chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 48

Hitchcock's Innocence Plot

• Reidar Due

During a twenty-five year period, spanning the Second World War and his move from England to America, Hitchcock showed a particular preference for plots involving an unjustified accusation against the film's central character. *The 39 Steps* (1935), *Young and Innocent* (1937), *Saboteur* (1942), *Strangers on a Train* (1951), *I Confess* (1953), *The Wrong Man* (1956) and *North by Northwest* (1959) are all variations on the same pattern with different thematic emphases. This article discusses the narrative logic and moral content of this 'innocence plot', running through Hitchcock's films from the mid-thirties to the late fifties.

The innocence plot revolves around the actions of one main character, the innocent protagonist. At the beginning of each story, this protagonist finds himself, by coincidence, in a novel situation compelling him to take up a definite and dramatic course of action. This series of actions define the course of the story.

The initial situation is one that the protagonist has neither created nor chosen, but it nevertheless frames his thoughts and the scope of his action, imposing on him a set of parameters which he cannot change. Throughout the story, he is thus confined to operating within the horizon disclosed by the initial situation. This passivity of the innocent character defines him as a *victim* of contingent forces, mirroring his narrative role as the target of unfounded accusations, and leading to a double victimisation.

This interpretation challenges those approaches to Hitchcock's films which take the films' relation to an audience as the primary locus of their meaning. Hitchcock liked to portray himself as a master craftsman skilled in capturing audience emotion. Truffaut comments that this effort on Hitchcock's part to maintain the attention of the audience lends his films a particular stylistic and temporal quality, a concentration of narrative in which there are no 'dead moments'.[1] This narrative intensity, generated through the mechanisms of suspense, invests each visual moment with a strong narrative charge, embedding it in relation to past and future events in the story.[2] Through this temporal structure and the suspense on which it is founded, the audience is seduced into emotional involvement.[3]

I argue that underlying this *rhetorical* dimension of Hitchcock's style, each film displays a thematic and narrative structure which does not depend on its temporal development and relation to an audience. This approach is structural and 'auteurial'.[4] It locates the place of the auteur within the perspective on morality generated by the thematic and narrative structure of each film. Within this structure, the central character does not appear as an object of identification or moral evaluation, but as a figure whose primary characteristic is his objectification within the plot.

Plot Structure: *The 39 Steps* and *North by Northwest*

The 39 Steps (1935) displays the narrative and thematic structure of the innocence plot in its minimal form: Richard Hannay, played by the elegant Robert Donat, learns a secret concerning foreign agents from a mysterious woman. She is shortly thereafter murdered in his flat, leaving him with a set of rules for action: he promptly embarks on a journey in search of 'the 39 steps' and 'the man with a missing finger'. However, Hannay is himself soon accused of the murder. His journey thus acquires a dual purpose; it is part escape and part discovery. Both of these tracks come to an end *simultaneously*, in so far as solving the mystery immediately entails his own absolution from guilt.

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 49

• *Blackmail* (1929) makes us ask: Who is innocent?

This plot displays a logic of guilt and innocence: in order to free himself from guilt, the protagonist must find another person who can be guilty in his place. This is a pattern that will characterise most of Hitchcock's subsequent innocence plots, most clearly *Young and Innocent*, *The Wrong Man*, *Strangers on a Train* and *I Confess*.

The accusation itself cannot be relativised. Only its application to a particular person can be questioned. The accusation at the base of the innocence plot is therefore absolute. It is also

arbitrary in its designation of the innocent character: the situation through which the protagonist becomes accused bears no relation to his previous life and action. His relation to this situation is thus perfectly *contingent*.

The plot of *North by Northwest* (1959) epitomizes this arbitrary relation between the protagonist and the situation which defines the plot. Roger Thornhill is a wealthy middle-aged man, played by Cary Grant. He is introduced as a somewhat spoilt and dull member of the urban elite. He is shown wearing a dark brown suit and being assisted by various motherly figures. The fact that Cary Grant is familiar from Hawks' comedy *Bringing Up Baby* gives him an additional air of whimsical unworldliness.

