios and independent companies. Mayer's research reveals unexpected clusters, including a series of twelve films produced for Columbia in Canada by Kenneth Bishop between 1935 and 1937 that were intended mainly for the British market – including *Convicted* (Leon Barsha, 1938), the first Cornell Woolrich adaptation – thus further complicating noir's conventional periodization. John Berra's continuation, *FILM NOIR AND POST-STUDIO PRODUCTION PRACTICES*, Chapter 14, charts noir's survival as a niche marketing strategy embraced by a range of filmmakers. In a marketplace dominated by the blockbuster, film noir continued to exist both as an innovative, critical form of filmmaking – low-budget indies – and as a highly commodified one, slickly stylized and aimed at the cable or rental markets.

Films are, of course, always commodities that have to be marketed and sold. Mary Beth Haralovich's discussion, *SELLING NOIR* (Chapter 15), considers the ways in which film posters – an art form in themselves – and exhibitors' promotional tactics, including press books and product tie-ins, often constructed somewhat different images (notably of femininity and masculinity), associations, and orientations from the films themselves. Of particular interest is Haralovich's discussion of how the images of the films noir altered in different national contexts, indicating a very fruitful avenue for further analysis.

The Fabric of Film Noir: Style and Subjectivity

From the outset, film noir was defined in terms of its arresting visual style and concern with psychological problems, its "deep shadows, clutching hands, exploding revolvers, sadistic villains and heroines tormented with deeply rooted diseases of the

mind.”¹² Parts IV and V of the *Companion* explore these central issues, each chapter arguing that noir studies should move away from an essentializing perspective that seeks to define noir through the delineation of a set of core characteristics towards one that acknowledges difference, variation, and range.

Patrick Keating’s discussion of lighting and cinematography (Chapter 16, *OUT OF THE SHADOWS*), argues that film noir employed a diversity of techniques, operating as an important site for the intersection of multiple and contradictory practices rather than moving towards a unique style. Keating argues that film noir cinematographers extended the conventions of expressive lighting through the (often experimental) development of existing practices as opposed to making a radical break, paying careful attention to their appropriateness to the story and the mood that is being created. These developments were influenced by technological changes as well as being a response to the social and cultural contexts within which the films were produced. In her equivalent discussion of sound design, *THE AMBIENCE OF FILM NOIR* (Chapter 17), Helen Hanson’s account of this underdeveloped area of film studies uncovers a similar history of assimilation and experimentation. Her analysis of the ways in which sound and music contribute to the mood and ambience of film noir and neo-noir delineates an evolving professional repertoire that developed out of practices in horror films and the understanding of melodrama. As self-consciously – and as creatively – as cinematographers, sound designers and composers used sound, music, and diegetic songs to express this new interest in psychology and ambiguous motivations. David Butler’s account of film noir’s music (*IN A LONELY TONE*, Chapter 18) also emphasizes the range and diversity of music in film noir and the need to resist its conventional homogenization under a set of conventions, especially the use of a jazz score that is a post-hoc misapprehension created through its iconic use by neo-noir filmmakers. By placing noir music back into its specific cultural context, Butler argues that its innovative qualities were varied and that noir offered composers opportunities for different approaches.

The distinctive ambience of film noir is not created solely by patterns of light and sound. As Donna Peberdy argues in Chapter 19 (*ACTING AND PERFORMANCE IN FILM NOIR*) it is also created by styles of acting and performance, which have, curiously, received little attention in conventional accounts. The slender literature on performance tends to emphasize minimalism, especially in iconic male actors such as Humphrey Bogart or Robert Mitchum, but Peberdy finds a range of performance styles from the minimalist to the highly expressive, noting that the key noir actors straddle both modes – often in the same film, as shown by Joan Crawford in *Sudden Fear* (David Miller, 1952). Peberdy also detects a pronounced interest in the performance of dissimulation – a concern with false appearances and the obscuring or ambivalence of motivation that embodies a central concern with the nature of identity, located in social types such as the returning veteran, but also a pervasive instability and alienation – the “performance of angst” being the key characteristic.

This concern with the problematics of identity is addressed in Christophe Gelly’s overview, *FILM NOIR AND SUBJECTIVITY* (Chapter 20), which explores noir’s concern

with the nature of subjectivity, specifically with alienation and the loss of individual identity. Gelly suggests that the use of particular aesthetic devices – flashbacks and voice-overs, subjective camerawork, dream sequences, and the frequent blurring of reality and fantasy – that combine to create temporal and perspectival instabilities, are the ways through which films noir forged a new type of modernist subjectivity. Later neo-noirs, he argues, take for granted the intertextual, non-referential nature of characterization, flaunting their postmodern relativity and reflexivity.

Gelly's concern with the broader contours of subjectivity is a useful framework within which to locate noir's representation of gender, which has been a preoccupation within noir studies as far back as the 1978 collection *Women and Film Noir*. In Chapter 21, *WOMEN IN FILM NOIR*, Yvonne Tasker acknowledges the importance of film noir as a site for feminist film criticism and the significance of its configuration of femininity in American society extending well beyond the iconic figure of the femme fatale as expressive of ideological tensions within patriarchy over female sexuality. Gender issues remain central, Tasker argues, in neo-noirs that respond to social and cultural changes. In that early collection, Richard Dyer memorably observed that "film noir is characterised by a certain anxiety over the existence and definition of masculinity and normality," thereby identifying masculinity as an equally important focus for investigation and scrutiny.¹³ Gaylyn Studlar's analysis, "THE CORPSE ON REPRIEVE" (Chapter 22), argues that film noir provides a distinctive site in which conventional models of masculinity break down and in which males experience a disabling loss of power and control. She delineates a plethora of troubled males, particularly the maladjusted veteran, who suffer from a pervasive guilt that dislocates them from normative ideals of altruism, honesty, and social responsibility. Studlar argues that this was the result of the social trauma of World War II, shaped by psychiatric discourses, which identified an array of psychological problems the post-war male would experience, a crisis of identity whose extreme form is amnesia in which the loss of self is total.

Although it did not form part of the agenda for early studies of film noir, race and ethnicity is an equally important vector through which to discuss gender, subjectivity, and identity. Dan Flory's account, in Chapter 23, *ETHNICITY AND RACE IN AMERICAN FILM NOIR*, ranges over film noir's depictions of different kinds of whiteness (including Hispanic, Latino, WASP, and Italian-American identities) as well as its representations of Asian and African American characters. Flory finds that although noir is often ambivalent in its depiction of race and ethnicity, in contradistinction to American cinema generally, it often presents unusually positive and even progressive representations. The Blaxploitation cycle of the 1970s and later neo-noirs were, he argues, an "important vehicle for advancing the humanization and acceptance of racialized others, particularly African Americans."

Film noir has always been seen as having a particular relationship to depictions of the city, one of its defining features, no less in *Bombay Noir* than in its American manifestations. Murray Pomerance (Chapter 24, *THE CLIMB AND THE CHASE*) offers a fresh look at the figure of the city in film noir, which is depicted as threatening and entrapping, populated by strangers whose identities are often masked and whose

actions are the result of obscure motivations. In an extended analysis of three films from the “classic” period – including the extraordinary *City That Never Sleeps* (John H. Auer, 1953), in which the city of Chicago itself is given a voice – Pomerance explores the ambivalences of the noir city, threatening but also fascinating, whose one constant is instability and the sense of change, perceptions that helped fashion an urban sensibility that was expressive of modernity.

