

Reviews

- Edward Buscombe

Stanley Corkin, *Cowboys as Cold Warriors: The Western and US History*, Temple University Press, 2004. ISBN: 1-59213-254-5 (pbk) and 1-59213-253-7 (cloth).

This book attempts to read a small number of canonical Western films as if they were parables about American foreign policy during the fifteen years or so after the end of World War II. Stanley Corkin tries to make close connections between Westerns and politics during the time when artistically and in terms of popularity the genre was at its height. His belief is that, 'The repressed dimension of Westerns is their relationship to imperialism.' p. 5). This is a somewhat contentious statement, since there has been no lack of analysis of the genre in terms of its relationship to American foreign policy. Corkin himself recognises the impressive body of work produced by Richard Slotkin, and indeed Slotkin's discussion of *The Magnificent Seven* in terms of its relationship to the Vietnam war is not dissimilar to Corkin's own. Prior to that one would have to mention John Lenihan's book *Showdown: Confronting Modern America in the Western Film*, which has an interesting chapter on the relation between the Western and the Cold War.

This is not to say that Corkin has nothing new to say. He proceeds by focusing in each chapter on a small group of films produced at almost exactly the same time. Thus *My Darling Clementine* and *Red River* both date from 1946. (For a variety of reasons, *Red River* was not released until 1948, two years after production.) Corkin contends that each film is essentially about the triumph of the American system of free markets in the post-war era, and that each film justifies the expansion of American power as both right and inevitable. *Duel in the Sun*, *Pursued* and *Fort Apache* are essentially melodramas, and Corkin has some interesting things to say about the figure of the absent

mother in all three films, and how this leads to extreme emotionalism in the female characters, which is a challenge to the (male) project of imperialism.

Broken Arrow and *The Gunfighter* (both from 1950) are taken as meditations upon the extent to which violence is necessary in order to achieve imperialist goals, both films seeming to challenge the idea that the gun is the only solution. *Shane*, *High Noon* and *The Searchers*, all dating from the mid-1950s, signify a change in the national mood, as a result of the Korean War stalemate. All three suggest that armed conflict is inevitable, but that total victory may not be achievable. But by the end of the decade, *Gunfight at the OK Corral*, *The Magnificent Seven* and *The Alamo* signal an increasing desire on the part of the US to intervene abroad. In his final chapter Corkin discusses three films from 1962: *Lonely Are the Brave*, *Ride the High Country* and *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance*. All three display 'imperialist nostalgia', a term Corkin derives from Renato Rosaldo.

Corkin is very well informed on the shifts in American foreign policy during these years, and his discussion of the films is never less than illuminating, if at times he seems to want to press his analogies too far. Thus, discussing *Gunfight at the OK Corral* he remarks on the fact that Wyatt Earp and Doc Holliday have an unusual alliance, just as the US found itself strangely allied in the mid-1950s with Germany and Japan, formerly its enemies. This is pretty unconvincing. Nor is one persuaded when Corkin sees an analogy between *Broken Arrow's* plea for the right of Indians to political autonomy and the position of the early Communist Party on the rights of independent republics of the Soviet Union. Corkin rightly points to the Communist past of several of the personnel involved in the production, but the politics of *Broken Arrow* have far more to do with the Indian policies of the US government than with what Lenin thought about Kazakhstan. However, much of

the time Corkin's analysis hits home. For example it is virtually impossible to ignore the contemporary resonances in world politics of a film like *The Magnificent Seven* (I have written on the film myself in just these terms). Similarly, given John Wayne's well-known political orientation, his long-cherished project of *The Alamo* demands to be read as an ideological statement, though much of what Corkin has to say about *The Alamo* and Barry Goldwater was already prefigured in Philip French's book *Westerns*, a book Corkin appears not to know, first published in 1973.