This socially well-protected character will from a certain arbitrary point in time be the target of a persecution of seemingly unlimited proportions. Thornhill is kidnapped, imprisoned and almost murdered by spies who mistakenly believe him to be a man named Kaplan. Thornhill survives and seeks to find out what has happened. In one of the following scenes of the film, he walks into the United Nations building in New York, in order to meet a certain Lester Townsend who he thinks can provide him with vital information concerning the situation in which he finds himself. He sees Townsend across the room and walks over to him. As Townsend is about to speak, his mouth freezes: he has just been stabbed in the back by a hitman who quickly disappears. Thornhill is shocked to find himself with a dead body in his arms. His first instinct is to remove the knife from the man's back, which leaves him in the position of holding a dead man in his arms with a bloody knife lifted over him – as if to stab him again. This is the pose photographed by all the journalists in the room, the picture that appears in all the American newspapapers the following day.

The tone is set: through no fault of his own, due to sheer bad luck, ignorance and human decency, Thornhill finds himself set up as a murderer. The very swiftness of events as the scene is edited turns it into a hyperbole of victimization in which everything has changed for the main character in the course of one brief, unfortunate moment. The protagonist's fall from social grace is swift and merciless, but also comical in its absurdity. We shall later come back to this humorous effect of the innocence plot.

This clear break with an unquestionable innocence through an unambiguous fall creates a powerful narrative trope, around which all of Hitchcock's innocence plots are constructed.

The Moral Question: *Young and Innocent*

In the innocence plot, there are for the protagonist only two possible relations to the social world: he is either unproblematically a member of a given social order or stigmatised as an outcast.

Young and Innocent (1937) illustrates this structure very clearly. The film opens with a violent quarrel between husband and wife. The next image shows a woman's body washed up on a beach. Then the film cuts to the figure of a young man, dressed in a light and elegant suit, briskly walking along a cliff high above the beach. As soon as he sees the body he rushes down and, not knowing whether the woman is dead, runs for help. Two young girls, discovering the body a few seconds later, see the young man 'running away', as do we.

The film plays on the two meanings of 'running away'. The young man, called Tisdall, is of course literally running away from the corpse, even if, as he will later claim to the police, he is only running for help. The girls and the police however will say he was trying to escape. The film cuts from the image of him running, as seen by the two girls, to an interrogation of the witnesses by a policeman. A group of villagers is present at the interrogation.

Tisdall is slightly arrogant. He seeks to dismiss the allegation that he was running away by simply stating that the girls are 'hysterical'. *So certain is he of his innocence*. This is the source of the film's narrative momentum. For within a few seconds this certainty is undermined as Tisdall realises that the whole group surrounding him assumes him to be guilty of the murder. His identity as a brilliant young man has, in the flash of a moment, been swapped with that of a

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 51

murderer. This initial situation thus exchanges one identity, one *world*, for another.

The film shows that the protagonist can buy his innocence back, be readmitted into respectable society, through the mediation of a social authority. In escaping from the police he is assisted by the daughter of the local police chief. The father is represented as a gentle patriarch and a paragon of human decency. At the moment when Tisdall's innocence is proven he is given the daughter as a reward by this moral and social authority. Innocence is thus shown in the film as a social *sign* that can be both lost and won.

It is an essential trait of innocence in Hitchcock's films that it must be granted by social authorities. Judges, fathers, lovers and representatives of the state must vouch for the hero's innocence.[5] Society can be wrong in its judgements as *Blackmail* and *Shadow of a Doubt* show.[6] This is part of Hitchcock's social satire. Legal and police authorities are often shown to be incompetent.[7] Nevertheless, the protagonist of the innocence plot has no other way out of his situation than to win the recognition of these authorities.

There is no way of being innocent other than that of being reincluded into the social world from which one was at first banned. Innocence thus becomes the object of a desire for inclusion, or reinclusion, within a certain world, a world of which one can be part *along with others*, without being singled out in any particular way. For to be singled out is to be suspect. Evil therefore often takes the form of excessive individuation in Hitchcock's films. Mr. Crewe, the lecherous painter (*Blackmail*), Uncle Charlie the handsome cousin (*Shadow of a Doubt*), Bruno Antony the demonic homosexual (*Strangers on a Train*), are all suspect because they are singled out as not belonging within the world of the protagonists.