The Noir Mediascape

Naremore’s influential concept of a “noir mediascape” – that noir plots, themes, and style can be found in other media and artifacts – informs the chapters in Part VI.¹⁴ However, understanding this mediascape is not simply to look at the circulation of motifs and images but also at the ways in which noir films are part of a rich cultural context. In Chapter 25, *RADIO NOIR*, Jesse Schlotterbeck’s analysis demonstrates that critics’ neglect of radio seriously distorts an understanding of the important two-way cross-fertilization of the forms from 1942 onwards, frequently using the same sources, characters, and actors, and showing an equally high investment in crime and murder mysteries. However, Schlotterbeck is keen to preserve a sense of the differences between the two media, emphasizing radio’s particular qualities as an art form in its own right, even if its cultural status is considered to be lower. This understanding of the specificity of cultural forms informs Steven Sanders’s analysis in *TELEVISION NOIR* (Chapter 26), of a form whose “classic” period came later: the 1950s through to the end of the 1960s. Emphasizing the key difference of the series, in which narrative resolutions are postponed thus undermining the fatalism often associated with films noir, Sanders maps this under-researched area as it ebbed and flowed in response to changing cultural, technological, and industrial conditions. He concludes with an analysis of its present flowering in such acclaimed series as *The Sopranos* (1999–2007), *Dexter* (2006–) and the various incarnations of *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*.

James Lyons’s account of noir comics (Chapter 27, “IT RHYMES WITH LUST”) offers another rich history of an analogous but distinct (and thoroughly international) form that operates both as a genre (crime noir) and as an approach to visual storytelling, one that has a commercial viability and versatility in its own right but which, again, has been given scant critical attention. Lyons sees its pioneers such as Will Eisner – who used chiaroscuro lighting, unconventional angles, and subjective perspective as well as canted panel frames that were unique to comics to express an unstable and threatening world – as demonstrating the fusion of modernism with blood melodrama that has been seen as the hallmark of film noir itself.¹⁵ Lyons argues that comics and graphic novels, now a global publishing phenomenon, have “emerged as one of the most prolific, influential, and inventive sources for the creation of noir texts over recent decades,” most notably the adaptation of Frank Miller’s *Sin City* (2005) with its hyperbolic exaggeration of the central tropes of classic noir.

The Success of Film Noir

This introduction has posited film noir as a murder mystery, a problem to be investigated and solved. We could look at this rather differently, as a success story. From its origins within cinematic discourses, film noir has become inscribed gradually in the lexicon of popular culture, “as much part of film journalism as bio-pic, sci-fi and docudrama.”¹⁶ If success is measured in terms of volume, then the plethora of academic and populist studies, readers, guidebooks, encyclopedias, and compendia, are evidence of a thriving minor industry that shows no signs of abating. The successful cinematic re-release of classic titles such as *Gilda* (Charles Vidor, 1946) witness both noir’s ability to speak to contemporary audiences and form part of a shared nostalgia for a vanished era. The proliferation of titles on DVD shows the widespread pleasures of viewing film noir and also, as many commentators have observed, demonstrates that film noir is eminently a collector’s cinema with new titles constantly being “discovered” to add to the continual expansion of its corpus.

In part, as Corey Creekmur argues in *CINEPHILIA AND FILM NOIR* (Chapter 4), this is because film noir is a peculiarly intense form of cinephilia, a special object of the cinephile’s passion because it is one that we have learned to love historically, viewed, from the first, as a transgressive practice in which aspects of American popular culture could be reclaimed as art – complex, intelligent, and critical of dominant values; an illicit love, which made it all the sweeter. Moreover, film noir’s initial identification in the late 1940s took place at the time of the emergence of cinephilia as a distinct response to film, marking a moment of critical engagement with cinema. Thus film studies itself has, in part, grown up with and through film noir, which has become integral to the discipline as it has evolved and matured since the 1950s. As Creekmur argues, the invention of film noir has created a conceptual framework and an evolving discourse that can reveal and also generate, “affiliations, patterns, and meanings that were difficult if not impossible to recognize before the deployment of the category itself.”

Thus to the question can film studies do without film noir? The answer given by this *Companion* is an unequivocal no. In the face of Marc Vernet’s skepticism – that film noir is a factitious invention of film criticism sustaining itself by “complacent repetition,” “an affair of heirs disinclined to look too closely at their inheritance,”¹⁷ – the contributors have subjected film noir to critical scrutiny, reflecting, as Peter Hutchings observes, on “the definitions that are being deployed, on their history and the reasons for using them now.” Each has explored noir’s characteristics, meanings, boundaries, and preoccupations with fresh eyes, often consolidating earlier work but also extending and deepening it, and opening out new terrain. This collection is, we hope, an informed contribution to the ongoing debate about this fascinating subject in which ossified taxonomies are being replaced by detailed cultural histories and, thus, part of an inexhaustible project that is central to the mutating nature of film studies itself.

Notes

- 1 Geoff Mayer, "A Hard-Boiled World: *Goodbye Paradise* and *The Empty Beach*," *Literature Film Quarterly* 21 (2) (1993): 112–114.
- 2 See Ray Pratt, *Projecting Paranoia: Conspiratorial Visions in American Film* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kentucky, 2001).
- 3 Jennifer Fay and Justus Nieland, *Film Noir: Hard-Boiled Modernity and the Cultures of Globalization* (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 69–70, 131. In chapter 4, pp. 236–262, the authors outline their "fragments of one international noir history."
- 4 Raymonde Borde and Etienne Chaumeton, *Panorama du film noir américain 1941–53*, trans. Paul Hammond (San Francisco: City Light Books, 2002), p. 1.
- 5 Paul Schrader, "Notes on *Film Noir*," *Film Comment* 8 (1) (1972); rptd in Alain Silver and James Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1996), pp. 53–63, at pp. 53–54.
- 6 Alain Silver and Elizabeth Ward (eds), *Film Noir: An Encyclopedic Reference to the American Style* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 1979), p. 1.
- 7 James Naremore, *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2nd edn, 2008) p. 5. See also Andrew Spicer, "Introduction," in Spicer (ed.), *European Film Noir* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 4–7, 16–17.
- 8 Naremore, *More than Night*, pp. 11, 39.
- 9 For a wide-ranging discussion of some possible noirs from this period, both American and British, see Wheeler Winston Dixon, *Film Noir and the Cinema of Paranoia* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), ch. 4, pp. 91–128.
- 10 For two interesting recent accounts of this aspect of film noir see Dennis Broe, *Film Noir, American Workers, and Postwar Hollywood* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009) and Jonathan Auerbach, *Dark Borders: Film Noir and American Citizenship* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).
- 11 See Sheri Chinen Biesen, *Blackout: World War II and the Origins of Film Noir* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).
- 12 D. Marsham, *Life*, August 25, 1947, qtd in Thomas Schatz, *Hollywood Genres: Formulas, Filmmaking, and the Studio System* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981), p. 111.
- 13 Richard Dyer, "Resistance through Charisma: Rita Heywood and *Gilda*," in E. Ann Kaplan (ed.), *Women in Film Noir* (London: BFI Publishing, rev. edn, 1998), p. 115.
- 14 Naremore, *More than Night*, pp. 254–277.
- 15 Naremore, *More than Night*, pp. 40–95.
- 16 Rick Altman, *Film/Genre* (London: BFI Publishing, 1999), p. 61.
- 17 Marc Vernet, "Film Noir on the Edge of Doom," in Joan Copjec (ed.), *Shades of Noir* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 2 *et seq.*