There are some questions one might ask about his method. Firstly, it seems to rely on a very small sample of films, a frequent failing of genre studies. What about all the rest, which may not fit the thesis? For example, another film from 1962 is *How the West Was Won*, a film which seems to suffer not at all from the kind of elegiac mood of *Liberty Valance* or *Ride the High Country*, but on the contrary exudes a kind of guileless belief in manifest destiny and progress. In any case, nostalgia in the Western is certainly not new in 1962; it can be argued that it has been present in responses to the west right from the beginning. Nineteenth-century painters such as George Catlin and Frederic Remington wrote eloquently about their desire to capture the west because it was already, sadly, disappearing.

Perhaps a more fundamental problem is whether Corkin's method short-circuits the relationship between production and ideology. Without necessarily introducing the question of intentionality (did John Ford intend Ethan Edwards to be a critique of Douglas MacArthur, as Corkin suggests he is?), one might ask how the ideological content gets into the films. Corkin's model might imply a simple case of reflection: American foreign policy manifests itself in the world, and these films hold up the mirror to it. I am sure that in fact Corkin has a more sophisticated understanding than that, and it would have been interesting if he could have devoted a few pages to the issue.

• Peter Hutchings

Geoff Mayer, *Roy Ward Baker*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004. ISBN: 0-7190-6354-X. 224 pp.

Auteurism might be a decidedly old-fashioned approach in the world of academic film studies but director studies continue to appear at a remarkable rate. Attempts have been made to secure authorship credentials for other players in the filmmaking process – including the producer, the screenwriter, the production designer, the cinematographer – but the film director still reigns supreme. This could well reflect the director's status and importance within the film industry. At the same time, one can often detect the residual influence of auteurism in these director studies as they seek to identify the ways in which directorial visions are communicated via the medium of film.

This bifurcated approach registers clearly in Geoff Mayer's book-length study of the British film director Roy Ward Baker. On the one hand, there is a concern to place Baker within the context of the British film industry as someone whose career and films are revealingly typical. On the other hand, the book also projects a sense of Baker as a special creative figure whose films are in certain respects distinctive and different. Baker's career lends itself well to both these perspectives. Very much an industry insider, he directed a series of solid entertainments during the 1950s – most notably the prisoner-of-war drama *The One That Got Away* (1957) and the Titanic film *A Night to Remember* (1958). When the market for this type of product dried up in the early 1960s, he switched to television direction for a while before directing some low-budget fantasy-themed films for independent companies Hammer and Amicus from the mid-1960s onwards (including *Quatermass and the Pit*, *The Vampire Lovers* and *Asylum*).

Telling Baker's story necessarily involves telling the story of the British film industry in the post-war period, and Mayer does this very effectively in the lengthy career overview that opens the book. We are given a clear picture of the circumstances within which Baker had to work,

with the emphasis not just on his achievements but also on the constraints placed upon him. More importantly perhaps, at least for a director study, there is a focus throughout on film direction as a profession rather than as an artistic vocation. A key motivation for Baker – as is probably the case for most film directors – was the desire for status within the industry, with this associated with the level of influence he was able to wield over the production process. From this perspective, the highpoint of Baker's career was the early 1960s when he became briefly a producer-director, with his later association with down-market Hammer and Amicus something of a letdown by comparison (although, paradoxically and with the possible exception of *A Night to Remember*, it is for his horror films that he is now best known).

Even as Mayer sets out Baker's career in professional and industrial terms, he also obviously wants to find something special and distinctive in Baker's films (otherwise why bother to write a book about him?). Again, Baker's career is sufficiently idiosyncratic to facilitate this, both in his unusual move from prestigious Rank productions of the 1950s to disreputable Hammer horrors of the 1960s and 1970s and in the undeniable quirkiness of some of Baker's films, notably the weird camp western *The Singer Not the Song* (1961). Having said this, Mayer carefully avoids making any excessive auteurist claims for Baker, preferring more modest statements such as 'within the aesthetic, institutional and cultural parameters of the popular film, Baker directed a number of outstanding and better-than-average films' (p. 1). Accordingly, when it comes to the discussions of Baker's films, the stress is on directorial technique rather than on grand directorial visions. The problem with this is that for some of his films, notably the later horrors, Baker's technique does not appear to be that distinctive, and Mayer's analyses of these films, while interesting in themselves, fail to separate them out to any significant extent from other horror films being made at the time. Clearly this relative directorial anonymity is the product of a low-budget production context and no doubt it helps