Extreme individuation is in these examples associated with sexual provocation in the eyes of the other characters. Innocence in Hitchcock's films therefore signifies *not to stand out*, sexually or in any other way. Innocence consists in belonging firmly and comfortably within a puritan middle class world. Evil and chance intrude into this world, which is represented as fundamentally innocent, seeing itself as an order of normality in which crime and excess have no place.

The Order of Normality: *Blackmail* and *Saboteur*

Blackmail (1929) portrays this order of normality as a highly ambivalent structure.[8] Sustained by authority and class, it at first seems unshakeable. At the same time however, it is shown to be morally unstable, as its individual members are susceptible to various temptations such as deceit, crime and sexual fascination.

The story runs as follows. A lively young woman called Alice White goes out with a dull and respectable policeman, Frank Webber. She is also courted by Mr. Crewe, a dazzling young painter, played by the charismatic Cyril Richard. Crewe persuades her to visit his studio, impressing upon her that his intentions are pure and innocent. He then attacks her and attempts to rape her. She stabs him to death with a knife.

By coincidence, the policeman investigating the case is her own fiancé. When he discovers her glove at the scene of the crime, he realises what has happened. A fourth character has also figured out what happened: a homeless man has seen her entering the house. He makes the most of his knowledge by blackmailing Frank and Alice, but as he has been seen entering the building he is himself suspected of the murder. Frank encourages these suspicions and threatens the blackmailer with giving him over to the police. The blackmailer is subsequently pursued by the police and dies in the chase. Frank and Alice are thereby released from suspicion and able to resume their former life as if nothing had happened.

Blackmail makes us ask: Who is innocent? The girl who defends herself against rape and thereby commits murder? Her fiancé, the policeman who protects her, covering up the evidence and preventing her from testifying? The blackmailer who exploits his knowledge of what has happened, but who is in turn accused of the

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 52

murder? The girl's shopkeeping parents who refuse to notice that anything is wrong when the blackmailer intrudes on their family breakfast? Or the cheerful police constable who could never suspect his handsome superior with his pretty fiancée to be in any trouble? Innocence appears here as a form of social self-confidence. After finding his fiancée's glove, the policeman becomes the recipient of a truth which disturbs this self-confidence. He is innocent of receiving this truth, but after having received it *he is no longer innocent*. He can no longer innocently fulfil his place within the order of decent normality.

This identification between innocence and social identity will be given a different emphasis in the innocence plot. Whereas *Blackmail* is a study of moral double standards within a given social world, the innocence plot is based on a split between a social world and the protagonist who has been excluded from it. Due to this fundamental split, the social construction of innocence becomes more heavily stylised in the innocence plot. This is most strongly the case in the American films of the fourties and fifties. In these films the patriarchal authority of the English films gives way to state authority as the arbitor of innocence. The hero's exclusion thereby becomes more universal and the distinction between inclusion and exclusion is rendered almost absolute. In the American films, the world from which the protagonist is excluded displays a more powerful cohesion than in the English films with their subtle social satire.[9]

Saboteur (1942) portrays such a cohesive social unity through a depiction of American cultural spaces: with its enormous industrial plant, its desert landscapes, highways and huge billboards the film creates a lush and almost mythical image of America. The story itself is rooted in a characteristically American moral mythology of purity and corruption.

The main character, Barry Kane, has the face and physique of a perfectly balanced young man. He is tall, with supple yet clear features. His face is neither harsh nor vague. He is presented as pure and good, with a forthright, friendly manner. This idealised member of society works in a factory together with his close friend Ken.

One day the plant is set on fire by a spy. Kane attempts to extinguish the fire, but at that moment someone hands him a fire-extinguisher which he passes on to Ken who eagerly grabs it. However, it has been filled with gasoline, and so instead of putting out the fire, Ken makes it grow and dies in it. Kane then attempts to console Ken's mother.