Part I

Conceptualizing Film Noir

The Strange Case of Film Noir

Robert Porfirio

When I first began teaching a college course in film noir and researching it for my doctoral dissertation in the early seventies there was little on the subject in English and only one book-length study, Borde and Chaumeton's yet-to-be translated monograph. Now, over thirty years later, there are numerous courses on the subject and a voluminous amount of written material in English, French, and many other languages. While I find the acclaim presently given film noir at both academic and popular levels a bit surprising, what is even more surprising to me is that film noir is still a contestable topic. Back then I would have thought that by now all ontological and epistemological controversies would be settled, yet the debate rages on, among scholars and fans alike. It is indeed tempting to simply give up the chase and agree with Peter Wollen who quipped that film noir is whatever Borde and Chaumeton say it is. But if there is no consensus it is certainly not due to any lack of effort on the part of Alain Silver, who, from the publication of the groundbreaking first edition of *Film Noir: An Encyclopedic Reference to the American Style* in 1979 through subsequent editions and revisions and a series of *Film Noir Readers*, has attempted, at the very least, to provide us with a sense of film noir if not a precise definition thereof.¹ And while that sense seems to favor film noir as a film movement, no extended case for such has found its way to publication, though it has been touched upon by others, myself included.²

In arguing for such a conception I am, understandably, restricting our attention to what of late has been termed the "classic period" of American film noir as opposed to that group of films now called neo-noir – a term coined by Todd Erickson who distinguishes them from classic film noir primarily by virtue of their use of new cinematic techniques and a self-consciousness generated by the awareness of contemporary filmmakers that they are working within an established "noir" convention.

Erickson (correctly in my estimation) makes the case that because of this self-consciousness classic film noir has generated an offspring, neo-noir, which today takes on all the auspices of a genre.³ How could it be otherwise? For once the defining “marks” of a particular cultural practice are recognized and deemed marketable there is the inevitable rush to popularize and peddle as practice becomes product, and art movements are certainly no exception (surrealism being a prime example). Indeed, it was in the 1930s that the major commercial film genres (western, romance, comedy, gangster, horror, detective/mystery, swashbuckler, etc.) were established as “Hollywood” became a global system and sought to capture and hold domestic and international markets alike through the use of formulaic practices. If anything, classic film noir represents an attempt to break with those formulaic practices as Borde and Chaumeton and other French cinéastes pointed out so early on. Yet by virtue of its own transgressive nature the noir cycle was doomed. For as the transgressive aspects of film noir became conventionalized, as the beleaguered Production Code finally gave way to the rating system, and as newer production techniques replaced the old, classic film noir disappeared until its rebirth as neo-noir in the late 1960s.⁴ Ironically, for a term that was virtually unknown in America during the classic period even among the filmmakers themselves (Robert Aldrich being the exception), in the postmodern era film noir is the driving force behind what James Naremore has termed the “noir mediascape,”⁵ just as the terms “noir” and “noired” have become popularized.

The problems inherent in trying to pin down film noir as a specific genre or style of filmmaking have been discussed at some length by Alain Silver and other critics over the years, and there is no need here to cover that ground again.⁶ Since film historians of a sociological persuasion have given us the notion of film movements – a class of phenomena typically more restricted to a given social context and temporal period – why should we not investigate film noir along those lines, especially if it is less problematic than other approaches? Film movements, of course, bear some resemblance to the more universalized aesthetic notion of art movements. Film sociologists, however, point out that film movements tend to be more tied to a specific time and culture and so they prefer to conceive of them in terms of Anthony F.C. Wallace’s notion of “revitalization movements” (“a deliberate and self-conscious attempt to provide a more satisfying culture”).⁷ So far four such phenomena have been identified: German expressionism, Soviet “expressive realism,” Italian neo-realism, and the French new wave.⁸ As a film movement, then, film noir can be conceived along the lines of a pervasive effect (rather than a restrictive genre) and located within a specific sociocultural context and temporal scheme, with the traditional stages of ascent (1940–1945), peak (1946–1950), and slow decline (1951–1960).

While there are problems inherent in treating film noir as a film movement (not the least of which is that the term itself was a post facto classification), they can, I believe, be overcome, and the advantages of such a conceptual model far outweigh the disadvantages. For one thing it allows us to isolate classic film noir as a distinct body or cluster of films where certain formal standards can be brought to bear (e.g.

closed composition, disjunctive editing, etc.), much like genre criticism. At the same time, the notion of a film movement guarantees that those formal changes associated with it be grounded in a real, material context. This grounding in turn opens us up to the subtle interplay between the micro-social level ("Hollywood" as product, praxis, and subculture) and the macro-social context, whose complex interaction with film culture can then be elaborated upon. We can then engage the "world" of film noir in an ongoing dialectic with its historical matrix, explicating every sort of cultural code (e.g. themes, iconography, or even larger patterns of meaning) to explore the complex process of mediation between a film culture and the material world.⁹

If we rethink film noir in terms of a film movement we may also be able to avoid some of the controversies that have haunted critical film theory for the last thirty or so years (e.g. auteurist vs. structuralist). For although most approaches to film noir tend to suppress stylistic differences to demonstrate the manner in which a group of films are similar, those differences which distinguish a Hitchcock-directed film noir from, say, a Lang-directed one can be handled quite nicely as personal idiolect, while those qualities which draw our attention to a rather heterogeneous group of films as noir (mood, disjunctive editing, chiaroscuro visuals, etc.) can then be identified as movement-idiolect, a term typically associated with art movements. Traditionally, art movements come into being when the quite restrictive idiolect of the individual creator (e.g. the language of *The Sound and the Fury*) is elaborated through the body of works of a given individual (as corpus-idiolect, e.g. all of Faulkner's fiction) and further elaborated through a specific art movement. We are speaking here of the process through which innovation becomes aesthetic convention, the unconscious becomes coded and individual practice becomes social praxis.¹⁰ But as so many postmodern critics are quick to point out, no author is in complete control of his text since aesthetic texts are built from larger aesthetic "worlds" and from the materials of the real world as well. Fortunately, these larger aesthetic worlds, often identified as intertext or context, have been given a good deal of recent critical attention.¹¹ And in so far as an aesthetic movement becomes distinguished by a specific aesthetic world, idiolect becomes identified with sociolect (the language of a social group, class, or subculture), a key nexus between a restrictive aesthetic world and the more accessible social one. If anything, the proliferation of the film noir world into virtually every media and its internationalization since the late 1990s is indicative of the manner in which a movement-idiolect becomes the sociolect of a distinct subculture.¹² It is also a good example of how the cutting edge of an art movement is quickly blunted as its devices are conventionalized and disseminated, or, as Fredric Jameson would have it, culture becomes commodified.¹³