to account for Baker's dissatisfaction with this part of his career. But, conversely, the more obviously authored or stylised elements in Baker's earlier films might well be a function of a more generously funded production context rather than an expression of what might, in true auteurist fashion, be described as a 'Bakeresque' worldview. Mayer does hint at this in the early part of his book but this insight could have been more profitably developed than it actually is.

The section of Mayer's book that is arguably most successful in addressing the question of Baker's authorship is that which deals with the relevance of melodrama to his work: 'The moral legibility of Baker's films is the same as the emotional and moral registers of melodrama. However subtly rendered, it is the world of victims and pathos' (p. 82). Again, significantly, this idea works better for the films of the 1950s than it does for the horror films, and again one wonders – as indeed does Mayer himself – whether this is a general characteristic of 1950s popular British cinema. A more detailed speculative account of what Baker's version of *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (a film he attempted to get made before it became a key text for the British New Wave) might have looked like would have been interesting in this respect, and perhaps more interesting than some of the rather hurried accounts of individual Baker films we are offered. Similarly, a tantalisingly brief comparison of *A Night to Remember* with James Cameron's blockbuster *Titanic* (1997) in terms of melodramatic structure might have been expanded in a way that could cast a new and interesting light both on Baker and on 1950s British film culture.

As it stands, Mayer's book is not unlike Baker's career. There is a solid core of achievement here in its fascinating presentation of a director's professional journey through the British film industry, and it also contains enough 'oddities' to give it a pleasingly idiosyncratic character. However, Baker himself remains a decidedly enigmatic figure, sometimes coming into sharp focus but elsewhere lost from view. To a certain extent, Baker's enigma is also the enigma of the director, an apparently familiar figure in the

production process whose significance in film culture is not nearly as straightforward as we might imagine. If nothing else, Mayer's book suggests that the director study is a far from exhausted genre.

• Paisley Livingston

Torben Grodal, Bente Larsen, and Iben Thorving Laursen (eds), *Visual Authorship: Creativity and Intentionality in Media*. *Northern Lights Film and Media Studies Yearbook*, University of Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press, 2005. 272 pp.

'Authorship', 'auteur', and related terms raise difficult problems in cinema and media studies. Some of these problems are *empirical*, and more specifically, *epistemological*, in that they have to do with the difficulty of gathering reliable evidence pertaining to the questions one would like to answer about a film or other audio-visual work. For example, one would like to know more about Carl Theodor Dreyer's attitudes, and in particular, about the thoughts and schemes that guided him as he worked on *Day of Wrath* (1943). We would also like to know more about what happened during the making of this film, about how he collaborated with his co-workers, and about how the film was understood by its first audiences in Nazi-occupied Denmark and elsewhere. There are, presumably, states of affairs associated with these questions – facts that would in principle answer them, but this does not mean that we have any reliable means of finding out what these facts are, as the evidence is sparse and supports only fallible inferences. Peter Schepelern is admirably lucid on this score: 'Nothing can be taken for granted about a film's authorship, it can only be decided through a thorough analysis of each film's production process, an analysis that, in most cases, will be impossible to make' (p. 103).

Other problems raised by scholarly usage of the term 'author' are not in this sense 'empirical', but are semantic and conceptual. What does 'auteur', when used in French and in other languages, mean, and what ideas or notions are correctly associated with this term?