As he is in a neighbouring house looking for a drink to comfort her, she receives a visit by two policemen. They tell her that Kane is responsible for the fire and for her son's death. They also tell her that Kane is a spy, an enemy of the American people. She now no longer knows what to believe. For in spite of Kane's good heart and good looks, *she can no longer trust him*.

This story repeats itself with a twist in Kane's meeting with a young woman, Patricia Martin. She is a model, appearing on billboards along the highway, but she is at the same time an ordinary young woman, a good citizen with a strong moral sense. She is therefore impatient to turn him in to the authorities. Only Kane's *enduring goodness* convinces her that he is not an enemy of the State.

Throughout the film, an extremely thin line thus separates love from persecution, trust from fear. Moral values are sharply confronted in a moral structure that is at once Manichean and unstable. It is therefore always possible for a character to switch category from trustworthy to untrustworthy and from innocent to guilty – or the other way round.

The more the innocence plot develops such a Manichean logic, the more it causes its protagonist to suffer. Hannay in *The 39 Steps* and Tisdall in *Young and Innocent* are traditional heroes of English films from that period. Their victimisation is on the one hand *legal* – they are accused – and on the other hand *narrative* – they are bound by the plot to undertake a journey in order to solve a mystery which will clear them from suspicion. But their victimisation does not bear a strong moral significance. With American films such as *I Confess*, *Strangers on a Train* or *The Wrong Man* this changes. The emphasis of

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 53

the films now shifts, from the telling of a story to the central character who is trapped within it.

The Auteur as Scientist: *I Confess* and *The Wrong Man*

The two American films *The Wrong Man* and *I Confess* both involve plots which entrap and frame their protagonists in an extreme way. This emphatic emplotment produces a particularly focused gaze on the central character.

The Wrong Man (1956) opens with the slender figure of Manny Balestrero (Henry Fonda) taking the subway through New York. We observe him on his way to and from the Stork Club where he works as a jazz musician. His stooping, lonely figure already expresses a certain vulnerability. The following scene with his family reinforces this first impression. A note of anxiety is to be heard in his wife's voice as she mentions an upcoming dentist's bill. She fears that they will 'again' be propelled into cycles of debt and insecurity, 'just like last year'. This overture establishes a situation of complex fragility. The family economy is weak, the wife's nerves are on the edge, the husband seems to be not quite of this world.

This situation is suddenly aggravated as Balestrero is abruptly arrested, accused of armed robbery in a series of New York grocery stores. The accusation is confirmed by several witnesses, since Balestrero, as we later discover, physically resembles the actual robber. The relation between this destiny and this man is perfectly arbitrary. No causal link connects him to the robber, but the film establishes a different link. It suggests that he is cast by life as 'the wrong man'. His monklike demeanour, his shyness and his poverty turn out in the course of the film to constitute a perfect screen for projections of guilt, since the vulnerability of his immaculate innocence is easily confused with the vulnerability of guilt. The wrong man thus fits perfectly the role assigned to him by life, a role which just happens to represent the exact opposite of his moral character. The accusation both humiliates and accentuates the protagonist's moral qualities. Manny Balestrero therefore is very close to appearing a saint, or a martyr.

The plot, however, like all of the innocence plots, is free from any moral or theological framework which could justify or give meaning to the protagonist's victimisation. In Hitchcock's films, the moral themes of guilt and innocence appear within the structure of a moral imagination which establishes rigid dichotomies between sin and virtue, evil and innocence. We might see this structure as the reflexion of a puritan or a Catholic ideology, but this would not be supported by the films themselves, since their narratives never support any definite moral or theological conclusions.

It is rather as if Hitchcock the puritan Catholic uses his own moral imagination as *raw material* for a vision of human beings which is fundamentally amoral, a vision which is based on the wish to tease and to irritate the self-suffiency of a moral world-view. This teasing attitude is even more evident in *I Confess* (1951). The film is based on the following simple situation. One night, a young Montreal priest called Michael Logan receives a confession from a German refugee named Otto Keller. Keller who is Logan's friend and works in the same church, confesses that he has just committed a murder.

