1

Introduction

Nigel Morris

A Companion to Steven Spielberg in part assesses the achievements and legacy of one of the most commercially successful and influential artists and entertainers (in any field) of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The collection overall is neither celebratory nor hostile but seeks to be analytical, informative, and critical. Within a rigorous academic ethos, contributors' different backgrounds, assumptions, and approaches ensure liveliness, contradiction, and passion rather than bland agreement, dry detachment, or strident uniformity. World-renowned scholars participate alongside emergent voices, offering fresh perspectives.

No other filmmaker's standing matches the career of one who has seen and lived through the 1970s Hollywood renaissance and the corporate retrenchment of the 1980s, and has adopted multiple roles through those and the ensuing decades, including director, producer, story deviser, businessman, popular historian, Holocaust memorialist, educator, and brand personification; these continue to develop within a synergistic approach that sets Spielberg apart from those contemporaries and protégés with whom he has been most often and readily associated.

While affirming that the Companion's guiding principle is to be prospective – to advance understanding and debates – it must be acknowledged that the project would have been unthinkable only a decade previously. A "landmark" international conference[1] in November 2007, enabled by six contributors to this volume, all of whom might until then have considered themselves lone voices, assembled a "remarkably wide range" of speakers who adopted an "overwhelmingly positive" tone and "largely lacked the defensiveness that only a few years earlier might have colored any such undertaking" (McBride 2009, 1–2). "The critical literature on Spielberg," as Joseph McBride points out, "is studded with astonishingly bilious and intemperate assaults" (2). Fred A. Holliday notes that "Spielberg and his cinema are often held up as the paradigm of everything that is wrong with contemporary Hollywood and its blockbuster-driven mentality" – including "dumbing-down of American culture" and propagation of "right-wing ideologies" (2008, 91). So powerful has been this tendency that colleagues at a Society for Cinema and Media Studies conference told Lester D. Friedman that Spielberg was the "antichrist" (2006, 3)

and that writing about his work would be career suicide: "the academic equivalent of appearing in a porn movie" (2).

This Companion emphatically eschews the defensiveness such inordinate comments or politer insinuations once elicited, even if it lingers in some contributions – as a latent presence in this introduction, perhaps – given the not fully reformed context in which they are written. As McBride opines, "critical debates about his films have become more nuanced, and the remaining Spielberg haters … seem increasingly passé" (2009, 1–2). Newfound esteem is indicated by an Irish Film Institute retrospective of Spielberg's work in January 2012, and the British Film Institute's use of images of E.T. in posters publicizing BFI Southbank (previously the National Film Theatre) in 2015. Nevertheless, background to the Companion includes blanket dismissal, not least by critics and academics who confuse Spielberg with other blockbuster directors. Enormous commercial appeal suggests that Spielberg's work must be symptomatic, expressive, and reflexive of the culture it responds to and contributes toward shaping, although the exact relationship is typically a matter of presupposition. Many pundits adopt an oppositional stance, either elitist or more or less consciously political, in relation to Hollywood cinema as predictable propaganda for the American way – of which Spielberg's output is at once one of the most salient, apparently typical, and hence, in view of its international success, most reprehensible embodiments. Spielberg's apparent adherence to classical form is, by many critics, confused, conflated, or equated with political conservatism, not least because of the association of blockbuster filmmaking with business and marketing strategies focused on maximizing profit and thereby pleasing the largest possible audience. Such classicism nevertheless sits awkwardly alongside Spielberg's multivocal address to different audiences, attendant stylistic range, and adoption of technological advancements in the realization of his audiovisual ambitions and his centrality to economic and industrial transformations. The latter associate him with the "post-Classical" Hollywood model of complex intersecting interests (Maltby 2003, 220), in terms of which his films are too often associated erroneously – at least, those that he has directed are – with simplistic, marketing-led, action-driven spectacle at the expense of character, narrative complexity, and thematic significance. Such assumptions are challenged and repeatedly disproven in the essays featured here.

With Lincoln[2] and Bridge of Spies, Spielberg has continued to consolidate a career phase in which much of his output, less characterized by blockbuster values than was always the case, receives respect although not universal admiration. Those two films maintain his lifelong exploration of, and experimentation with, cinematic form, based on or alluding to precedents both mainstream and – more than negative criticism acknowledges – sometimes notably abstruse. In this parallel concern with showmanship and artistry, based on the director's extensive knowledge of the medium's history and ceaseless curiosity about its function and possibilities, Spielberg echoes two of his more obvious formative influences: Alfred Hitchcock and John Ford, who, until nearly 50 years into their filmmaking, were similarly not taken seriously by arbiters of taste and quality (McBride 2011, 514).

Even at its most stately and classical, Spielberg's filmmaking does not default to a safe, unquestioning, would-be mimetic mode but rather uses style to highlight (should the spectator be inclined to notice) its own mediation and construction. Self-consciously dialogic positioning in relation to precedents in Hollywood and alternative traditions interrogates the adequacy of Lincoln, Bridge of Spies, or indeed any cinema, to events and issues portrayed. As an example of blindness to such possibility, former Village Voice film critic

(and academic) J. Hoberman has reprinted in a book his original review (2004) of *The Terminal*. The unamended article follows new material that describes the same (Presidential election) year's "extraordinary pageant of Ronald Reagan's funeral" as "subsuming all political conflict in a simplified, sentimental, personality-driven narrative – … the year's preeminent example of Spielbergization" (2012, 95). Gratuitous assumptions are made with the expectation of knee-jerk agreement, particularly offensive in that one might concur with the writer's world-view generally if reasoned evidence replaced the self-righteous harangue. Instead Hoberman glosses over the function and form of funerals, the links between personality, privilege, and the Presidency (and a particularly conservative one at that, aligned explicitly with religious groups such as the Moral Majority), the relationship between American individualism, popular fictions, and exemplary lives in politics and show business, the politics of news and the conventions of reporting, and the hegemonic connections between these important issues. The review then plunges intermittently from Hoberman's characteristic New York intellectual urbanity into an emotive and debased discourse, and logic constructed through impressionistic association and damning non sequiturs, neither of which are uncommon in hostile writing about Spielberg (Morris 2007, 4–5, 389–90), as if the author has to expend aggression to protect against contamination through enjoyment. It describes Tom Hanks's protagonist as "a real goat-fucker" who learns to speak "increasingly accomplished, cutely accented English," which in turn reminds Hoberman of certain Robin Williams roles, and thereby "more than passing resemblance to the repellently cloying Russian immigrant … in the Reagan-era heart-warmer *Moscow on the Hudson* [Paul Mazursky, 1984]" (Hoberman 2012, 96). Soon after, Hoberman's free association refers to "the most memorably offensive" of the multi-ethnic airport workers Hanks's character befriends, and calls them "elves" (97). The point here is not to attack any particular critic or their right to hold certain views, but rather to suggest how a pre-existent discourse – in this instance of "Reaganite entertainment" (Britton 1986) – dialogically fortified by anticipation of its audience's response, determines the argument and evidence presented.

Such negativity, damnation by association, and harsh rhetoric point to ongoing debates around popular culture and highbrow taste – entertainment versus art – as well as unresolved disputes specifically concerning ideological propensities and alleged effects of Spielberg's work. This Companion intervenes authoritatively into such tendencies. Focused primarily on Spielberg as director – as the series' remit demands – it acknowledges that his profitability in that role quickly elevated him into a major industry player whose work has considerable influence, as writer, producer, executive producer, or studio head, and in television and computer gaming, as well as the 30 feature films so far directed. Inevitably auteurist in orientation, then, the Spielberg Companion contextualizes and problematizes assumptions of that approach. It does so by recognizing the commercial author function as a marketing strategy, as pointed out by Barthes (1975) and Foucault (1977), and paying attention in some of the essays to Spielberg's early self-promotion, and subsequent reinvention of his image as a serious artist, a public figure, a celebrity, an educator, and so on. Beyond examining such attempts at consolidating preferred meanings, many of the authors are attuned to the ambiguity and complexity of Spielberg's directorial work that help make it popular across generations internationally and increasingly intriguing to criticism and scholarship.