In other words, what sort of items is the word 'authorship' supposed to classify or single out, and what conditions govern its meaning and reference? It is clearly a mistake to assume that everybody agrees about the answers to these conceptual questions, and indeed, there may not even be genuine *disagreement* on this score, where genuine disagreement requires that people attribute contrasting or incompatible properties to some entity to which they are commonly referring. In some cases, there is not even disagreement about authorship, since the concepts in play do not even overlap. People wrongly think they are disagreeing when in fact they are not even referring to the same thing.

We can, contra Quine, maintain that the empirical and conceptual questions are reasonably (if not absolutely) distinct, but that does not mean they never interact. Intractable empirical problems sometimes end up aggravating the conceptual problem, since frustration over the lack of data pertinent to one topic may lead researchers to shift their attention to other matters. This is the point of the old story about the person who looks for his keys not where he probably lost them, but where the street lamp provides the kind of illumination that makes an optimistic search possible. In the arts, some people have been attracted to notions of authorship that short-circuit the empirical obstacles. Authorship, then, is not taken to be an empirical fact but is thought to be something made up or constructed by disparate audiences. One can readily grasp the *motivation* for espousing such a view in cases where the evidence is lacking, yet this does not give us a genuine *justification* for a thoroughgoing anti-realism about authorship, especially if authoring something is an action taken as having a causal influence in the world.

A number of conceptual questions and options associated with authorship are made manifest in some of the essays in the volume under review, the production of which was motivated by the idea that we need an alternative to the false choices on the market. As Casper Tybjerg aptly puts it, 'a more circumspect and modest conception of authorship should

help us move beyond the false alternative of either prostrating ourselves before the author-God or declaring him dead and gone' (p. 48). One of the options at work in several of the essays in this volume derives from the French and American versions of the '*politique d'auteur*'. This is a notion of authorship that is highly selective, normative, and honorific. To be an audio-visual author, or 'auteur' in this sense, one must be primarily if not solely responsible for the production of an innovative and valuable collection of works in the relevant media. Thus significant episodes of individual creativity are *conceptually* linked to authorship. (No serial creativity, no authorship!) One can accept this highly selective manner of understanding 'authorship' while deeming it an unhelpful piece of 'bourgeois ideology', or one can instead go about the difficult task of identifying those singular individuals who have met this high standard. Lars von Trier, many would say, passes the test with flying colours. The essays by Schepelern and Torben Grodal amply document the fact that von Trier operated on a longstanding intention of cultivating his own identity as a distinctive and creative author. Dreyer and Dennis Potter, it is argued, also qualify. The case for the lesser known Danish director Ole Palsbo is presented by Birger Langkjær.

A familiar objection to the honorific notion of authorship is that we sometimes are warranted to speak of hackneyed and mediocre authorship. Thus another conceptual option is to try to develop a less normative and more descriptive conception, or family of conceptions, of individual authorship. That would mean one could speak meaningfully of mundane, routine, uncreative, or even downright bad authorship. And delinking the concepts named by the words 'author' and 'oeuvre' (or 'life-work'), one could speak meaningfully of a case of brilliant, one-shot authorship. Another alternative in the conceptual construction of notions of authorship is to choose a classificatory scheme that allows for both individual and collective or collaborative authorship, which notions could be either normative or purely descriptive. The next task is

that of saying under what conditions the contributions made by more than one person at work on an audio-visual document count as instances of collective authorship as opposed to something else, such as disorganized or chaotic 'making'. The contributors to this volume say surprisingly little about this difficult problem, perhaps because it is so very difficult. Johannes Riis suggestively claims that even a film actor's involuntary expressive gestures ought sometimes to be counted as episodes of authorship, but the more general conception of authorship that warrants this perspective is not fully articulated.