The victim turns out to be no stranger to the priest. He was the blackmailer of a woman called Ruth Grandfort, whom the priest once loved – or perhaps still loves, since the story leaves this open. Due to his connections with Mrs. Grandfort, Logan is gradually identified by the police as the prime suspect. He cannot defend himself, as he is barred from revealing what he has heard during confession.

This situation presents the good and handsome young priest, played by Montgomery Clift, as *framed* between the police, his former mistress, and the murdererer who has confessed his crime to him. When Logan is accused of the murder, the film tests his moral endurance. We see his face becoming increasingly strained, bearing ever stronger marks of inner turmoil until, in the end, he is 'released' from suspicion after the murderer reveals his identity to the police.

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 54

Logan is portrayed as a moral, self-sacrificing hero in the film, but we never see the story from his perspective. We know little of his thoughts. We look at his face and at his body. We see him resolutely striding through Quebec city. His body is frequently paralleled with church towers as both are filmed from below in oblique angles. As a highly conscientious priest he is the church in person. But he is also not the church. He is human and therefore fragile. It is from this relation between fragility and strength that the film draws its aesthetic effect. He is the expressive locus of *goodness taken to its limits*.

Logan is, like Balastrero, a saint-like figure whose victimhood is close to martyrdom. As he is a young priest he makes one think of another young priest, the hero of Bernanos's *Journal d'un curé de campagne*, which was filmed by Robert Bresson in 1950. In that story, the hero's social isolation has a clear spiritual significance. Being too intensely religious even for the Church, he is almost heretical and certainly constitutes a social menace within the village community. Logan's isolation, by contrast, is purely moral and self-directed. He teaches no-one and causes no social or moral disruption. No spiritual or moral lesson is to be drawn from his suffering. The focus is here purely on the aesthetic effects of a certain situation upon a particular character.

This effect is observed in a clinical light. We follow each step in the fracturing of Logan's composure. The film thereby enacts an experiment with goodness: how far will goodness reach? What happens, what will it look like, if we take a perfect character and emplot him within the most devilish plot, with the most elegant, the most economical trap for his moral conscience? Such is the *auteurial stance* in this film.

In both *The Wrong Man* and *I Confess,* emplotment frames the central character so as to enact a play with him. His endurance is tested, his goodness put under stress. The protagonist basks, for a moment, in a light from which his innocence offers no protection. Innocence becomes the object of mockery.

Comic Fragility

Entrapment of the central character allows the films, as we have seen, both to explore the theme of innocence and to create a particular form of teasing victimisation of the central character. The innocence plot is governed by two formal principles: the arbitrary removal of the innocent character from his place within a familiar world and a sharp opposition between guilt and innocence, between belonging to a world and being excluded from it.

These two principles combine to form a specific auteurial gaze upon the victimised character: if loss of innocence is both contingent and absolute, it creates a victimisation which seems to imply the power of fate or the whims of an all powerful God. The crucial feature of this playful auteurial gaze in Hitchcock's films is, however that it is not divine. The films project no divine perspective from which victimisation can appear meaningful or endowed with a moral lesson. Victimisation remains gratuitous and the fragility of social identities carries no moral implication.

Rather it is a teasing and experimenting gaze that Hitchcock creates through the innocence plot, a gaze through which human life appears comically fragile in the inconsistency between the characters' innocent desire for happy domesticity and their exposure to chance and diabolic mockery. This auteurial gaze expresses a wish to tamper with a good character's place in the world. The auteur seems to be saying: what happens if we, *just as a joke*, interfere with a character's identity? How will he cope? What will happen?

This humorous view of social identity is represented vividly in one of Hitchcock's television films, *The Case of Mr. Pelham* (1955). Mr Pelham is haunted by the spectre of an uncanny *doppelgänger*. This unwanted double appears at his job, at his club and in his home – but never when he is himself present. In order to out-manoeuvre this imitator, Mr. Pelham buys a conspicuously colourful tie, quite different from his usually dull and respectable style of dress. When he is finally confronted with the false Mr.

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 55

Pelham, the latter persuasively observes that this very tie is the proof that he, the impersonator, is the real Mr Pelham since *he* would never have bought such a tie.