The validity of authorship study and Spielberg's importance as a director, in terms of artistic value or, according to different criteria, as a cultural or economic phenomenon, are pragmatically taken as given. Nevertheless, from various perspectives within the now

mature disciplines of Film, Media, and Cultural Studies, contributors explore aspects of how such discourses function and are constructed. For all the shortcomings and contradictions associated with single director study – of which most writers of these pages are, as seasoned academics, aware – in practice directors are central to how cineastes and some types of fans classify movies and to how film industries promote, and reviewers judge, many of them. After all, *The Terminal* might mean something different if its director's name – evoking fixed connotations for some – did not associate it with what *Jaws* purportedly represents. Paradoxically, though, Spielberg's presence has confused perceptions of authorial provenance, due to the fact that he has sometimes written, often produced, and frequently been credited as executive producer without directing, with his name figuring at least as prominently as the director's. *Poltergeist* (Tobe Hooper, 1982) represents an extreme case in point.

Spielberg's status and significance are inseparable from the aesthetic, financial, technical, and cultural developments his image personifies – conveniently for journalism and public relations, although proper academic scrutiny demands more circumspection – irrespective of whether he is their cause or effect or, more complicatedly, their embodiment. Since *Jaws* supposedly inaugurated blockbuster production values and revolutionized marketing strategies,[3] Spielberg, as an extraordinarily popular filmmaker with a formidable record, is the most visible and widely known representative of the industry other than on-screen stars. As an example, the MacRobert Arts Centre at the University of Stirling, the venue where this editor as a 1970s undergraduate immersed himself in European Art Cinema and New Hollywood movies, has had a banner near the campus gate since 2015 proclaiming, "JAW-dropping prices." Its graphics and typography evoke the movie and the preceding cross-marketed bestseller. Forty years on, the narrative image retains potent recognition value and synonymity with "cinema," significantly disavowing distinction between popular and arthouse that the location's former status as a Regional Film Theatre upheld. To the extent that Spielberg now is associated with that film, he *is* cinema.

The centrality of auteurism to film culture, and of Spielberg's now widespread acceptance, as well as the approach's function as a marketing tool, are reiterated by press advertisements in April 2016 that proclaimed: "We are Hitchcock. We are the Coens. We are Spielberg. We are BFI Southbank." Such recognition, together with the popular and variably acclaimed titles and eventual industry prestige that followed *Jaws*, is cause for celebration by fans – and journalism that serves them – and a public relations coup for Hollywood. As a distinguished contributor to this volume put it a quarter of a century ago, Spielberg – with his colleague, collaborator, and rival, George Lucas – was "replacing the director-as-auteur with a director-as-superstar ethos" (Schatz 1993, 20). This makes Spielberg a scapegoat for critics who hold him responsible for tendencies they bemoan.

Part of the wider background to Spielberg's career is the emergence in the 1950s of *la politique des auteurs*. This was a youthfully provocative assertion of cinephilia, fandom, and cultural rebellion in France – *la politique* meant a "policy" or deliberate attitude – that had prompted the misleadingly termed authorship "theory" in the United States in the 1960s (Sarris 1968). The two were essentially different. The first valorized freedom and individualism promoted by Hollywood cinema that had been banned under Nazi occupation. Coinciding with recriminations, shortages, and national soul-searching, an extensive back catalogue had become suddenly available as American distributors flooded a previously inaccessible market, making it possible to detect or assert thematic or stylistic continuities associated with particular film practitioners. The *Cahiers du Cinéma* critics

championed Hollywood over what they saw as staid, unimaginative productions intended to promote traditional and establishment culture; these were made initially under Nazi patronage as propaganda that French values were not under threat from the Reich, and after the liberation as expressions of national continuity. As French New Wave directors, several *Cahiers* group members went on to bend aspects of Hollywood genres to contemporary French concerns while advancing technique through devices such as jump cuts, location shooting, and freely mobile camerawork.

Simultaneously in the USA, studios were failing to satisfy exhibitors' demands for a regular turnover of feature films. The 1948 Paramount decree had made movie making less profitable. Fewer were being produced but on higher budgets than before, while expertise and resources increasingly moved to television. The new medium symbolized and in effect promoted economic and lifestyle shifts antithetical to regular movie going. Among these were suburban dwelling that entailed commuting, separation from the extended family, car ownership, trips to the sea or the countryside, shopping malls, home ownership, housework, gardening, and home improvement. However, television alone was popularly blamed for declining cinema attendances. From the late 1950s to the late 1960s more North American theatrical releases originated overseas than from Hollywood (Wasser 2010, 34). These tended to play more in urban settings close to colleges, where better-educated audiences, likely to identify themselves in opposition to the conformity associated with television, were deemed more open to cultural differences and challenging material.

Thus was born art cinema, associated with sexual frankness not permitted under the Production Code; typically lower budgets, with emphasis on performance, dialogue, and serious themes; and cinematic experimentation, rather than genre conventions, lavish spectacle, and happy endings. Need to understand a foreign language or more likely, at least, willingness to read subtitles – itself a literary connotation – encouraged definite snobbery in the case of lesser known world cinemas. These films attracted audiences of a liberal disposition, who nevertheless looked down on both television and Hollywood movies. Intellectualism meshed with countercultural values that, as Frederick Wasser explains, "despised industrial production of culture and espoused self-expression" under the "romantic notion that economic success should only be the result of the people's embrace of the artist's authenticity" (2010, 35). Enlightened by European trends, such audiences considered film an art with its own traditions and auteurs, distinct from mainstream entertainment and high culture alike. A good portion of foreign product entering the United States was either shot in the English language (UK productions, for example) or dubbed into English (many Italian and French films were translated thus). The influx of overseas titles was very complex in terms of its range and diversity. Alongside English-language imports on television, it also came in the form of popular genre pieces playing in drive-ins and lower prestige theaters less inclined to exhibit "non-commercial" cinema, and thus provided further competition for the beleaguered American industry to reach another part of the baby boomer youth demographic.

Yet Old World intellectuals were discoursing knowledgably and enthusiastically on the mainstream popular medium against which art cinema as a preference and, increasingly, marketing category, defined itself. The so-called auteur theory effectively created pantheons based on taste – highly subjective, provisional, and context bound – that, without much reflection, enabled cineastes to discriminate (in all senses of the word) between products of the Dream Factory they had previously rejected wholesale but also to discuss some of them on the same lists as the work of revered international visionaries.

A journalistic novelty became an institution, valuable first for ascribing signatures to an otherwise industrial aspect of popular culture. A director's name placed "cinema," as opposed to anonymous "movies," alongside authored literature, drama, classical music, jazz, painting, and the other arts as personal expression, and increasingly it could come from anywhere. It could be respected as a manifestation of individual genius or initially an indigenous American aesthetic form, enabling it to be taught in art schools and later universities alongside practices originating in commercial calculation (such as spaghetti westerns) or revolutionary propaganda (Soviet montage) co-opted into high art. Inevitably, however, academic attention questioned romantic notions of artistry in a commercial and collaborative medium and, over half a century, nurtured other, more or less consciously political, approaches such as genre, industry, semiotics, stardom, structuralism/poststructuralism, psychoanalysis, formalism, cognitivism, negotiated and oppositional readings from various "minority" perspectives, and affect. Many of these either bracketed out or explicitly interrogated questions of taste and value.

The New Hollywood of the late 1960s and early 1970s[4] – influenced by the spirit and formal innovations of the French New Wave as well as gradual abandonment of the Production Code, which was replaced with a ratings system – represented a relatively open-minded approach to content and marketing. Ever more desperate studios allowed filmmakers comparative freedom in response to the unexpected success of unconventional youth-oriented films, most remarkably *Easy Rider* (Dennis Hopper, 1969), which, with a $450,000 budget (Hall and Neale 2010, 191), grossed $60 million in three years (IMDb) – a ratio of 133,333:1. It was during that period Spielberg's professional career began. He started out, Buckland (2006) contends, as a self-conscious stylist determined to be part of the burgeoning movement. With the television ratings and critical acclaim achieved by *Duel*, in particular after it was lauded following European theatrical release, Spielberg was feted as an auteur, a reputation subsequently untarnished by disappointing box office for *The Sugarland Express*. Ironically, *Jaws* was a project to which Spielberg had no great commitment. Nevertheless, as that film symbolizes the beginning of the end of the New Hollywood, his work's continuing profitability has led to him being blamed personally or as a representative of the industry at its most commercial as if, somehow, arthouse or New Hollywood were not profit oriented. *Jaws* is remembered not just as the first movie to break the $100 million box office barrier – erroneously, Sheldon Hall and Steve Neale point out (2010, 210), as that was *The Sound of Music* (Robert Wise, 1965) – but also as the epitome of cross-marketing, funding, distribution, test-screening, advertising, and release patterns which, Hall and Neale observe, had been used for other titles, and would have developed inevitably even if *Jaws* had never existed.