Another conceptual step is to move from a purely descriptive conception of authorship to an explanatory one: an account of what happened in the making of a film can contribute to the story of its authorship only if it is at least a partial *explanation* of why the film has certain relevant features. Such a step is very bad news for the advocates of anti-realist or 'spectator-constructed' authorship. Patrick Colm Hogan insists on this explanatory condition in his paper, which interestingly sketches a connectionist model of a filmmaker's cognitive behaviour. Hogan opts to link this explanatory condition, not to a general, descriptive notion of authorship or film-making, but to an evaluative notion of the 'auteur' that includes strong creativity requirements. Hogan's definition, then, is 'an auteur is any person – director, producer, cinematographer, editor, star, set designer – whose *oeuvre* shows distinctive characteristics for any aspect of the film (narrative, sound, lighting, theme, etc.)', and he adds that 'the properties that distinctively characterize an auteur's *oeuvre* manifest some degree of creativity' (p. 84). On the assumptions that there is no bad creativity and that Johnny Depp's acting is consistently excellent, Depp, then, is an 'auteur'. This reviewer wonders whether many others will find this way of using the term something of a stretch.

Some of the essays in this volume are especially helpful with regard to empirical matters related to authorship. There are informative and insightful critical discussions of Lars Trier, and Tybjerg provides a very useful

survey of discussions of the authorship of Carl Dreyer. Anyone teaching some of Dreyer's works could find this an especially useful essay.

• Amy Sargeant

Alan Lovell and Peter Krämer (eds), *Screen Acting*, Routledge, 1999. ISBN: 0-415-18294-8.

Pamela Robertson Wojcik (ed.), *Movie Acting: The Film Reader*, Routledge, 2004.
ISBN: 0-415-31025-3.

What are 'Readers' for? On the one hand they seem to mark an opportunistic and relatively swift recognition on the part of publishers of a burgeoning area of academic interest. On the other, they can provide teachers and students with an easy summary of that subject and indicate gaps in its coverage yet to be explored. It is the job of the editorial matter to make sense of the selection, to re-contextualise individual items historically, politically, socially and theoretically, to identify discrepancies and continuities between contributors and to make the collection coherent and, if at all possible, readable.

In the earlier Routledge volume, this task is undertaken not only by Alan Lovell and Peter Krämer but in David Mayer's opening essay which rebukes academics who approach acting from a film studies or film history position (in general and in particular instances) for adopting a simplistic model of theatrical precedent and justly draws our attention to 'the lamination of various elements' (p. 17) and to codes which are 'intersecting but not homogenising' (p. 21). He sets out a number of issues relevant beyond the early silent period with which he is immediately concerned. Pamela Robertson Wojcik, in her introduction, settles on five key areas: ontological questions; stylistic questions; questions of authorship; historical questions and ideological questions. While Lovell and Krämer regret the lack of discussion in their book of acting as a profession, this is considered in a couple of Wojcik's choices; meanwhile Mayer's cautionary remarks are addressed to a number of

Wojcik's contributors and should be recommended to any student new to the field.

Lovell, Krämer and Wojcik attempt to explain the past woeful neglect of acting in the field of film studies as the product of an eagerness to distance cinema from the stage (in spite of many exchanges documented here of texts and personnel), preoccupations with directors and mise-en-scène and a certain tendency in the 1970s to reduce the significance of the actor to nothing more than a shot sign. Wojcik, however, includes pre-lapsarian excerpts from Siegfried Kracauer and Rudolph Arnheim (sadly stripped of the original illustrative examples). John O. Thompson's 1978 *Screen* article, 'Acting and the Commutation Test', re-printed by Wojcik, begins: 'At the moment, only those who oppose the semiotic study of the cinema seem to want to talk about acting.' (p. 37) Roberta Pearson produces her own version of a commutation test for Lovell and Krämer, comparing the actual performances of Frederic March and James Mason in the 1937 and 1954 versions of *A Star is Born*. Importantly, more emphasis is placed by Lovell and Krämer and their contributors on scripting and vocal delivery: Martin Shingler observes the mobility of Bette Davis' facial features and her body (the result, he suggests, of her dance training) and also her voice. Stars, it is stressed, should also be considered as actors. Lovell, Susan Knobloch and Gianluca Sergi respond to a similar brief in their case studies of Susan Sarandon, Helen Shaver and Morgan Freeman. Cynthia Baron's study of 'Acting in the Hollywood studio era', noting the favouring of theatrically trained actors with the coming of sound, is included in both collections.