Hitchcock introduces the film by explaining that it is a tale about nasty pranks such as people putting chewing gum into one's pockets. He then illustrates this by showing that his own pocket is full of gum. At the end of the film Hitchcock appears again, screaming 'I am the real Alfred Hitchcock', as he is about to be taken away by force to a mental hospital. A serene Hitchcock observes the scene and comments: 'I would never have chewing gum in my pockets'.

In both plots, in the film and in the surrounding vignette, a subject of authority is humiliated and made into a victim. This alienation of the subject's position happens on the symbolic and expressive level of clothes. This reveals a conception of identity as artifice: our appearance depends on props and conventions, but this constructed identity is also constitutive of who we *really* are.

The Auteur as Jester: *Strangers on a Train*

Strangers on a Train (1951) exemplifies a similar teasing gaze directed at a particular form of social fragility. The film is a portrait of social ambition. Its protagonist, Guy Haines, is a tennis player, married to a lower class woman of uncertain respectability. He has now met another woman, more to his taste, the beautiful and delicate daughter of a wealthy politician.

This situation makes Guy an ideal victim. Eager not to overstep his new social boundaries he has little flexibility and room for manoeuvre. At the same time, his life has been made vulnerable through his stardom as a tennis player. It has been turned into an image for public consumption, an object of other people's fantasies.

The first long scene of the film shows Guy's meeting with Bruno Antony. Bruno is an expert on Guy's life. He is also a master talker. Confronted with Bruno's rambling monologues, deftly oscillating between flattery, wit and excess, Guy's carefully maintained facade of effortless elegance comes under strain. Bruno's invasive speech insidiously finds its way to Guy's complicitity. It is as if Guy's life, with its all too polished surface, extends an invitation to the demonic teaser Bruno-Hitchcock.

Bruno proposes a contract. He will kill Guy's undesired wife and Guy will do the same with Bruno's father. Guy fights hard to laugh off these suggestions as silly jokes. But his stress shows. He leaves behind a lighter with his own insignia. This object will be the sign of his weakness. After murdering Guy's wife, and realising that Guy will not return the favour, Bruno seeks to plant the lighter on the scene of the crime to focus suspicion on Guy.

Guy's weakness lies in never being able completely to distance himself from Bruno's thoughts. Thus when Bruno tells Guy that he cannot go to the police to accuse Bruno of the murder, since Guy himself would become the prime suspect, he immediately embraces this reasoning as conclusive. Bruno is in a perfect position to manipulate Guy, because he sees through his fears and aspirations. Bruno himself is almost invulnerable. An outsider to normality he does not seek to be admitted into any social world. His combination of shrewdness, psychological insight and social detachment makes Bruno the perfect teaser.

The film is set in a Washington socialite upper class. This class is contrasted with a lower class from which the protagonist seeks to escape. Both of these classes are characterised sharply and in clear opposition to one another: the anxious elegance of the one is set off against the boisterous vulgarity of the other. The film portrays its characters against the background of very specific settings: trains, mansions, monuments, a fair, a tennis court. These settings in each case accentuate the entrapment of the protagonist. Appearing against these shifting backgrounds, he is at moments hedged in by a narrow or alien space and at other moments belittled by large official buildings.[10]

These contrasts serve to develop a trope of confinement which dominates the entire film. Guy is trapped within himself and in his relations to the world. In *Saboteur*, the protagonist was

allowed to stay composed throughout the story. In *Strangers on a Train*, on the other hand, he will become increasingly uncomfortable as he is entrapped by a plot which allows him just enough freedom to suffer, but not enough to change his situation.

As the film progresses, Guy becomes ever more restricted in his scope of thought and movement, incapable of moving beyond the parameters he has set for himself. This increasing confinement is symblised by the tennis match towards the end of the film. The match is cross-cut with Bruno's attempt to place the lighter at the scene of the crime, at the fair where he murdered Guy's wife. Guy's actions are here constrained, simultaneously, by the game, the police and his anticipations of Bruno's actions.