Critical theorists Stephen Heath (1976) and Fredric Jameson (1979) were aware of the cultural significance of *Jaws* very quickly, analyzing its meanings and their implications seriously and incisively – and, notably, before *Screen*, a journal whose title became synonymous with rigorous, politically inflected theory, was devoting much attention to contemporary mainstream output. Indeed Heath published his article in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* rather than a film journal. Jameson and Heath furthermore indicated no disrespect for *Jaws* as popular culture – they set out to understand rather than patronize or dismiss it. Even Andrew Britton, later one of Spielberg's most virulent critics, writing in *Movie* in 1976, analyzed the film positively and contrasted it against what he saw as the cynicism of Peter Benchley's novel. Where Britton got it wrong was in connecting the film's affect too closely with his fear of the masses: "The film is inconceivable without an enormous audience, without the exhilarating, jubilant explosion of

cheers and hosannas which greet the annihilation of the shark, and which transform the cinema, momentarily, into a temple" (27). As anyone who has analyzed the film will attest, studying it in solitude on a small screen to explain its effects indicates that these are as much to do with technique as the presence of an audience. If film going were no more than a ritual, patrons would respond accordingly irrespective of what was shown, even if the presence of others amplifies individual responses.

Spielberg's success and longevity can partly be attributed to the fact that he has never stopped experimenting. How many thrillers have two- or three-minute extended shots, blocked out in deep focus, as *Jaws* does in the cliff-top scene involving the power struggle between Brody (Roy Scheider) and Hooper (Richard Dreyfuss) and Vaughn (Murray Hamilton)? Or scenes like Quint's (Robert Shaw) *Indianapolis* speech, which is essentially a four-minute monologue, yet so effectively written, performed, and shot that it produces highly vivid and affecting images in the mind – a prime example of what Michel Chion calls "textual speech" (1994, 172) – and this near the climax of what is so often regarded as a relentless, visceral action flick? The movie works not just as shark attack piled upon shark attack, but by alternating light and dark, comedy and horror, action and contemplation, human drama and elemental conflict – and in a way that engrosses and startles. That is important, because even though *Jaws* exemplifies high concept, it fulfills its narrative image within the first 4½ minutes – yet keeps delivering for two hours.

Jaws is significant, too, and typical of much of Spielberg's output, for the gravity underlying what is much more than a rollercoaster holiday movie. James Kendrick's book *Darkness in the Bliss-Out* elaborates this aspect of Spielberg's work: "one of the film's most disturbing images," he writes, "is not of a shark attack, but rather a low-angle shot in the surf of an apparently lifeless elderly man who has been trampled by fellow swimmers and is being dragged out of the water" (2014, 145). But Molly Haskell got there first, when her original review pointed out how "Spielberg delights in showing us humanity – a kind of lynch mob perennially in the making – at its worst" (1975) – hardly what would one might expect as a reaction to a popular confection.

Spielberg is unquestionably a cultural phenomenon to be addressed from a plethora of approaches, not simply derided or defended. Retrospectively, however, his work's profitability coincided with the first inklings of the demise of New Hollywood cinema, even if it would be a few years before the financial catastrophes of the likes of *Heaven's Gate* (Michael Cimino, 1980) and *One From The Heart* (Francis Ford Coppola, 1982) – and, indeed, Spielberg's *1941* – heralded a definitive end to high budget maverick filmmaking. Later blockbusters confirmed the kind of business model that *Jaws* came to epitomize as much by luck as by intention, Spielberg's or anybody else's. His success and public recognition were simultaneous also with resurgent conservatism that culminated in Reagan's election and second term. Spielberg's emphasis on families, although a moment's reflection would confirm them to be dysfunctional (a topic Linda Ruth Williams explores in her essay in this book) – even before and long after Reagan adopted the rhetoric of "family values" – made it all too easy for some commentators to dismiss Spielberg's output. The director's films were either unworthy of attention or crudely asserted to be causally related to, on the one hand, prevailing political trends and, on the other, the decline of "innovative and off beat" productions that actually, Schatz explains, resulted from changes in tax laws that previously favored investment in independent films (2003, 21).

Although it was never calculated that the collection should be encyclopedic, between them the present writers cover Spielberg's full feature output as director up to and

including *Bridge of Spies*. Prospective contributors were approached initially, a handful at a time, on the basis of existing expertise but were offered the opportunity to range outside their usual interests if they wished, to maintain freshness and originality. Some are established Spielberg scholars; others are discussing the director for the first time. The book's structure has thus evolved from a loose initial conception, adapted to incorporate each new commission, modified again retrospectively to impose some coherence on the range of essays submitted. There are doubtless other ways the material could be presented. Each essay is independent and self-contained and there is no particular order in which they should be read. Nevertheless, numerous intersections, overlaps, continuities, and complementarities appear, given Spielberg's extraordinary range of entertainment industry interests; these, while the volume overall focuses on his role as a director, constitute parallel and indeed – as several contributors explore – sometimes mutually compromising as well as synergistic careers.

The 25 chapters that follow are grouped under seven headings: "Industry and Agency," "Narration and Style," "Collaborations and Intertexts," "Themes and Variations," "Spielberg, History, and Identity," "Spielberg in the Digital Age," and "Reception."

The first section comprises "Spielberg as Director, Producer, and Movie Mogul" by Thomas Schatz and "Producing the Spielberg 'Brand'" by James Russell. Schatz disentangles Spielberg's filmmaking across distinct career phases, detecting a gap between "corporate" and "artistic" efforts, reflected in Spielberg's erstwhile uneasy relationship with the Motion Picture Academy. *Jurassic Park* and *Schindler's List*, "enormous hits" produced simultaneously, Schatz considers "utterly antithetical pictures that evinced the yin and yang of Spielberg": blockbuster showmanship and creative artistry. These films – which, one might add, currently come halfway in Spielberg's professional filmography, numerically and chronologically – mark a watershed. They reversed Spielberg's fortunes at the one time his activities as director, producer, and mogul meshed constructively rather than coexisted in awkward tension. The two films attracted huge acclaim, together garnering 10 Oscars (including Best Picture and – a first for Spielberg – Best Director). They tempered his standing after a backlash, from which his image still suffers, that he was seen as commercially cynical, based on his executive producing of children's films. They furthermore saw him taking risks: substituting CGI (computer-generated imagery) for puppetry in parts of *Jurassic Park* (thereby redeeming his reputation as a proponent of special effects); tackling difficult subject matter in *Schindler's List*; and, for the latter, abandoning storyboards to create a more spontaneous style in partnership with Janusz Kaminski. Spielberg's Director of Photography ever since, Kaminski has worked with him on a series of darker films in the post-9/11 era, none of them a commercial hit on the scale previously associated with the director. All this Schatz documents against Spielberg's rise as a creation of the Hollywood system and his mastery of deal making and industry politics, which earned him enormous freedom yet, ironically, curbed his directing with distractions from the demands of managing Amblin and the particularly troublesome DreamWorks project.

James Russell extends and integrates different authorship approaches to examine continuities between Spielberg's earlier reputation as a children's director and his preeminence as an educator. Both roles help market Spielberg's image as a commercial brand, thus connecting Russell's chapter with others that deal with Spielberg and childhood and those that explore his roles not only as a director but also a businessman and a public figure. American cinema, Russell notes, increasingly creates distinct brands that are highly valuable as marketing propositions and as legal properties. Spielberg

himself facilitated this through involvement with franchising, licensing, and serials. His own brand recognition accrues in attacks as well as praise – "Spielbergian" is a familiar epithet – as evidenced by Hoberman above. Russell relates how Spielberg's position as producer, often loosely defined, brands other directors' work as a mark of quality, promise of a particular kind of experience, or as addressing particular themes, whether in block-buster entertainment or low-budget documentaries. Like Schatz, Russell considers *Schindler's List* a turning point. Thereafter the brand repositions from high-profile family films to that of a public figure whose filmmaking frequently asserts an educationally and socially transformative function that nevertheless resonates with parenting and childhood themes that permeate his work. In the context of wider social and economic influences on the audience demographic, Russell considers Amblin and DreamWorks SKG as unifying Spielberg's output with other directors', before considering in detail his involve-ment with the Shoah Foundation, Holocaust documentaries, and associated educational initiatives including the Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation.