It would seem that if we are to consider the noir cycle in terms of Wallace's revitalization movements we run into trouble right away in attempting to demonstrate that it was "deliberate and self-conscious." Less problematic is the second half of the equation – "the attempt to provide a more satisfying culture." Virtually every filmmaker I interviewed back in the 1970s (whether writer, director, photographer, or composer) was by degrees chafed by the studio system of the 1930s, at times rankled

by the ways it repressed personal creativity, and rather consistently anxious to push the boundaries – the Production Code being a particular *bête noire* among writers and directors.¹⁴ It seems to me that the degree to which these films noir involve audiences of all ages today, or seem more modern than their predecessors, or even play into our notions of postmodernism, is a good measure of the success of their creators. Yet there are critics who still decry the fact that those involved in the production of these films noir lacked a sense of identification with some larger phenomenon – but such lack of identification is often the case with art movements, the early impressionists being a prime example. More telling perhaps are those theorists who subsume film noir into such larger cultural movements as modernism or postmodernism or view it as little more than an American extension of French poetic realism¹⁵ or German expressionism – a confusion, it seems to me, of text with context or intertext.

More problematic is the first half of the equation since “deliberate” and “self-conscious” are attributes we normally associate with the creators of the neo-noir films of today. But if we are the least bit supple in applying these terms to the filmmakers of the classic period I believe we will find a degree of cohesiveness between the two groups of newcomers to the Hollywood system throughout the 1930s and 1940s whose talents were a prerequisite to the growth of film noir. The first group, the Germanic émigrés, came to Hollywood from Europe during this period. And while there was a degree of rivalry among them, there was also a good deal of camaraderie based on common experiences (most were of Jewish background, many fled to America through France via a virtual “underground railroad” initiated by Robert Siodmak in the 1930s). While not all were members of an American Popular Front, they understandably shared an antipathy towards fascism and likely a sensibility that was quite sensitive to the creation of the dangerous and threatening world of film noir. Unlike their fellow émigrés of the Frankfurt School, they were not hostile towards American popular culture, and most were quite responsive to it. Yet for all of their involvement in American culture and social customs they were still outsiders harboring a sense of detachment matched by that found in the hard-boiled “school” of fiction and the stance of many of its protagonists. Perhaps the Germanic predisposition toward Lorelei figures matches as well the misogynistic bias of much tough guy literature.

In addition to these Europeans there was also a group of incipient filmmakers – mostly writers but directors and actors as well – who migrated from the east coast, whom I have termed the “domestic émigrés,”¹⁶ and who were, for the most part, variously involved in the American Popular Front. The majority came to Hollywood in the late 1930s and early 1940s and most were “lefties” (to use a term popularized by Clifford Odets), veterans of one form or another of the radical theater that flourished on the east coast in the 1930s. There are too many to list here but a representative sampling would indicate their importance to film noir: Jules Dassin, Cy Endfield, John Garfield, Elia Kazan, Joseph Losey, Ben Maddow, Albert Maltz, John Paxton, Abraham Polonsky, Nicholas Ray, Robert Rossen, and Orson Welles. Together with writers such as Daniel Mainwaring, A.I. Bezzerides, and Dalton Trumbo, and emerging talents like Edward Dmytryk and Adrian Scott, the more

politically inclined among them developed an authentic esprit de corps, which of course was shattered with the advent of the Red Scare and the Hollywood blacklist.¹⁷ On the micro-social level, the combined effects of the Red Scare, the consent decree (divorcing the studios from their ownership of theaters in 1948), the advent of television, changes in the disposition of film audiences, and, finally, the rise of independent productions changed Hollywood forever. Yet these eastern “mavericks” helped nudge film noir in the direction of the social commentary/exposé with entries such as *Crossfire* (1947), *The Prowler* (1951), and *Underworld Story* (1950). Even though their ranks were broken and decimated by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) and the blacklist, the ones who remained to work in Hollywood moved it in the direction of more topical genres that would appeal to new generation of filmgoers with films such as *The Wild One* (1954), *On the Waterfront* (1954), and *Rebel Without a Cause* (1955). Finally, it was noir icons Burt Lancaster and Kirk Douglas who led the fight to wrest control of the production of Hollywood films from the major studios with their own independent production companies (Hecht-Lancaster and Bryna respectively).

If Hollywood’s political “awakening” in the late 1930s made it fashionable for members of the colony to “go left” as one social analyst asserts,¹⁸ it is also true that the domestic émigrés, especially the more radical among them, devoted much of their energy to advancing the cause of trade unionism and forging a Popular Front within the film industry. They were particularly influential in securing industry recognition of the Screen Writers Guild as a bargaining agent in 1940 and the Marxist domination of this organization continued throughout much of the decade. Yet Hollywood’s Popular Front was always a heterogeneous political amalgam, including Republicans and New Deal Democrats as well as radicals, but it was its anti-fascist spirit that provided a key nexus between the Germanic and domestic émigrés. However, it is not at all surprising that the Europeans trod more quietly than their American counterparts since their status as immigrants put them in a more precarious position. Very few were inclined to beat a hasty retreat to their native lands, as Bertolt Brecht and Hanns Eisler were forced to do, though the fact that even a filmmaker with the prodigious reputation of a Fritz Lang was touched by the blacklist was sufficient cause for discretion on their part.¹⁹ And while the films noir with which they were involved are often cited as critical of American social mores most of the Germanic émigrés had a peculiar fondness for American culture despite their critical eyes²⁰ – a provocative synthesis that left them perfectly attuned to that hard-boiled tradition which provided the noir cycle with much of its content. Today we recognize that none of those who were then newcomers to Hollywood were revolutionaries. A greater irony lies in the fact that of all the émigrés, especially those whose careers touched upon the radical theater, the one who was arguably the least radical was the one most skilled at synthesizing a variety of avant-garde aesthetics, and it was Orson Welles who proved to be the greatest influence on the Hollywood cinema of the 1940s. Having established the degree to which kinship promotes a sense of self-consciousness, we can now begin to define film noir in terms of the three broad criteria which determine a film movement.

A “Radical Aesthetic Break”

Given the repressive structure of the Hollywood film industry in the 1930s, one would not expect as radical an aesthetic break as might be found in other art movements. Yet there was a definite break with the traditional studio film of the 1930s (Hollywood’s version of the classic narrative text) which valorized the smooth unfolding of the story (or in today’s critical parlance, favored story over discourse) and used every device at its disposal to place the spectator in a position of coherence: continuity cutting (i.e. *découpage classique*); optical effects such as wipes and dissolves; balanced lighting; the star system; shallow focus, etc.²¹ When “The End” title appeared audiences expected and typically got closure, if not always a happy ending. So story was king and producers such as Irving Thalberg, David O. Selznick, and Darryl F. Zanuck based their reputation (and their power) on their ability to ferret out a compelling story, thereby making the producer the most important cog in the creation of the studio film. Occasionally a writer like Preston Sturges began to experiment with this structure (e.g. *The Power and The Glory* (1933)), and when Sturges began to direct his own films in 1940 he paved the way for the emergence of other writer-directors, who in turn began to displace the producer in importance. Among the most important of these as far as the noir cycle is concerned were John Huston, Billy Wilder, and especially Orson Welles. Welles was a major contributor to the film noir but it is his role in the production of *Citizen Kane* that is significant here. A unique film standing outside the noir cycle, *Citizen Kane* remains the key proto-noir in so far as it signaled a break with the classic studio film which opened the way for the film noir. In the interests of brevity I will simply list here those aspects of *Citizen Kane* which constitute an important part of the film noir’s distinctive idiolect:

- 1 Depth staging
- 2 The sequence shot
- 3 Subjective camera positions to suggest psychological states
- 4 Anti-traditional *mise-en-scène*
- 5 Expressive montage instead of *découpage classique*
- 6 A baroque visual style characterized by mannered lighting and photography
- 7 Formative use of sound: for example, overlapping dialogue, aural bridges, modulations in the amplification of sound effects
- 8 The displacement of “wall-to-wall” romantic scores with expressive and interpretative music
- 9 The use of documentary conventions within the structure of a narrative film
- 10 A convoluted temporal structure involving the use of first person voice-over narration
- 11 Psychological or Freudian overtones
- 12 Use of an investigator who attempts to order an inherently incoherent and ambiguous world
- 13 A morally ambiguous protagonist.

Since Orson Welles was allowed to set up his own “Mercury Productions” unit at RKO (one of the most crises-ridden of the eight major studios in this period) he had more latitude than virtually any other filmmaker within the studio system – a latitude not seen again until the rise of independent productions in the 1950s. The result was *Citizen Kane*, which at its release tested the expectations of its audiences and which, more importantly for us, provided a virtual palimpsest of film noir’s intertext. From his background in radical theater, Welles brought with him a taste for experimentation, a penchant for dealing with social issues, and a troupe of actors new to Hollywood. From radio he brought to Hollywood Bernard Herrmann, who signaled the break with the romantic scores of the past; a penchant for innovative and formative uses of sound including the authoritative connotation of a stentorian narrator; and the use of actors to restage actual events.²² Finally, despite his insistence that he learned most about the cinema from viewing the films of John Ford, Welles was a great admirer of F.W. Murnau and spent a good deal of time viewing the German classics, especially those *kammerspiele*films associated with the second phase of German expressionist film.²³

Indeed it was this second (or “compromised”) phase of German expressionism that was truly the forerunner of film noir, not the classic earlier phase whose extreme visuals and acting styles found a more conducive vehicle in the horror film (*Son of Frankenstein* (1939) is the exemplar here). It was during this second stage that the fluid visual style of Fritz Wagner and Karl Freund displaced the static, fixed camera of pure expressionism, that the expressive potential of editing was tapped by directors like Pabst and Murnau, that more subtle shades of lighting made possible the greater range of *stimmung* associated with the *kammerspiele*film, that the popular “thriller” was given respectability by Fritz Lang, and that the artificial quality of studio sets began to give way to the sociological interest of the so-called street films. *Stimmung* (or mood, or “inner vibrations” if you will) was put to the service of “psychological realism” in the *kammerspiele*film, and this in turn has its analog in the noir cycle where virtually every entry has a psychological dimension and where a variety of devices (visual and aural) were put to use to portray “inner states.”²⁴

If we look at but three of the major contributors to film noir, the influence of the *kammerspiele*films becomes readily apparent. Orson Welles we have already mentioned. A less obvious figure, Alfred Hitchcock, has confessed his familiarity with the German films of Murnau and Lang and stated that the first picture he would claim as stylistically his own is *The Lodger* (1927), a film with strong roots in the “Germanic” tradition. His first entries in the noir series, *Suspicion* (1941, whose imposed “happy ending” unfortunately blunted Francis Iles’s original novel, *Before the Fact*, on which it was based), and *Shadow of a Doubt* (1943) reverberate with elements of the *kammerspiele*film. The third key figure is Fritz Lang, himself a major force in the development of this second phase of German expressionism. Of his many entries in the noir cycle, those in which he was most invested (often as one of the producers) display the greatest kinship to that earlier tradition: *Woman in the Window* (1944), *Scarlet Street* (1945), *Secret Beyond the Door* (1948), and *House by the River* (1950). Yet these are only three among scores of other Europeans with a

background in this tradition who enriched the Hollywood film industry generally while contributing to that aesthetic break which defines the film noir.²⁵ At this point, then, let us turn our attention to the second of the three determinants of a film movement.

A Distinct Cluster of Films

On first consideration this criterion would seem less problematic to demonstrate than some of our earlier assertions since we are here only dealing with classic film noir. Today most film theorists seem relatively comfortable placing the cycle within the parameters 1940 and 1960. In more theoretical terms, film noir was a movement which bridged the classic text (the story-bound studio film of the 1930s) with the postmodern one (including neo-noirs to the present). Yet for whatever consensus there is as to the noir period, the question “What constitutes a film noir?” remains; and here controversy perennially rears its ugly head. The best English-language equivalent in American journals of that era would probably be the term “psychological crime film,” and this is accurate enough since there is certainly a psychological dimension (i.e. as opposed to the environmental determinism of the crime and social problem films of the 1930s) and some sort of crime (real, imagined, or dreamt) in every film noir I have seen. It is also comprehensive – indeed so comprehensive and all-inclusive that it loses its validity as a critical criterion. This is why I believe some formal standards must be brought to bear so that film noir can be measured against those films which preceded it and those which succeeded it – with the added proviso that we do not become too doctrinaire in imposing a rigid visual style (or styles) or narrative structure(s) in assessing each candidate’s inclusion. It also seems to me that those standards (visual, aural, or narrative) can only be understood in contradistinction to the classic studio film, that is, in so far as they transgressed the standards (including the Production Code) that Hollywood established in the 1930s as requisite to a good story-film.

The noir visual style is nothing less than a shrewd combination of techniques which traditional film theory has polarized as either *expressionistic* (unusual camera angles, formative editing, mannered lighting, etc.) or *realistic* (the sequence shot, depth staging, location photography, etc.). Its narrative structure is not a set of typologies but something akin to the postmodern text by virtue of the way it disrupts a cohesive story via chronological and/or (primarily) causal disorders. This is what differentiates a noir western dealing with a family “feud,” like *Pursued* (Raoul Walsh, 1947), from a contemporaneous black-and-white western also dealing with a feud, like *My Darling Clementine*, (John Ford, 1946). It is also why early attempts to “fit” hard-boiled fiction into studio styles and formulae failed until the advent of the noir cycle with entries such as *The Maltese Falcon* (John Huston, 1941), *The Glass Key* (Stuart Heisler, 1942), and *Murder, My Sweet* (Edward Dmytryk, 1944).