Both books are predominantly concerned with Hollywood, with Lovell and Krämer also including interviews with the British stage and screen director Mike Leigh and the British stage and small and large screen actor Ian Richardson. Both books contain articles on Lee Strasberg, with Sharon Marie Carnicke, for Lovell and Krämer, comparing his methods with those of his supposed mentor, Konstantin Stanislavsky, and Virginia Wright Wexman, in Wojcik, identifying the success of the Method in Hollywood with a particular depiction

of masculinity in crisis in the 1950s. Wojcik herself makes some reference to acting manuals in her discussion of the development of type-casting as a standard studio practice (inherited from stock companies and legitimate theatre). Genre, under-discussed by Lovell and Krämer, is an issue for Henry Jenkins in Wojcik's inclusion of his 'A High-Class Job of Carpentry: Toward a Typography of Early Sound Comedy'. There is much gestural reference in Wojcik's selection to the influence of Stanislavsky and Brecht on various practitioners; students wishing to know how actors work with such models should, I think, look to Bella Merlin's 2003 Routledge guide to Stanislavsky and Meg Mumford's forthcoming companion to Brecht. Overall, the former book provides more information on procedures and the crafting of roles whereas the latter is more given to abstract speculation.

Wojcik's final section is devoted to the distinction between character actors and stars. Donald Bogle, in a set of three potted biographies, determines that Sidney Poitier was successful because 'For the white mass audience, he was a black man who had met their standards. His characters were tame; never did they act impulsively, nor were they threats to the system.' (p. 200) Patricia White, in her discussion of Agnes Moorhead, asks 'What is it that supporting characters are meant to "support" if not the imbricated ideologies of heterosexual romance and white American hegemony permeating Hollywood cinema?' (p. 212) White suggests that certain audiences read performances against this grain: 'As images of a different version of femininity than that of female stars, supporting characters may not ultimately be so supportive of the status quo, for they can deflect with female desire the image of woman embodied in the leading lady, with whom they are narratively paired and

iconographically contrasted, often within the same frame.' (p. 215)

However, Wojcik is, it seems to me, insufficiently critical of the material she presents. Terms such as 'realism' and 'naturalism' (provisionally defined by Mayer), slippery at the best of times, are used indiscriminately and yet pass without comment or clarification. François Delsarte is invoked, 'Delsartean' perfunctorily employed, but without any citation in the bibliography of his acolytes; Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin and Sergei Eisenstein are lumped together in the introduction in spite of their catalogued disputes over the question of typage and their different handling of actors and non-actors (raised, in passing, in subsequent chapters). These Soviet directors are set against Stanislavsky in spite of the fact that Pudovkin spent much of his life endorsing Stanislavsky's principles – principles which, as Merlin ably demonstrates, have often been misunderstood in translation and which mutated over time. Given that this Reader is presumably intended primarily for First Year undergraduate teaching, new students may well find the wobbly contradictions and the lack of explanations perplexing.

At the very outset, Wojcik acknowledges 'it can be very difficult to describe acting' (p. 1). Her inclusion of James Naremore's discussion of variety in Lillian Gish's performance in *True Heart Susie* (1919) presents a fine example. But film studies courses have, I think, discouraged and disparaged the very sort of detailed observation and description that is required to begin to answer the questions which Wojcik so usefully identifies. Both books are welcome in that they support a revival of interest in their subject. But how film performance is researched and conveyed seems to merit as much attention from teachers and students as the recognition of its importance.