Spielberg's concern from the outset with managing perceptions and the status of his work is apparent from "Magisterial Juvenilia: *Amblin'* and Spielberg's Early Television Work," Nigel Morris's contribution to the section "Narration and Style." This offers a detailed and comprehensive account of Spielberg's professional output before – and indeed briefly after – his feature breakthrough. Spielberg utilized affordances of television directing – opportunities to work with knowledgeable and efficient technicians and expe-rienced performers, against constraints such as tight schedules, routine practices, and low budgets, as well as formulaic scripts structured around advertising – to produce a com-pendium of allusions and techniques that attract attention and assert ambition. Apparent in this early output are continuities with the self-reflexivity and intertextuality characteristic of Spielberg's later features, even though television viewers' attention may differ greatly from that pertaining to the prolonged intense gaze, and indeed auteur expectations, in cinema. By 1971, when *Duel* attracted huge acclaim – a television movie-of-the-week that, in Europe, became Spielberg's first theatrical release – he had evolved a highly visual nar-rational style, often dialogue-free, with camera positions, movements, and editing points strictly motivated. Cinema and television were distinct, and competing. Film, lacking synchronized sound, had elaborated a rich visual rhetoric during its formative years that continued into the classical and postclassical eras, which Spielberg had internalized. Television was an extension of broadcasting – talk-based, an outgrowth of radio – limited by small screens, poor image quality and, until less than a decade previously, to live studio transmission. Drama was wordy, performance-centered, and characterized by close-ups. Such distinctions the young Spielberg simply ignored in the move he helped pioneer from studio-bound drama to television films.

Spielberg's celebrity and the disdain with which some regard him go back to the rapidity of his transition from first-time television director in 1969 to having directed Hollywood's biggest box office hit a mere six years later. Unsurprisingly, then, writings about his early features center on *Jaws* and *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*, both massive successes and definitive in establishing what a Spielberg film looks like. As James Kendrick recognizes, because these two films receive so much attention, his others from that era remain comparatively little known. In "Finding His Voice: Experimentation and Innovation in *Duel*, *The Sugarland Express*, and *1941*" Kendrick explores those marginal-ized 1970s films – respectively a made-for-television thriller, his first theatrical feature, and a "failed" World War II comedy. Kendrick provides close textual analysis of their aesthetic, thematic, and narrative features and how they relate to Spielberg's later films. In *Duel* and

The Sugarland Express, Spielberg was developing an individual style, trying out approaches to sound, image, identification, and narrative that align him with innovative directors of the New Hollywood as well as leading lights of the classical era. *1941*, conversely, came after the massively profitable *Jaws* and *Close Encounters*, yet it continues the experimental tendency – even, Kendrick contends, thwarting expectations of what Spielberg would do next. Together, Kendrick argues, his three selected films demonstrate ambition and versatility, confidence to embark in new directions, and willingness to respond to what Spielberg thought audiences wanted while also pushing beyond what was tried and tested.

In "Creating a Cliffhanger: Narration in *The Lost World: Jurassic Park*" Warren Buckland applies to one sequence close analysis of the kind he has advocated and practiced with other films (2006). He demonstrates how Spielberg's creative decisions are integral to the meaning and, by extension, pleasures and success, of what might in other hands have been conceived of as, and resulted in, formulaic filmmaking. Buckland eschews romantic auteurist assertions of individual genius permeating a text with its unique vision. Rather he locates Spielberg's status in effective employment of cinematographic and editing conventions to create particular moods, attitudes, or understandings. These are more intense than is explicable by any notional transfer of information from script to screen, that holy grail of "fidelity" characteristic of outmoded approaches to adaptation that failed to consider complexities of different media's specific signifying practices. They result, as Buckland illustrates, from choices made by the director and his collaborators that reveal or restrict information, encourage identification by aligning knowledge with certain characters, build tension, fulfill or overturn expectations with concomitant pleasures and investments associated with suspense or surprise, and achieve engagement by judicious construction of off-screen as well as on-screen space and sound. The precision of Buckland's observation and description, grounded in the discipline of statistical style analysis, are exemplary of how limitations of formalism can be transcended when it becomes a methodology to provide data for evaluation or interpretation as opposed to an end in itself. Whatever criteria investigation favors are determined by the purpose and focus of the study, from aesthetic to consciously ideological, institutional to affective. Buckland highlights the craft and artistry of what might otherwise be dismissed as a trivial piece of work, thereby hopefully encouraging other scholars to move beyond subjective and impressionistic assertions.

Over more than a third of a century, mainstream film endings have tended to become more elaborate, Michael Walker points out in "Steven Spielberg and the Rhetoric of an Ending." Many exceed the basic requirement to deliver satisfactory conclusion to "a tale well told." They demonstrate self-consciousness about the ending as ending, Walker argues, mobilizing material that resonates with audiences in various ways. Elements from the preceding narrative blend with imagery considered appropriate for an ending – one of Walker's primary examples is the sunset – and which is also presented in distinctive manner. Most familiar is a concluding helicopter shot that moves back not simply to withdraw the audience emotionally from the story but also to suggest plenitude – fulfillment in the tale's completion as well as celebration of the natural richness of the landscape. As more such elements are incorporated, and as the style works more overtly to display the ending, we could speak, Walker suggests, of the rhetoric of an ending. Looking at the full range of Spielberg's feature films, Walker shows he is a director whose endings frequently exhibit this sort of elaboration. The chapter considers the nature and associations of the elements Spielberg brings into play. Endings comprise liminal *sequences* – transitions between characters' structures of relationships or individual states of being within the

diegesis, but also from the spectator's immersion in the film toward blinking as the lights go up, akin to what Fiske and Hartley (1978) term boundary rituals. They furthermore, Walker makes apparent, typically occupy liminal diegetic *settings*. These include beaches, geographical boundaries, evolutionary and technical frontiers, interplanetary landing and launch sites, interpersonal – and indeed, psychoanalytically speaking, intrapersonal – spaces, as responsibility for narrative resolution transfers between protagonists and superego authority figures. In the process, wider questions of narrative structure, meaning, and interpretation are addressed, including mythical connotations and Spielberg's connection with aesthetic traditions stretching back to Romantic poetry, through fine art painting, and from silent cinema.

Steven Rybin further employs purposeful, formalist analysis as an aspect of his study, together with theories of performative gestures derived from Rudolf Laban in theater and dance concerning systematic expression of characters' inner experience. "The Spielberg Gesture: Performance and Intensified Continuity" starts from the familiar observation that central to performance in Spielberg's films is the closely framed face. This typically expresses wonder and invites participation in transcendence of dissatisfaction with the diegetically represented social world. Rybin goes against descriptions of Spielberg's characters as solipsists, however, seeing them instead as reacting to, or against, particular social circumstances. Spielberg's distinctive facial close-ups, he points out, often result from transformation of some other shot that includes initially a context for the actor's performance. Distilled into the latter, then, are broader elements, involving interaction with (now off-screen) other characters or perceived threats as well as with the mobile camera. Economical gestures and expressions synthesize classical and intensified continuity styles. Classical style makes acting more a causal "driving force" that appears to motivate cinematography and editing, whereas in intensified continuity it becomes an integrated structural element. Spielberg's practice evidences subtle evolution of the spectator's relationship with the screen actor, and the character's relationship with diegetic space that allows Rybin to question critical accusations of manipulation and sentimentality concerning identification and subjectivity. Rybin concludes by considering how these relationships shift in the different ontology of CGI effects when actors must signal characters' responses to events that, during shooting, they literally can only imagine.

The team of John Williams and Steven Spielberg is the longest composer–director collaboration in history. It reaches 41 years with the release of *The BFG* in summer 2016, following an enforced separation (due to Williams's health) that led to Thomas Newman scoring *Bridge of Spies*; the only other break was Spielberg's brief liaison with Quincy Jones on *The Color Purple* (part of the controversial attempt of that film, which Jones also produced, to remain true to African American culture in the face of perceived commercial necessity at that time for a white director). According to Jack Sullivan, whose essay "Spielberg–Williams: Symphonic Cinema" starts the section "Collaborations and Intertexts," that musical alliance represents "the gold standard" for artistry, the greatest since Bernard Herrmann and Alfred Hitchcock. Indeed, as Sullivan explains, intriguing overlaps and direct continuities link the two marathon partnerships. Not only might one romantically posit the passing on of a flame but also, Williams insists, both directors' creative sensibilities concerning music, and the working relationships involved, are remarkably similar. As did Hitchcock, Spielberg works meticulously with his composer in every detail of sound construction. What makes Williams the ideal Spielberg composer, Sullivan contends, is his fanatical technical professionalism, a parallel to Spielberg's. Unlike many Hollywood composers, Williams orchestrates his scores by hand, every last

note of every part. For Williams, the physical sound of an instrument and the atmosphere it creates are as important as melody; he persists in using a full orchestra rather than synthesizers, and some of his best known scores are credited with saving symphonic film music when many in the industry had predicted its demise. Combining close readings of the films, interviews with Williams, and insightful musical analysis that remains accessible to readers without specialist knowledge, Sullivan shows that Spielberg and Williams together preserve the values of Golden Age Hollywood while carrying them forward with constant innovation.

