

transpositions engender in cultural meanings. Whatever the heady mix of a difficult personality (he was married five times) and of cloudy metaphysics (Northern Protestant attracted to Buddhism), Wegener's enabling role in the arts of his time and his curiosity for the technical media which brought so many other creative forces into the films, ensure that his work contributes to a modernity in many ways just as radical as Expressionist storm-and-stress, while cautioning us from conflating his philosophy with the "reactionary modernism" of the late twenties and early thirties.

It would be pleasing to think that Paul Wegener *frühe Moderne im Film* could find a publisher able and willing to produce also an English (or French or Italian) edition. While waiting for such an eventuality, funds should be found to translate at least the chapter on *Der Golem*, for it is difficult to think of the work of many other scholars working in the field, perhaps with the exception of Yuri Tsivian, who like Heide Schönemann combine an extensive knowledge of art history and cultural studies with such a fine eye for filmic images and their multiple reverberations.

SELECTED BY: ANDRÉ GAUDREULT

Jacques Malthête, Laurent Mannoni sous la dir. de, *Méliès, magie et cinéma* (Paris: Musées, 2002)*

* André Gaudreault apologizes for being unable to send his review.

SELECTED BY: TOM GUNNING

Mark Garrett Cooper, *Love Rules: Silent Hollywood and the Rise of the Managerial Class*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003)

Love Rules offers a rather unique contribution to current American film history. This work poses a rather unique situation, uncommon in our somewhat young field of film history, of a work whose thesis I feel is ultimately wrong, but whose clarity in stating this thesis, depth of research in arguing it, and careful analysis of film form as part of its argument makes it a book which would be dismissed by our field only at the peril of ignoring one of the more serious and ambitious forays into American film history made in the last decade.

Recent works on American film history have shown a certain modesty and mostly have maintained a clear separation between stylistic evolution and the social uses of film as a medium. Thus we have on the one hand laudable works like Charlie Keil's recent *American Cinema in Transition* that provides an excellent and nearly quantifiable survey of the changes in narrational style during the period from about 1907 to 1913. On the social front, the continued feminist concern with film history, including such fine works as Shelly Stamp's *Movie Struck Girls*, has investigated not only issues of representation, but also film-going practices and uses of cinema in the transformations of gender occurring at the same time as film radically altered its social identity. But no one has offered the sort of overview of cinema's relation to society in a manner which takes as seriously the evolution of film form as Cooper does whose thesis gives film form a crucial role in shaping American attitudes.

The book simultaneously describes changes in American society in the late 1910s and 1920s, which the author relates primarily to the rise of the professional managerial class, and the establishment of the Hollywood feature film which the author claims achieved stability in this era through a particular visualization of a romance plot. The romance plot, which Cooper claims rules the vast majority of American feature films, consists not only of the traditional formula – sep-

eration (or threat of separation) followed generally by re-union of a white couple (Cooper emphasizes the racial aspect of the romantic union) – but involves a very specific visualization of this drama based in cinematic editing and composition. Love is expressed in the American cinema in terms of lover’s glances and longing looks, which are united by eye-line match editing or simply off-screen looks. Cooper sees the final re-union of lovers, after overcoming the obstacles that have separated them, not simply as a plot device, but as an essential visual resolution in which the lovers are placed in a safe, well-lit uncluttered space, in which it is indicated their love will be safe and will be fostered. Cooper’s other narrative deals with the rise of the managerial class and the transformations in American society in the 1910s and 1920s, especially the new concept of the public sphere this entails. Cooper provides a detailed discussion of the debate between Walter Lippman and John Dewey in the 1920s over the role of a new class of experts in transforming American democracy from a direct expression of the people’s will into a society heavily dependent of a class of professionals both in setting social agenda and proposing solutions to social problems.

Cooper’s book asserts a relation between the romance scenario of the cinema and this fundamental change in social values through which a managerial class of professionally certified experts in a range of areas (medicine, business organization, education, social science) gained unprecedented power over the daily life of citizens. It is here that Cooper’s book is most daring, and, in my opinion, runs into the most difficulty. Cooper asserts the visual presentation of the romance scenario (and hence its cinematic uniqueness) does not simply represent the changes in American society, but plays a crucial, and apparently causal, role in bringing them about.

This bonding together of film analysis and social analysis marks a major contribution and charts the ambition of Cooper’s work.