While it is nicely symmetrical to place the noir cycle within the parameters of 1940 and 1960, its initiating date is not simply arbitrary. For it was in 1940 that

Stranger on the Third Floor, arguably the first true film noir, was released. More importantly, the film was produced at RKO, the studio where *Citizen Kane* was to be filmed shortly after and whose films noir, most critics in this field agree, were the most definitive of the noir style. *Stranger on the Third Floor* combined the talents of photographer Nicholas Musuraca, composer Roy Webb and art director Albert D'Agostino who formed the "core" of the RKO noir style. Perhaps most relevant to this style was D'Agostino who had already been exposed to the "Germanic" style when working at Universal, where the art department included Charles Hall and Herman Rosse – key figures in the development of the definitive look of the Universal horror film, beginning with *Frankenstein* (1931). Unlike earlier noir pretenders, *Stranger on the Third Floor* is sufficiently unique in the way it combines elements from a variety of classic film genres – gangster/crime, detective, horror, even social problem – to usher in the noir era, though it is a far cry from *Citizen Kane* in terms of quality and originality. While Frank Partos's story betrays its pulp sources in its illogic and incongruities, it is indebted to them as well in its depiction of an oppressive, fear-ridden world, one that we would come to associate with the fiction of Woolrich. And if we look back further, it is also beholden to the *kammerspielefilm*, as is quite evident in the expressionistic bias of Latvian-born Boris Ingster's direction (one contemporary critic noted that he was better at directing shadows than actors) and Peter Lorre's performance as the pathetic, crazed killer – reminiscent of his role in *M* (1931).

It is probably no mere coincidence that film noir found its beginnings and its most definitive style at RKO for of all the major studios RKO was the most beset with the type of "crises mentality" that opens the door for innovation, due in no small part to the rather rapid shifts in ownership (Rockefeller/Sarnoff – Floyd Odlum – Howard Hughes – General Tire) and production chiefs (George Schaefer – Charles Koerner – Dore Schary – William Dozier) that characterized it from the late 1930s till its virtual demise in 1957. If George Schaefer's emphasis on quality allowed for the production of *Citizen Kane* then Charles Koerner's insistence on mass appeal pointed in the direction of the B film where Val Lewton's "horror" unit and the Scott/Dmytryk "thriller" units flourished. Though limited by budget and genre constraints, Lewton's unit, employing several of the veterans of the old Mercury unit, was cohesive enough to imbue each film with a consistent "atmosphere," and indeed some of its entries come closer to film noir than to the horror genre (especially *The Seventh Victim* and *The Leopard Man* (both 1943)). Two of Lewton's directorial protégés, Robert Wise and Jacques Tourneur, went on to make important contributions to the noir cycle as well. Edward Dmytryk, Adrian Scott, and their leftist associates at RKO were, if not the most numerous contingent of Marxists in 1940s' Hollywood, certainly the most visible. Working with screenwriter John Paxton, Dmytryk and Scott released a version of Chandler's *Farewell, My Lovely* (*Murder, My Sweet*, 1943) that turned Hollywood in the direction of the hard-boiled private eye more assuredly than Huston's earlier version of *The Maltese Falcon*, while their version of Richard Brooks's *The Brice Foxhole* (*Crossfire*, 1947) put the social problem film well within the boundaries of film noir.²⁶ It would seem that the lower

budget B film allowed filmmakers greater latitude in terms of filmic techniques as well as narrative content.²⁷

With the acquisition of RKO by Howard Hughes in 1948 and HUAC's renewed interest in Hollywood, political winds at the studio turned severely to the Right and those films with a "liberal" social message began to disappear. Dore Schary managed to exit gracefully but many others there were caught in the political crossfire. While the Red Scare forced several key producers, directors, and writers to exit RKO, the studio maintained a number of essential personnel, especially at the technical level, so that the RKO noir series continued through the mid-1950s, aided by the arrival there of directors such as Nicholas Ray and Fritz Lang. Undercapitalized, RKO was unable to compete with the so-called "Big-Five" majors (in terms of implementing new technology such as wide screen, color, and bigger budgets), and so it fell victim to changing audience tastes and the competition of television in the 1950s (in many respects television dramas replaced the B film). In a sense, its demise paralleled that of the noir cycle and did so for some of the same reasons.

Though released through United Artists (RKO was no longer functioning as a production company), *Odds Against Tomorrow* (1959) has much of the style and texture of a RKO noir and not surprisingly since it was produced and directed by Robert Wise and has Robert Ryan in a lead role. Forward-looking though it is in its use of a cool jazz score and 1.85:1 aperture, it looks backward as well, its brilliant black-and-white photography enhancing its interiors with classic noir style (venetian blinds, shadows, lowered ceilings, etc.) and its use of deep focus on exteriors, contrasting daytime and nighttime locales. Add a narrative structure built around a heist gone wrong which intercuts the lives of its two principals (Robert Ryan and Harry Belafonte) and which plays upon the psychological and sociological implications of their tenuous relationship before they die atop a flaming oil storage tank and you have all the ingredients of a classic film noir. By my reckoning *Odds Against Tomorrow* was one of the last entries in the cycle and a fitting epitaph.

Sociocultural Trauma

This third and final criterion of film movements appears to be the most obvious. Film historians are quick to point out that because the Depression, World War II, and the Red Scare paralleled the rise and fall of film noir in chronological order they must have had a good deal to do with its ascent and descent. Yet one must be wary of such a facile explanation. For one thing, the majority of the Depression took place in the 1930s, the decade in which "Hollywood" became a global system, the major commercial genres were established, and Americans flocked to the picture palaces as a means of escape from the harsh realities of life. As discussed, the 1930s was the era during which the classic studio film reigned supreme, and if we are correct in defining the film noir in opposition to that classic text then the Depression did little to stimulate the growth of the noir cycle. But as students of American culture know, the Depression provided fertile ground for the growth of

popular culture in the United States (in the form of pulps, comic books and strips, radio shows, magazines, parlor games, etc.), and it is precisely here that the Depression influenced the noir cycle – by providing the intertext which Hollywood would (at times) be forced to assimilate in succeeding decades. Certainly hard-boiled and proletarian fiction was popular enough in the 1930s, but Hollywood's response to these writers was to bowdlerize them and force their fictions to fit pre-existing commercial genres (e.g. the best Hollywood could do with Hammett in the 1930s was *The Thin Man* series, which was more domestic comedy than hard-boiled detective story). In a more oblique way, however, the Depression did contribute to film noir in so far as it furthered the dominant position of Hollywood, which became a magnet for all those struggling artists and writers that we have dubbed the domestic émigrés. Nor can we discount the effects of the Depression in Europe, which advanced the cause of fascism and the outbreak of war there. The Germanic émigrés who departed from Europe as a result of these events not only enriched the Hollywood film industry but were an essential ingredient in the development of film noir.

As far as the effects of America's entry into World War II on film noir are concerned, critics and historians seem to take one of two approaches. The French cinéastes emphasize Hollywood's response in terms of the production of war-orientated propaganda films and the need to reinforce American values (thus, films begin to depict gangsters fighting the Nazis and other fifth-column types as opposed to the apolitical stance of Raven in *This Gun For Hire* (1942)). This they view as an impediment to the production of films noir, almost truncating the movement just as it was starting. American critics, on the other hand, while not opposed to this view, tend to focus on the effect of the war on the tastes and sensibilities of the American audience and on the presentation of certain themes within the noir cycle. Thus the wartime brutalities of the weekly newsreels seasoned audiences for the heightened violence of the film noir, just as the sadistic practices of the "enemy" in the propaganda films prepared them for its analog in the noir cycle. The displacement of men by women in the workforce and the fears of returning veterans over the fidelity of their wives (or girlfriends) are used in turn to "explain" the characteristic femme fatale of film noir (rather than the intertext, as mentioned above).