"Spielberg and Kubrick," Peter Krämer's study, starts by tracing striking resemblances between the two directors' early careers, even though they were a generation apart and made their names in very different sociocultural and industrial contexts. The direct and indirect influence of *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) on *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* demonstrates Spielberg's modeling of much of his previous work on Kubrick's, whom he regarded as one of the greats of cinema and whose career trajectory, Krämer suggests, he may well have set out consciously to emulate. But Krämer also identifies thematic similarities at comparable stages in their careers, of which Spielberg was almost certainly less aware at the time. The older filmmaker had become increasingly interested in portraying parent–child relationships, particularly maternal bonds, a theme that has long been recognized as characterizing the younger director's work. Krämer documents the pair's developing personal and professional friendship, which was to culminate in their collaboration on *A.I.*, which Spielberg eventually shot and completed after Kubrick's death. Initial reviewers saw *A.I.* as indicating very different, even contradictory, sensibilities. Kubrick's cool analytical style and interest in artificial intelligence, human–machine interactions, and more generally humanly created systems that turn Frankenstein-like on their makers, as manifested not least in *2001*, seem far removed from Spielberg's repeated narration of quests to reunite children with parents. This chapter, however, demonstrates conclusively which aspects originated with which side of the partnership – previously a matter of journalistic and academic conjecture, often tainted with prejudice. Basing his judgment on access to previously unpublished information through extensive research in the Stanley Kubrick Archive, Krämer contends that Spielberg remained faithful to Kubrick's preparation in making *A.I.*, rather than extensively altering anything to stamp his own mark on the project. Kubrick's approach, on the other hand, had at an early stage been affected already by *E.T.* Part of Krämer's intention in telling this story of revelations and surprises is to treat Spielberg as a serious filmmaker, a claim that he deems "is still necessary to present in the face of continuing doubts."

Like most Hollywood films, Spielberg's have tended to be adaptations from previously published material. I.Q. Hunter considers in "Spielberg and Adaptation" how this typicality confirms the filmmaker's conformity, indeed centrality, to Hollywood institutional practices, while his unique negotiation of this commercial necessity reinforces perceptions of him and, as other contributors to this book note in different ways, is a major factor in the establishment and evolution of his brand image. Spielberg's sources range widely from pulp blockbusters and airport paperbacks to contemporary literary novels, genre classics, non-fiction, children's books, short stories, and comic books. His other films, Hunter observes in a chapter that neatly draws together important developments that have revitalized adaptation theory over the last 20 years, embrace adaptation in the extended sense of being sequels, remakes, or massively allusive, intertextual riffs on genres and clichés. It is certainly true, Hunter concedes, that a number of Spielberg's most significant, and arguably best, films were adapted only from their own screenplays

(although some of these are "inspired by a true story") but nevertheless his status as an auteur is inextricable from his success in adaptation. The chapter is not, however, about comparing the films with the books or judging the fidelity of the transformations. The focus is rather on the role of adaptation in Spielberg's career profile and reception as a director in the context of a film production culture in which it is just one reference point in a matrix of intertextual relations created by synergic cross-promotion (including, for example, video games, graphic and literary novelizations, CD soundtracks, multiple Director's Cuts and DVD versions, prequels, sequels, and franchises). Crucial, for example, is how in the 1980s literary adaptation, as opposed to cinematic homage and pastiche, signified a new "seriousness" in Spielberg's films, while maintaining continuities with his most important themes. Hunter compares Spielberg with Hitchcock, Kubrick, and Cronenberg, each of whom established and transformed his authorial signature through different approaches to adaptation.

Neil Sinyard's title, "'A very cruel death of innocence': Notes Toward an Appreciation of Spielberg's Film of *Empire of the Sun*," quotes the director as a way in to exploring the film as an adaptation of J.G. Ballard's novel. The study challenges the view of a number of critics – including Sinyard himself at the time of the original release – that the film's alleged sentimentality weakens and simplifies its source, and argues instead that it is true to the novel's surrealistic as well as realistic qualities. Accordingly it finds imaginative cinematic correlatives to what Sinyard considers the book's elusive tone. Sinyard draws on the film's production history, including David Lean's initial involvement and ongoing aesthetic influence, and other aspects of its context, literary and cinematic intertexts, and reception – not least Ballard's admiration for its achievement – to support his main argument. This is that the film is both typical of Spielberg in its fabulous visual craftsmanship and sensitive portrayal of childhood, but also a bold movement of the director into a new terrain of moral ambivalence, emotional complexity, and war-induced brutality. The result, Sinyard concludes, is one of the most original and unusual of all war movies, one that is neither pro- nor anti-war, nor favors one side over another. War here is the unavoidable, expressive, and essential backdrop for the perilous progress of a hyper-imaginative boy toward a singular adulthood. Hence it is an example of the ambiguity and multi-discursiveness of Spielberg's work that is being increasingly recognized but that in this instance, Sinyard contends, was a factor in the film's box office failure.

"Themes and Variations" begins with "'Who am I, David?': Motherhood in Spielberg's Dramas of Family Dysfunction." Linda Ruth Williams explores Spielberg's recurring representation of the family as what she describes as "an ambivalent, damaged and damaging entity." Children and childhood are central to the director's work, as narrative agents and the focus of culturally resonant images and ideas. Spielberg tells children's stories for family audiences and makes child's point-of-view films for adults. These representations often underpin accusations that the director's work is sentimental and emotionally manipulative. However, children in his films are not invariably flawless or innocent, and the child also signifies failure as well as idealization, bearing witness to and sometimes provoking acute family dramas. Such concerns anchor and humanize cinematic spectacle. Reciprocally, spectacle provides a vehicle for examining the family in all its fallibility; as Spielberg acknowledges, melodrama imposes itself on his work in other genres. Williams turns the spotlight on mothers, whose experiences confirm that underlying Spielberg's movies is, she concludes, "a dark vision indeed." Idealized mothers exist in Spielberg's work, but fleetingly. Complex, troubled mothers are the norm. Concentrating on four case studies, Williams observes, among other insights, that while childishness

perhaps makes fathers more whole, replacing a human element suppressed in the formation of masculinity, as in *Close Encounters*, in the case of mothers it signifies failure and is denigrated. These films express the contradictions of the wider culture. In *E.T.* children are strong and responsible yet the mother insufficiently differentiates herself, undermining her authority. Focalization encourages critics to read the film in terms of the absent father, not husband. *The Sugarland Express* remains Spielberg's most overlooked film and may have failed commercially, Williams suggests, not merely because it ends unhappily but because, unusually, it is a road movie in which the mother drives the action even though not literally holding the wheel. Comedy does not fully counteract the film's nihilism, but rather produces unsettling ambivalence. *A.I.* posits a mother who is monstrous for putting maternal desire before her adopted surrogate son's happiness, failing to protect him while seeking egotistical gratification from his unconditional love; yet, Williams acknowledges, Spielberg makes the audience feel the agony of her predicament, even while empathizing with David. After these mother–son stories, Williams proposes there is a need for more study of the daughters in Spielberg's work.

In "Close Encounters of the Paternal Kind: Spielberg's Fatherhoods" Murray Pomerance begins with an overview of shifts in family relationships since the Industrial Revolution and concomitant challenges to traditional masculinity. His essay examines a crisis in paternal authority as manifested in father–son interactions, or indeed lack thereof, as a recurrent theme across many of Spielberg's films – one that gains resonance from allusions to intertexts that appropriately are the heritage from which Spielberg's creations are the offspring. Like Williams, Pomerance reads these concerns as partly autobiographical, in accordance with known facts about Spielberg's life, including comments made in interviews, but also as manifestations of deeper cultural malaise. Like Walker's earlier chapter too, Pomerance here draws on traditions in painting; these he uses to argue that Spielberg's representations, characters in actual or figurative father roles, are constructed in specifically audiovisual – that is, cinematic – terms that provide a simultaneous commentary alongside identification with characters and their situations. This double address, nevertheless, is sometimes – as in the Indiana Jones series – knowingly spiked to maximize commercial appeal to the movie's target demographic. Much more serious, however, is the example of *Amistad*, for which Pomerance makes a strong case – partly supported by the director's personal experience as an adoptive parent of African American children – that patriarchal ancestry unites American and African leaders in parallel relations to belief systems that ultimately assert common humanity in the face of the abhorrent institution that is slavery. The remainder of the essay considers what Pomerance terms "incoherent" father–son relationships, or surrogates for them, across a range of tonally very disparate movies, from different stages in Spielberg's career. These demonstrate in various ways the fragility, corruption, or inadequacy of a once much-revered social bond.