Books received

- Akhater, Javed, *Talking Songs: Javed Akhater in Conversation with Nasreen Munni Kabir*, Oxford University Press, 2005, 252 pp.
- Benshoff, Harry and Griffin, Sean (eds) *Queer Cinema: The Film Reader*, Routledge, 2004, 242 pp.
- Berghahn, Daniela, *Hollywood Behind the Wall: The Cinema of East Germany*, Manchester University Press, 2005, 294 pp.
- Beumers, Birgit, *Nikita Mikhailov*, KINOfiles Filmmakers' Companions series, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 146 pp.
- Burton, Alan G., *The British Consumer and Co-operative Movement and Film, 1890s-1960s*, Studies in Popular Culture series, Manchester University Press, 2005, 260 pp.
- Chapman, James, *Past and Present: National Identity and The British Historical Film*, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 400 pp.
- Cook, Pam, *Screening the Past: Memory and Nostalgia in Cinema*, Routledge, 2005, 246 pp.
- Dalle Vacche, Angela (ed.), *The Visual Turn: Classical Film Theory and Art History*, Rutgers University Press, 2003, 279 pp.
- Downing, Lisa, *Patrice Leconte*, French Film Directors series, Manchester University Press, 2004, 166 pp.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, Alexander Horwath and Noel King (eds), *The Last Great American Picture Show: New Hollywood Cinema in the 1970s*, Amsterdam University Press, 2004, 391 pp.
- Evans, Peter William, *Carol Reed*, British Film Makers series, Manchester University Press, 2005, 194 pp.
- Fischer, Lucy and Marcia Landy (eds), *Stars: The Film Reader*, Routledge, 2004, 299 pp.
- Ganti, Tejaswini, *Bollywood: A Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema*, Routledge, 2004, 254 pp.
- Gibbs, John and Douglas Pye (eds), *Style and Meaning: Studies in the Detailed Analysis of Film*, Manchester University Press, 2005, 250 pp.
- Hughes, Howard, *Once Upon a Time in the Italian West*, I.B. Tauris, 2004, 288 pp.
- Ince, Kate, *Georges Franju*, French Film Directors series, Manchester University Press, 2005, 172 pp.
- Kaveney, Roz, *From Alien to The Matrix: Reading Science Fiction Film*, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 208 pp.
- Moor, Andrew, *Powell and Pressburger: A Cinema of Magic Spaces*, Cinema and Society series, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 250 pp.
- Riley, John, *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Life in Film*, KINOfiles Filmmakers' Companions series, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 150 pp.
- Rothman, Jack, *Hollywood in Wide Angle: How Directors View Filmmaking*, Scarecrow Press, 2004, 199 pp.
- Sergi, Gianluca, *The Dolby Era: Film Sound in Contemporary Hollywood*, Inside Popular Film series, Manchester University Press, 2004, 209 pp.

- Books received

Smith, Alison, *French Cinema in the 1970s: The Echoes of May*, Manchester University Press, 2005, 296 pp.

Smith, Andrew Brodie, *Shooting Cowboys and Indians: Silent Western Films, American Culture, and the Birth of Hollywood*, University Press of Colorado, 2003, 230 pp.

Smith, Sarah J., *Children, Cinema and Censorship: From Dracula to the Dead End Kids*, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 237 pp.

Tasker, Yvonne (ed.), *Action and Adventure Cinema*, Routledge, 2004, 414 pp.

Taubman, Jane, *Kira Muratova*, KINOfiles Filmmakers' Companions series, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 125 pp.

Temple, Michael, *Jean Vigo*, French Film Directors, Manchester University Press, 2005, 178 pp.

Widdis, Emma, *Alexander Medvedkin*, KINOfiles Filmmakers' Companions series, I.B. Tauris, 2005, 154 pp.

**If you are interested in reviewing any of the books listed above, or any other recently published film/film related book, or if you have a book you would like us to review, please contact the book reviews editor, Dr Sarah Cardwell, University of Kent:
s.e.cardwell@kent.ac.uk.**