At the most mundane level, World War II drew away some of Hollywood's key personnel (particularly actors and directors), thereby opening the door to new talent. At the same time, the experience of many filmmakers "in the field" during the war helped to encourage the use of authentic locales in the post-war period.²⁸ But perhaps the most compelling force behind the growth of the noir cycle in the 1940s was the changing marketplace. For one thing, the war cut Hollywood off from an international market that had accounted for up to 40 percent of its profits at the height of the 1930s. The film industry attempted to increase domestic attendance (weekly attendance figures reached their peak in 1946) through a variety of tactics, most of them successful, at least for a while: Saturday morning/afternoon matinees and all-cartoon shows to attract the kids; door-prizes and various give-a-ways to attract the adults; longer exhibition hours; and, most

importantly for our purposes, increased use of the “double feature” at most theaters other than the prestige “first-run” houses in major markets. Double features of course meant increased production, especially of B films, and for studios like Monogram or PRC this was virtually their entire output. And the B film, the true domain of the film noir, allowed, as we have seen, for a greater degree of “experimentation.” Hollywood also attempted to attract larger numbers of adult males, less a staple of weekly attendance figures during the 1930s but an increasingly important market segment as the war veterans began to return home. And this last, perhaps, was the most compelling force leading Hollywood to assimilate the hard-boiled intertext left virtually untouched in the 1930s since males were the major consumers of pulps and tough fiction.

Of course, sociocultural trauma can as easily end a film movement as initiate it, and this seems to have been the case with film noir. If I were to pick a specific year as the start of the demise of the noir cycle it would be 1948, the year in which both the consent decree and the blacklist began to have a major effect on the film industry.²⁹ This was about the time the social problem films of the cycle began to be displaced by the semi-documentaries, and these in turn began to be formulaic as the police procedurals became dominant. Even the procedurals began to focus more on the heroics of the government agents rather than on their entrapment within the criminal demimonde (as in *T-Men* (1948)) or on the activities of fugitive criminals (as in *He Walked by Night* (1949)) before they finally succumbed to anti-Communist hysteria as America turned right (*Walk a Crooked Mile* (1948), *I Was a Communist for the FBI* (1951), *The Whip Hand* (1951)). By the early 1950s, this type of film noir was hardly transgressive. If anything, it tended to reinforce conservative American values and, not surprisingly, its format was easily assimilated by television (*Treasury Men in Action* (1950), *Dragnet* (1951), *Racket Squad* (1951), *The Lineup* (1954), *Naked City* (1958)). Television also started to draw the adult male audience away from theaters with such “attractions” as sports and crime shows. Understandably, the major studios turned away from B movies toward A films whose budgets allowed them to deploy a variety of “new” techniques (including improved color, wider and wider screens, stereophonic sound, and, briefly, 3-D) which were corrosive of the visual style of film noir (by emphasizing the film plane over the depth plane, balanced lighting over chiaroscuro, “star” over “icon”) and which once again began to valorize story over technique. The number of screens in the United States began to dwindle (until replaced by the multiplex theaters starting in the 1960s), and the double feature became a thing of the past.

If film noir became less transgressive in its declining years, by 1968 there was little to transgress (at least as far as the Production Code was concerned) as Hollywood’s older moral establishment threw in the towel and the Code was abandoned in favor of the rating system. In one sense this change represented a victory for film noir (however pyrrhic), although the commercial potential of this “moral” liberalization was not lost on the film producers who hoped to lure viewers away from their television sets and from the burgeoning art houses where foreign films were

far less concerned with moral standards. Actually, by 1968 “Hollywood” no longer existed as a distinct colony and subculture: the major studios, which had been replaced by the independent production companies that followed in the wake of Hecht-Lancaster, no longer produced films; instead, they rented their facilities to others and functioned essentially as they do today, as a major vehicle for the distribution of films worldwide. And, as the American film industry attempted to maintain world dominance, budgets and film stocks grew larger and effects more “spectacular.”

By a strange twist of fate, it was the French new wave – whose homage to American B films generally and to the film noir specifically was no secret – that helped to move American films away from bloated projects like *Cleopatra* (1963) towards smaller, more innovative films like *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967, directed by Arthur Penn, though Jean-Luc Goddard was originally considered for the role). Penn’s previous film, *Mickey One* (1965) was itself an homage to the new wave, so self-reflexive that the protagonist (played by Warren Beatty) speaks directly to the audience (as the putative night club audience becomes the film audience). In any case, by the mid-1960s film noir was a known entity in the United States.³⁰ Filmmakers were quite aware that they were working within a tradition. In *Harper* (1966), for example, Paul Newman (as Lew Harper née Archer) looks at the audience incredulously when one of his sarcastic jibes goes completely over the head of the Pamela Tiffin character and, in an even more nuanced action, allows the killer, his friend Graves (Arthur Hill) to go unpunished.³¹ *Kiss Me Deadly* (Aldrich, 1955), arguably the most self-reflexive film noir of the cycle, concludes with the two protagonists *momentarily* surviving a nuclear blast. *Point Blank* (Boorman, 1967), arguably the breakout neo-noir film, opens with its protagonist, “Walker” (Lee Marvin) being shot at point blank range in a cell on a deserted Alcatraz island. He “miraculously” survives to extract revenge from those who crossed him but ends up once again in the shadows on Alcatraz – suggesting that Walker may in fact have been dead from the beginning of the film. Here Marvin’s persona – silver-white hair and impassive features belying a penchant for instantaneous violence – matches perfectly the cold steel and glass of contemporary Los Angeles. He is a protagonist who fits well Camus’ pejorative description of the “denatured hero” of tough fiction and who is an adequate foe of the fashionable denizens of a corporate (and rather legitimized) underworld. As Borde and Chaumeton observed in updating their classic study to include neo-noir films: “color confers on the urban setting of steel and glass, which has been visually transformed over the years, a preponderant place, as if the actor were no more than the emanation of this. And this victory of color values . . . suggests a new kind of morbid toughness.”³² In such a world, a more traditional existential “anti-hero” such as James Caan’s Frank in *Thief* (Michael Mann, 1981) seems woefully out of place and appropriately disappears into the night at the end, having cut all ties with the world.³³ It is as if film noir has lost its innocence as filmmakers seek to mine the tradition for nuance (and for popular appeal) and as movement becomes genre, film becomes product, and text becomes metatext.