Frederick Wasser's "Spielberg and Rockwell: Realism and the Liberal Imagination" confirms that Spielberg's connection with Americana is fascinating not least for his career's coinciding with the political and cultural turn of the American polity toward the hard right. An ostensible liberal Democrat, Spielberg has built huge audiences. While these have become increasingly international, he continues to address broad portions of the American spectrum. Spielberg tries to bridge political divides with repeated declarations that he is an entertainer. Therefore it was easy to accuse his early films of a complacent ideology that facilitated neoliberalism. But Spielberg's films have always blended political concerns with entertainment. His narratives have reflected and crystallized

evolving belief systems of the post-1960s generation. For all the fantasy elements and apparently classical conventions that seemingly justify rejection as escapism or cynical, formulaic, wish fulfillment (and may indeed contribute to extraordinary profitability), there has always been commitment to a version of realism inseparable from mode of address. Spielberg's generation is the first really to accept movies as co-equal with other ways of experiencing life. Spielberg overtly shares his love of Hollywood movies and this allows audiences quickly to grasp his narrative frames. He creates increasingly ambitious films inspired by current American dilemmas yet utilizing populist images from the New Deal era. His work thus demonstrates contradictions that permeate American popular culture. In parallel with Pomerance's insistence on painterly qualities derived from fine art intertexts, Wasser argues that Spielberg's movies occupy a similar position to realism as did the illustrations of Norman Rockwell. To write Spielberg off as a manipulative storyteller in service to a dominant conservative ideology is to overlook the strategy of manipulation borrowed from Rockwell, which lies in closely observed details.[5] Commitment to realism leads both as artists to present a liberal critique of America even while maintaining huge popularity. After an overview of Spielberg's earlier suburban cycle, Wasser presents *Catch Me If You Can* as exemplifying this kind of critical realism in contrast to the fantastic history of Zemeckis's *Forrest Gump* (1994).

Questions of realism and ideology also inform Stephen Prince's contribution, "Too Brave for Foolish Pride: Violence in the Films of Steven Spielberg," along with further demonstration of ambivalence. Prince traces Spielberg's increasingly sophisticated and reflexive approach to screen violence and concludes that the director is an iconoclast who has "radically redesigned" representational conventions. While Spielberg's early features came in the midst of an explosion of grotesquery and boldness released by the ending of censorship, he waived the opportunity to produce images as explicit as in *The Exorcist* (William Friedkin, 1973) or *Taxi Driver* (Martin Scorsese, 1976). Although Spielberg represented violence imaginatively, the acts portrayed were not treated reflectively. He avoided the graphicness and stylization associated with Sam Peckinpah, suggesting to Prince that he was not yet fully questioning the implications of the violence for the characters, the story, the filmmaker, or the audience. In *The Sugarland Express*, for example, professional snipers coldly discuss and carry out a police assassination of a suspect in a way calculated to create unease in the viewer and that jars with the film's prevailingly comic tone, which earlier had been cemented with a spectacularly hyperbolic shoot-out. This inconsistency may have contributed to the film's poor box office. *Schindler's List* and subsequent historical dramas, however, employ filmic violence consciously to shock audiences into awareness of human cruelty, using gore not to seek identification with protagonists' thirst for vengeance but rather to question conventional assumptions around heroism and villainy, complicating moral certainties and eschewing glory in killing. Simulating violence unflinchingly, yet sidestepping editing conventions that stress spectacle and excitement rather than victims' plight, Spielberg instead, Prince establishes, controls shot length and depth of field to highlight the drama and injustice of events. He thereby establishes a moral framework for their representation. While *Saving Private Ryan* stages warfare more familiarly to provoke visceral reaction, it significantly darkens Hollywood's notions of heroism by emphasizing scale and chance to undermine any sense that individual character makes much difference. Thus ideals of patriotic glory in war are complicated and heroism becomes more existential than narrowly ideological. In a study that ranges across Spielberg's features, Prince concludes that while these move progressively further from moral certainty there remains a contradiction with the commercial need for popular appeal.

Sarah Barrow's "Morality Tales? Visions of the Past in Spielberg's History Plays" opens the section on "Spielberg, History, and Identity." It explores how Spielberg's more serious and overtly political films, after what Barrow characterizes as the "dark turn" of the 1990s, represent historical occurrences. Polarized responses are again explained in terms of some critics' failure to recognize contradiction. Barrow sees uncertainty and ambiguity, embodied in protagonists, their motivation, and their responses to events, as contributing to the critical and commercial success of these moral tales as they appeal across national and cultural boundaries yet remain emphatically North American in their topics and mode of address. Past conflicts relate to present concerns and are relatively easy to understand yet the films remain undecided and provoke controversy. This is despite, indeed separate from, Spielberg's clearly articulated politics in interviews and wider public activities. Barrow regards Spielberg's protagonists as struggling to find the right path and confronting their personal shortcomings. This makes the films dramatically engaging while "wry knowingness and wit" position their attitude to various forms of absurdity, resulting from inhumane logic or simple incompetence, that characters encounter. Film noir, Barrow argues, is one stylistic and moral frame for protagonists' existential doubts and the dangers these exacerbate. "Inconsistencies of Western civilization" thus emerge; Barrow, like Prince from a different focus, considers how the films question the official appropriation of heroism and sacrifice that less astute critics accuse Spielberg of unsubtly supporting. That moral anxiety and uncertainty replace patriotic glory-mongering unsurprisingly elicits contradictory responses. These often concern the films' relationship to actual events, which Spielberg deliberately compromises, for example by pre-empting claims that *Munich* is "a true story." Interplay between blockbuster aesthetics and evidently serious issues, as well as between personal and public modes of being, raises the duality between the everyman and the exceptional human being. Even Abraham Lincoln is re-presented not so much as a familiar, monolithic visionary as a shrewd, tactical pragmatist, even if the film overlooks some of his more questionable decisions. Heroes are ordinary, chosen by chance, in these real-life narratives as well as in *Jaws* and *Close Encounters*, and they emerge by struggling against what is expected of them.

For historians, movie representations of the past are important and problematic because they create vivid impressions that shape understanding of events, bring to prominence incidents that might otherwise have remained little known, and spark interest where previously there was ignorance or indifference. There is always the certainty, however, acknowledged by media practitioners and academics, that any dramatic version simplifies for clarity and emotional impact. Inevitable inaccuracies might be insignificant, but a common fear is that the cinematic version, often intended primarily as entertainment, supplants the truth in the public imagination. This is of particular concern with events considered still to impinge on the present. Such worries are central to debates around Holocaust representation, of which *Schindler's List* is the best known and most influential example. Erin Bell, however, adopts a rather different take on media effects by examining the continuing influence of Spielberg's film on accounts of another thematically connected but quite dissimilar story. In "'Britain's Secret Schindler': The Impact of *Schindler's List* on British Media Perceptions of Civilian Heroes," Bell considers media acknowledgment of the achievements of Nicholas Winton and his Czech colleagues in organizing the deliverance of Jewish and non-Jewish Czech and Slovakian children from Czechoslovakia in March 1939, in response to the German invasion. It begins by considering the commemoration of Winton's deeds in the 1980s, drawing on material in the

British Library's oral history holdings such as the "Living Memory of the Jewish Community" project. It then moves on to determine the extent to which the success of *Schindler's List* led to a refocusing upon Winton's achievements but also to a remodeling of the man into an ersatz Schindler, when his life and background were significantly different from those of the German businessman. While in 1995 Thomas Fensch's edited collection on Schindler unsurprisingly included Spielberg's then-recent film, this contribution is less concerned with criticizing the film as a text than considering its effects in the following two decades, using Winton as a case study. It thereby confirms the wider cultural importance of Hollywood as well as of Spielberg's films in particular, something that academic critics tend to assume but which here is indisputably corroborated.