Revisiting his description of the romance scenario, one must introduce another key point of his analysis: the sense of what I would call an omniscient narrator in resolving the separation of lovers and creating the place of safety which fosters their love. Underlying the union/separation of lovers through eyeline matches is what Cooper describes as a spatial problem – most literally the separation of the lovers. However, the editing of the film brings lovers together even when they remain spatially separate, as if the film’s style could “see” a resolution the couple cannot. Apparently the crux of Cooper’s argument rests on an analogy between this omniscient narrative agency (an impersonal force which possesses more knowledge than the characters or viewer) and the new reliance of experts for social agenda and solutions. Thus Cooper claims:

Although the rise of public relations, market research, polling data, and sociology all clearly affected what it meant to represent the “public,” these fields of information arguably would not be able to compete and collaborate in the ways they do had cinema not first established as common sense the proposition that private individuals are incapable of representing their relationship to a larger social whole (p. 106).

But if the cinema did establish the proposition that “private individuals are incapable of representing their relationship to a larger social whole,” how was this done? Cooper’s basis for this assertion is a narratological analysis that finds a sense of order in films larger than an individual character’s perception. But can we move from this description of a form of narration to a claim about the nature of society? Even if the use of an omniscient narrator did indicate a desire for an impersonal authority, does this order necessarily take the form of professional expertise? More importantly, if the cinema actually tutored audiences to accept an expertise

beyond themselves to manage their affairs, wouldn't someone would have commented on it? No one ever made this analogy, not even commentators like Lippman or Dewey. This lack of recognition of the true cause of a social transformation needs to be explained. Was it repressed?

This lack of commentary could indicate an unconscious ideological process, but then Cooper needs to explain the model of the unconscious he is relying on. It could involve other mediating factors, but Cooper doesn't explain what they might be. He rests his argument primarily on the formal analogy between a narrative form with an impersonal regulator and the adoption of experts dedicated to impersonal professional roles. In other words, there is no real causal argument here at the center of the text. This is the crucial problem, indeed failing, of the book, but as much as it calls into question its central thesis, it does not lead me to dismiss it. Rather a new project of research opens up: figuring out what aspects mediate between a public's response to a new narrative form that gains unprecedented influence over a population and the types of transformations that society undergoes at the same time.

To my mind this attempt to relate film form to social change remains a bit premature and ultimately unsuccessful, but nonetheless brilliant in its conception of what could be the major issue of a serious cultural film history: how do cinema's specific resources for narration and fantasy construct a subject that relates broadly to the transformations in modernity? Cooper establishes some important issues for such an investigation and his treatment of Lippmann and Dewey provides a good entry to the issue. However, a more complex conception of the way the effects of a medium actually appear in society is needed, one rooted in actual discourse and discussions of the period, not simply in formal analogies. I think Cooper relies too much on a concept of similarity between the forms of film and the forms of social organization. This work needs

a complex theory of social spectatorship. That Cooper does not supply this may call his thesis into question, but does one expect such a theory from a scholar's first published book? This important emerging scholar has raised the issue of the relation between narrative form and social change with a new urgency and in a new context – and he has raised the stakes in the investigation of American film history.

SELECTED BY: FRANÇOIS JOST

Fernando Andacht, *El Reality show: una perspectiva analítica de la televisión* (Buenos Aires: Grupo editorial Norma/Enciclopedia Latinoamericana de Sociocultura y Comunicación, 2003)

Depuis plusieurs années, parallèlement à mes recherches sur le début du cinéma, je consacre beaucoup de mon temps à travailler sur la télévision. Invité à choisir un livre pour rédiger une note de lecture à l'intention de CINEMA & Cie, je m'interroge: est-ce qu'une recension d'un livre sur la télévision a un rapport quelconque avec le thème de notre revue? Le plus simple serait sans doute de répondre non. Pourtant, je sens bien que ce serait aussi trompeur que de répondre par l'affirmative. Que la télévision soit à des années-Lumière (!) du cinéma, en tant qu'objet, n'empêche que l'apparition de nouveaux formats comme la priorité accordée à la catégorisation générique obligent tout chercheur curieux (ce n'est pas un pléonasme) à interroger une fois de plus la relation de l'image à la réalité et la relation du chercheur à sa méthode. C'est animé de ces interrogations, en tout cas, que je tiens d'une main le petit livre, récemment paru en Argentine, de Fernando Andacht, *El Reality show*, et de l'autre mon stylo (l'exercice est acrobatique...).

La première chose qui me frappe, de ce point de vue, est l'étrange parallélisme entre