Notes

- 1 See, especially, Alain Silver and Elizabeth Ward (eds), *Film Noir: An Encyclopedic Reference to the American Style* (Woodstock: Overlook Press, 1992), pp. 1–6; Alain Silver and James Ursini, (eds), *Film Noir Reader* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1996), pp. 3–15; and Alain Silver, Elizabeth Ward, James Ursini, and Robert Porfirio (eds), *Film Noir: The Encyclopedia* (New York: Overlook Duckworth, 2010), pp. 15–22 and 349–350.
- 2 See, for example, Todd Erickson's "Kill Me Again: Movement becomes Genre," in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader*, pp. 307–329; my "No Way Out: Existential Motifs in the Film Noir," also in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader*, pp. 77–93; and my introduction to Robert Porfirio, Alain Silver, and James Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader 3* (New York: Limelight Editions, 2001), especially pp. 2–3. I have, however, covered this topic extensively in my unpublished dissertation, "The Dark Age of American Film: A Study of the American Film Noir," Vols 1 and 2, (Ann Arbor, MI.: University Microfilms, 1980).
- 3 See Erickson, "Kill Me Again."
- 4 In a sense film noir provided a gateway for more contemporary commercial genres to emerge as many of its talents – those in particular who were not drummed out of Hollywood by the blacklist – turned to more topical material. Elia Kazan and Nicholas Ray are exemplar here.
- 5 See James Naremore, *More Than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).
- 6 The evasive nature of film noir in terms of consistent iconography or narrative patterns has fueled a good deal of the debate. For a concise but lucid overview, see Appendix C. in Silver and Ward (eds), *Film Noir*, 3rd edn, pp. 372–385. To its credit, the transgeneric nature of film noir has made it a staple of contemporary film criticism since many see there the seeds of the postmodern metatext.
- 7 A.F.C. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," in *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956). Terry Lovell's article, "Sociology and the Cinema," *Screen* 12 (1) (Spring, 1971): 15–26, a seminal application of this concept to film, indicates its usefulness in defining the French new wave.
- 8 I'm not fond of the term "expressive realism" but use it here because George Huaco labels it thus in his seminal study of the first three movements, *The Sociology of Film Art* (New York, Basic Books, 1965). Huaco's study relies on a rather crude base-superstructure model and lacks the methodological sophistication of Terry Lovell or Andrew Tudor's important discussion of film movements in *Image and Influence* (New York: Viking, 1974), to which I am indebted. For a more contemporary sociological approach (though one lacking in a discussion of film movements) see Graeme Turner, *Film as Social Practice* (London: Routledge, 4th edn, 2006).
- 9 James Naremore comes close to just such an analysis in *More than Night*.
- 10 For the conception of the personal idiolect as a "species" of the unconscious I am indebted to Bill Nichols's "Style, Grammar and the Movies," in Nichols (ed.), *Movies and Methods* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), pp. 607–628 and to Gregory Bateson, to whom I was directed by Nichols's article.
- 11 See, for example, Gene Phillips, *Creatures of Darkness: Raymond Chandler, Detective Fiction and Film Noir* (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 2000); Stephen Faison, *Existentialism, Film Noir, and Hard-Boiled Fiction* (Amherst: Cambria Press, 2008); Alistair Rolls and Deborah Walker, *French and American Noir: Dark Crossings*

- (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Paula Rabinowitz, *Black & White & Noir: America's Pulp Modernism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002) and James Naremore, *More Than Night*.
- 12 Since 2005 there has been a "[Film] Noir of the Week" website featuring a review/synopsis of a different classic film noir each week with its own blog link and touting "The Film Noir Foundation" for donations towards the preservation of classic films noir. Regarding the influence of film noir on comic books and strips, when I interviewed Will Eisner, creator of *The Spirit*, in 1972 he told me that among the influences on his visual style were films such as *Citizen Kane* and those "crime thrillers" of the 1940s that we now term classic film noir.
 - 13 Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991).
 - 14 Many of these interviews are contained in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader 3*. This spirit of rebelliousness extended even to producers like Dore Schary, who was proud of his "smaller" black-and-white films, especially those that dealt with social issues, and had no qualms about clashing with owners such as Louis Mayer and Howard Hughes.
 - 15 Yet commentators like Jean-Pierre Chartier even in 1946 recognized the difference between the French films noir of the 1930s and the American films noir which eliminated the romantic sensibility of the French films and often replaced romance with the allure of the femme fatale. See "Americans are also Making *Noir* Films," in Alain Silver and James Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader 2* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1999), pp. 21–23.
 - 16 Porfirio, "Dark Age of American Film," chapter 4.
 - 17 In a series of interviews I had with Edward Dmytryk in 1976 he described the camaraderie among Hollywood's "lefties." He felt the dearth of intellectuality in the Hollywood of the 1930s was mitigated by the arrival of the European and domestic émigrés – giving the edge in that domain to the Marxists. He was quick to point out that most studio chiefs were apolitical and he demonstrated a certain disdain for liberals like Dore Schary.
 - 18 Leo C. Rosten, *Hollywood: The Movie Colony, the Movie Makers* (New York: Harcourt, 1941).
 - 19 See Lang's interview in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader 3*, especially pp. 58–60.
 - 20 As Curtis Bernhardt put it, "Foreign directors who came to this country . . . have a clearer snapshot of the culture than the native who has been immersed in it all his life," in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader 3*, p. 230.
 - 21 For a more comprehensive discussion of the ways film noir broke with the conventions of the classic studio film, see Porfirio, "Dark Age of American Film," especially chapters 5 and 6.
 - 22 From Welles's experience with radio's *The March of Time*, which, together with the film series of the same name, proved to be the major source of the semi-documentaries of the noir cycle.
 - 23 I was told this by David Bradley (director of the noir *Talk About a Stranger*, 1952) who knew Welles from their association with the Todd School, which they both attended.
 - 24 I read scores of film reviews of putative films noir in the trade papers of that era. Since the term "film noir" was unknown in the United States at the time, the most typical appellation was "psychological thriller."
 - 25 For a book-length study of the influence of the Germanic émigrés (among others) on Hollywood film see Larry Langman, *Destination Hollywood: The Influence of Europeans on American Filmmaking* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000).

- 26 During a conversation Dmytryk told me that his visual style, particularly at RKO, was influenced primarily by Welles and by Murnau.
- 27 At least according to Dore Schary. See Silver and Ursini, *Film Noir Reader* 3, especially pp. 180–181.
- 28 See, for example, the interviews of Joseph Lewis and Sam Fuller in Silver and Ursini (eds), *Film Noir Reader* 3.
- 29 Most “lists” of films noir, though they may vary in terms of titles, are rather consistent in affirming 1947 as the peak of production of films noir (see, for example, the lists of films noir by year in Silver, Ward, Ursini, and Porfirio (eds), *Film Noir: The Encyclopedia*, pp. 343–345, and a comparison of such lists in Andrew Spicer, *Film Noir* (Harlow: Longmans/Pearson Education Limited, 2002), p. 28.
- 30 Higham and Greenberg’s *Hollywood in the 1940s* was published in 1968. L.A. Filmex’s “Salute to Film Noir” (the original source of Paul Schrader’s seminal “Notes . . .,” which were handed out to attendees some two years before they were published in *Film Comment*) took place in 1970.
- 31 At the film’s finale neither character can act, and as Harper echoes Graves’s “Ah, hell,” the film underscores this stasis by closing on a freeze-frame of Newman, an affirmation, perhaps, of Borde and Chaumeton’s final comment on neo-noir films in their 1979 post-face to their seminal study: “Deriving from the world of the novel, from the gratifying frisson of fear, and from a certain qualitative notion of pleasure, the noir series has, over the years, linked up with the anguish of a society that no longer knows where it is headed.” Raymonde Borde and Etienne Chaumeton, *A Panorama of American Film Noir 1941–1953*, trans. Paul Hammond (San Francisco: City Light Books, 2002), pp. 159–160.
- 32 Borde and Chaumeton, *Panorama*, p. 158.
- 33 In Jameson, *Postmodernism*, Fredric Jameson has observed that the older existential antiheroes have disappeared along with existentialism itself.