Nathan Abrams and Gerwyn Owen consider *Munich* to have been designed as an allegorical response to President George W. Bush's "War on Terror" as well as Israel's targeted assassination policy. This is certainly suggested by its timing 30 years after the events portrayed, and the ominous inclusion of the World Trade Center in the closing scene. That image hints at an ongoing cycle of violence, particularly as Spielberg's previous feature, *War of the Worlds*, could be read as a reframing of the war in Iraq from the perspective of that country's inhabitants. In "The (M)orality of Murder: Jews, Food, and Steven Spielberg's *Munich*" Abrams and Owen argue that the film questions whether state-sanctioned violence, in the name of either revenge or prevention of further terrorism, is effective, suitable, and ethical, or ultimately counter-productive. In doing so, however, it presents the Israeli hit squad repeatedly sharing elaborate meals. Unlike accounts on which it is based, the film portrays important scenes of the characters discussing the morality and consequences of their mission while preparing and eating food. Homing in on apparently incidental details and linking them makes a compelling case about the film's thematic strands and its status as a piece of specifically Jewish as well as Hollywood cinema. *Munich*, the writers show, makes food a metaphor to render complex political considerations more accessible to audiences unfamiliar with the chillingly brutal paradoxes that determine the realities of counter-terrorism. The price of food becomes equated with the value placed on life and integrity and the cost to the agents who variously stand to lose, or actually do lose, their humanity, dignity, faith, patriotism, community, or indeed, their lives. Abrams and Owen link this image system to dietary laws, cultural traditions, religious rituals and teachings, nationhood, family loyalties, sense of belonging, psychoanalytic conflicts, and consequent questions of identity, ethics, morality, responsibility and guilt, as well as to cinematic intertexts. Contradictions and dilemmas abound as ultimately, they argue, the filmmakers use food to criticize the Mossad unit and, by extension, both Israeli and US defense policies.

"You Must Remember This: History as Film / Film as History" by Lester D. Friedman also considers *Munich* in detail. It starts by observing how the film tempers the representation, at the end of *Schindler's List*, of Israel as the Promised Land, and goes on to trace the symbolism of the titular city in German, Israeli, European, American, and World history. Terrible events of the first half of the twentieth century cast their shadow over those of the second half, during which Spielberg's film is set. "Munich" has become a metaphor in contemporary political discourse. Friedman recounts the impact of the 1972 atrocity on Jews everywhere, for whom it recalls the Holocaust, an association *Munich* unsurprisingly acknowledges. Friedman explores Spielberg's cinematic strategies in *Munich* and the contradictory meanings attributed to it, while recognizing that it is a mediation of what was already a media event that relayed and established some of the defining contemporary images of terrorism. Reflecting on the nature and significance of

docudrama, Friedman considers controversies engendered by *Munich*. Initially he compares the film with its literary source to suggest that the secretive production history shows Spielberg was aware of the ideological minefield he was entering by daring to question the policies of the nation he had done much to support, having asserted his ethnic roots since *Schindler's List* and extended philanthropy toward Israeli causes. He nevertheless defended himself against impassioned verbal attacks by asserting that he was a critical friend to Israel and wanted to provoke human feeling as an alternative to destructive logic – a reaction that Spielberg's kind of filmmaking may be well suited to achieve. In the process, however, Friedman's textual analysis demonstrates, *Munich* strikingly re-inflects typical Spielberg treatments of familiar thematic concerns: Family, Home, Sex and Violence, and the Happy Ending.

Robert Burgoyne and John Trafton's title, "Violence and Memory in Spielberg's *Lincoln*," points to similar themes in relation to portrayal of events that occurred over a century previously but likewise reverberate in the present. The power and importance of violence in Spielberg's historical films, they argue, has not received sufficient critical attention. Like Prince in his appraisal of Spielberg's use of cinematic violence generally, they discuss its centrality in Spielberg's oeuvre; but they focus on the historical films. Their chapter considers how art and violence interact in a film that is shaped by the viciousness of civil war and shadowed by the foreknowledge of Lincoln's assassination. Juxtaposed against the extreme battlefield violence witnessed in the opening minute, they point out, the language of Lincoln's speech – establishing a rhetoric of renewal and historical regeneration – acquires concrete specificity and urgency which are incorporated into the film as a kind of answer to the history of mass brutality. Immediately after the ferocious combat, the President is shown conversing with two black enlisted men, who raise ongoing racial inequalities in the Army. As the talk is coming to an end, one of the soldiers looks Lincoln in the eye and completes Lincoln's thoughts with a line from the Gettysburg Address, words that a white soldier, who was present at Gettysburg, seems not quite able to remember. A black soldier continues reciting the speech flawlessly as the men return to their posts. The historic address gains what the contributors call "vernacular familiarity"; elevated purpose and commitment are capable of permeating the population, transformed from an individual's eloquent expression into democratic agency for change. Analogously, throughout the film the violence of war and slavery are continually evoked, incorporated into the texture of the work to keep the discourse alive. The chapter thereby makes the case for serious exploration of Spielberg's approach to violence as a defining historical theme, as a continuing and motive force in history. This has been largely overlooked despite exceptionally graphic scenes of violence in *Saving Private Ryan*, *Amistad*, *Schindler's List*, and the Spielberg- produced HBO series *The Pacific*. In *Lincoln*, Burgoyne and Grafton observe, 1860s representations of violence enter into dialogue with the present, similarly to the monochrome intertexts of *Schindler's List* or the fading documentary appearance of *Saving Private Ryan*'s opening battle, and establish a dichotomy between progress and loss, beauty and horror, glory and suffering.

"Spielberg in the Digital Age" covers two aspects of Spielberg's work as director and businessman. He continues to shoot and edit his films primarily on celluloid but has been a pioneer of computer-generated effects. Also, he is a gamer himself, as well as a filmmaker with a powerful sense of narrative immersion despite the accusations of some critics that contemporary Hollywood subsumes the pleasures of story to spectacle (King 2000). His unusual access to the expertise and technical resources behind a games industry that shares much in common with effects houses, but which in financial terms is bigger

than filmmaking, puts Spielberg at the interface of entertainment media that remain separate despite franchising re-mediations and attempts (by others) to converge them in the chimera of interactive cinema.

Dan North in "The Spielberg Effects" examines special and visual effects in the films, with particular reference to Spielberg's close working relationship with the effects company Industrial Light and Magic (ILM). North considers several key films that integrate visual spectacle – whether pro-filmic, optically post-produced, or digital – into their narratives, including *Close Encounters*, *Jurassic Park*, *A.I.*, *Minority Report*, *War of the Worlds*, and the Indiana Jones series. All explore the potentialities of technologies both earthly and extraterrestrial. In these and other films, Spielberg finds intelligent and intuitive accommodation for spectacular imagery, which provides some explanation for the films' commercial appeal as well as their critical approval, but it is the stable and consistent input of ILM that provides a safe and fertile base for the visual creativity that fuels his best work. ILM is often the delivery point of Spielberg's imagination, carrying out the tasks of visualizing-to-order his spectacular set pieces. But it also proffers its own innovations and expertise that define what is imaginable in Spielberg's films. The director's thematic and aesthetic preoccupations are frequently inflected by ILM's own skill set, so that a rich and fascinating dynamic has emerged between their compulsion toward innovation and Spielberg's nostalgic inclinations. North's close readings of key scenes examine carefully how the films use special effects. Techno-scientific discourses enfold the films in a rhetoric of progress that attempts to market Spielberg as both a champion and archivist of practical effects, linear editing, and stunt work, at the same time as he is an innovator in ultramodern digital filmmaking techniques. North insists nevertheless that Spielberg does not employ effects either for their own sake or to aid technological development but, characteristically, foremost as vehicles for the cinematic expression of ideas.