In *I Confess* and *The Wrong Man*, the central character was made to suffer for a period of time and was then released. They were picked out from the crowd, put under the scrutiny of the police, and then returned to normality and non-differentiation. The same is the case here. In the end Guy is allowed to return to his social ambitions, resume his train journeys as a normal member of the elite. The mockery concludes on a happy note.

The Innocence Plot

The innocence plot allows the auteur persona to experiment with characters. The plot defines a limited and over-determined narrative universe in which possibilities are narrowly circumscribed at the outset of each story. A situation is constructed in which a central character is falsely accused and thereby displaced from his social identity. Sharp oppositions between normality and guilt dramatise this situation, thereby accentuating the victimisation of the central character.

This victimisation constitutes a suspension from normality. In the later innocence plots – *I Confess*, *Strangers on a Train*, *The Wrong Man* – this state of social uncertainty is used by the auteur to test the moral endurance of his central characters, and to tease them for their various moral virtues: goodness, humility, social ambition.

The innocence plot displays an auteurial gaze which observes characters in order to question the self-evidence of their place within a given social world and to disturb their firm conviction of belonging within a solid moral order.

Notes

1. 'As a general rule, the suspense scenes form *privileged moments* in a film, which we remember. But looking across Hitchcock's work, it becomes clear that throughout his career he has tried to construct films whose every moment will be "privileged"'. François Truffaut quoted in *Hitchcock/Truffaut*, Ramsay, 1983: 11.
2. Susan Smith says about the films' control over narrative information within suspense: 'The nature of suspense means that such control is necessarily ambivalent, on the one hand pointing forward to the narrative's future tense by raising explicit questions about both what and when certain events will happen, yet on the other hand stalling narrative progress by delaying and withholding the information required to reach that destination.' Susan Smith, *Humour, Tone, Suspense in Hitchcock*, The British Film Institute, London, 2000: 25.
3. Accordng to some critics, this response extends into a moral involvement with the characters. Robin Wood thus stresses that 'always it is our own impulses that are involved, not only the characters''. Robin Wood, *The Films of Alfred Hitchcock*, London, 1966: 28. Leslie Brill refers to the characters' capacity to reclaim innocence as 'the center of hope for both protagonists and audience.' Lesley Brill, *The Hitchcock Romance, Love and Irony in Hitchcock's Films*, Princeton, 1988: 23.
4. I use the terms 'auteur' and 'auteurial' to refer to structural properties of the films which only indirectly reflect Hitchcock's role within film production and the persona he manufactured of himself through interviews, cameos etc..
5. The desire to be recognised as innocent by a social authority also defines the plot structure of *Notorious* where Ingrid Bergman believes she can change her life and become a decent woman if she can make herself be loved by Cary Grant.
6. The murderer in *Blackmail* is not convicted and the murderer Uncle Charlie in *Shadow of a Doubt* dies a hero.
7. In *Easy Virtue*, the court appear as a terrible farce, while in *Young and Innocent* the police constantly make mistakes.
8. *Blackmail* does not have a pure innocence plot since it does not revolve around a character being falsely accused.

chap 3 10/6/04 12:08 pm Page 57

9 Raymond Durgnat suggests that the English sound films are characterised by a very accurate portrait of English society: 'That sense of the typical which can later lead Hitchcock into tourist-trap stereoptypes (as Miller remarks) doesn't, on his home ground, play him false. I can vouch, from vivid memories and a child's sharp eye, that Hitchcock's English era is in another class altogether from Ealing's England.' Raymond Durgnat, *The Strange Case of Alfred Hitchcock*, Faber, 1974: 30.

10 Architecture reflects Guy's entrapment with Bruno. 'At one point in the film, the camera tracks Guy as he walks towards the Jefferson Memorial with a police detective. When Guy suddenly turns his head and looks outside the frame, the camera follows the direction of his gaze and pans the Jefferson Memorial. The composition of this shot immediately focuses our eye on Bruno. Unlike the other figures in the shot, he stands near the centre of the frame, motionless and looking straight into the camera.' Robert J. Corber, 'Hitchcock's Washington' in Jonathan Freedman and Richard Millington, *Hitchcock's America*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999: 112.