Grethe Mitchell's chapter, "Spielberg and Video Games (1982–2010)," examines an aspect of his career that has been largely overlooked. It covers the period bookended by Atari's *E.T.* and Electronic Arts' non-release of *LMNO*. Thus it considers both video games licensed from Spielberg's films and others produced with his direct involvement. Spielberg was, alongside George Lucas, one of the earliest film directors to become involved with games and this interest has continued. *Raiders of the Lost Ark* was among the first films made into a video game, arriving in November 1982, and *E.T.* followed within a month. Yet in spite of Spielberg's strong personal interest, his work in this field has not been easy. The need to release the *E.T.* video game before Christmas led to an impossibly short production schedule and a game regarded by many as among the worst ever made, with millions of copies being crushed and buried in landfill due to poor sales that were exacerbated by a worldwide slump in the games industry. Spielberg's more recent work likewise had its problems. *The Dig*, produced for LucasArts, took such an unprecedented length of time to make (1989 to 1995) that it was widely believed it would never be released. Spielberg's collaboration with Electronic Arts between 2005 and 2009 involved two contrasting projects, each with issues. *LMNO*, an ambitious game that sought to achieve emotional engagement on the part of the player, was canceled – after four years in development – without being released. The second, *Boom Blox*, was a casual game for the Wii that came out to positive reviews but was not commercially successful; also, because it lacks any characteristic Spielberg touches, it is difficult to see what his involvement was. After an overview of these troubled production histories, Mitchell specifically considers video game structures and their relationship with cinema in a detailed and sustained comparison that draws productively on narrative theory.

Her chapter shows Spielberg to be not only an enthusiast and creative innovator but also a deal maker – DreamWorks Interactive, for example, depended on $60 million invested by Bill Gates, and lasted for five years during which Spielberg developed the hugely popular *Medal of Honor* franchise. Ultimately, perhaps, as Schatz concludes in relation to interruptions in Spielberg's film directing, his parallel careers meant Spielberg was unable to give sufficient attention to bring everything to fruition.

Raymond J. Haberski, Jr. opens the final section, "Reception," with an overview of Spielberg's critical reputation. "Sharks, Aliens, and Nazis: The Crisis of Film Criticism and the Rise of Steven Spielberg" considers how the director was blamed for making film criticism obsolete by supplanting its informed commentary on broad cultural issues, including the future of film, with market forces – simply giving moviegoers what they want. *Jaws*, however, provoked many writers to connect audience reactions with critical analysis and academic theory. Accordingly, Spielberg has kept on the boil debates about the function of film criticism for 40 years. An early review compared *Jaws* to *Bug*, a formulaic exploitation B-picture (ironically by the director who would make *Jaws 2*), allegedly different only in its advertising spend; marketing hype duped audiences into thinking they conferred success, supposed Stephen Farber, who actually called *Jaws* "lowest common denominator" filmmaking. Newspaper declarations about the state of movie going prompted "the first truly substantial generation of film scholars," Haberski states, to weigh in with theoretical interpretations fueled by political and cultural concerns – a body of writing that grew inversely with the alleged decline of press reviews. Haberski traces such polarization back to a 1915 US Supreme Court declaration that movies were "commercial product" rather than free expression, while more enlightened movements from the 1920s thought otherwise, waging debates that raised the status of movies and criticism alike through to auteurism and the innovations of New Hollywood. Critics like Pauline Kael and Susan Sontag considered films a modernist form akin to the sensibilities of abstract paintings or experimental novels. Then came *Jaws* and recriminations that it typified conservative filmmaking that destroyed personal vision, while a new youth market sought comforting reassurance after Vietnam and Watergate. Spielberg's popularity challenged critics' authority over film culture. Haberski maps the ensuing academic arguments through shifts in Spielberg's image and the style and concerns of his work against the background of influential film reviewing's move to television in America. There the instant (but suspensefully awaited) "thumbs up" or "thumbs down" seemed redundant against the enormity of Spielberg's audiences, and he meanwhile wrongfooted criticism by engaging with big ideas that initiated debates around history, identity, and relationships between movies and art, entertainment, propaganda, and education. Spielberg's prominence as mythmaker now transcended judgment of the film's qualities, which – largely taken as given in terms of aesthetics and technique – had to be gauged against competing criteria, as yet again self-appointed experts returned to the assumption that audiences are manipulated and misled.

Lincoln Geraghty's contribution, "Spielberg, Fandom, and the Popular Appeal of His Blockbuster Movies," again goes beyond exclusively textual matters. Geraghty investigates the place of merchandising in the development and promotion of Spielberg's blockbuster films and franchises. From *Jaws* onward Spielberg has utilized marketing and product placement not only to sell films but also to build an enduring following for his distinctive variety of fantasy, science fiction, adventure, and family entertainment. This includes, intriguingly, Spielberg's identification with his most ardent followers as a fellow fan himself. The tendency complements the address to cineastes in his movies that is

implicit in the conscious intertextuality of allusions to other films from Hollywood and beyond, a trend in contemporary cinema that he spearheaded. Geraghty explains how Spielberg appeared at the 30th Anniversary screening of *Raiders of the Lost Ark* in Los Angeles and at the San Diego Comic-Con in 2011 to promote *The Adventures of Tintin*. Geraghty situates these events in a project to engage with fans while developing ever-widening marketing opportunities, both to maintain the vitality of past productions and to feed into future ones. At the same time they cultivate Spielberg's image as part of a passionate cine-literate community rather than the cynical, commercially driven show-man detractors accuse him of being. In assessing Spielberg's influence and impact on contemporary Hollywood and how his films are synonymous with modern marketing and branding, Geraghty focuses on ways in which fans use the films, merchandise, spin-off and tie-in products, toys, and other commodities in their own creative practices. In this respect, however, they are replicating at a domestic and subcultural level Spielberg's own postmodern appropriation of cultural artifacts, which can be seen as at once con-sumption and recycling. Using web technologies to make and share fan videos is nothing new but does, Geraghty observes, echo Spielberg's origins whereby the budding director experimented with home movies, models, and animation – cultivating skills inspired by his own favorite films and television shows. Indeed he has, as a producer, championed protégés whose work and tastes resemble his, thereby creating a further fantasy of emu-lating his success. This mirroring of Spielberg's creative evolution and fans' use of his films and merchandise to express their own identities indicate an important part of con-vergence culture that Geraghty explores. They also, he suggests, parallel the centrality among contemporary Hollywood audiences of nostalgia, memory, and fan play in the ongoing attraction to Spielberg as blockbuster director, and to his movies.

"Spielberg and the Rise of the Celebrity Film Director" continues the emphasis on his image as a person rather than an anonymous creative force constructed or projected from each film as a guiding principle behind its narration. Kirsty Fairclough and Andy Willis bring the Companion's arguments full circle by addressing the media circulation and public consumption of a parallel version of Spielberg to those of the entertainer, (some-times disputed) artist, mentor, enabler and showman, tycoon, technical innovator, edu-cator, and national treasure that the opening section introduced and following contributions further investigated. The complementary image, woven from discourses that surface intermittently in academic explorations, embraces both the ordinariness and the glamor of Spielberg as baby boomer, geek, child prodigy, victim of bullying, brat, protégé, suburbanite, Horatio Alger role model, Peter Pan, teetotaler, bearded wearer of baseball caps, husband, divorcee, family man, affectionate son, admiring son, born-again Jew, and friend of film stars and presidents. As the cult of the director became commonplace in the 1960s with acceptance of the auteur principle, some filmmakers underwent eleva-tion from being simply studio employees to the coveted "the name above the title." The arrival of the Movie Brat generation of filmmakers established directors as a decisive driving force behind Hollywood's revitalization and renewed creativity. As they moved from the fringes of the industry into the establishment their names became marketing tools, offering audiences very particular expectations. In Spielberg's case (among others) biographical information set the agenda in promotional materials such as press packs and interviews and – rather like the "confessional" sincerity the music industry associated with singer-songwriters in the 1970s – determined to a large extent the meaning of the product as well as the evolving image of its apparent originator, which was used to pre-sell subsequent releases. With the seemingly insatiable appetite for celebrity developed in

the twenty-first century, filmmakers moved to the pages of gossip magazines, their every move coming under increasing scrutiny and their films merely part of their wider celebrity package. Breaking his career into three sections – "Spielberg the Movie Brat," borrowing Joseph Gelmis's term, "The Film Director as Superstar," and, finally, challenging James Cameron's self-anointment as "The King of Hollywood" – Fairclough and Willis use the work and various extratextual images of "Steven Spielberg" to explore the impact of the trajectory from studio employee to gossip column fodder on the idea, meaning of, and critical thinking about, the contemporary Hollywood film director.

Notes

1 "Spielberg at Sixty" was convened at the University of Lincoln, UK.
2 See "A Note on Film Titles" preceding this Introduction.
3 Closer examination reveals all that "can be said with absolute confidence about *Jaws* is that its distributors and promoters learned from all its antecedents and applied their lessons particularly well" (Hall and Neale 2010, 212).
4 For the sake of clarity, it should be acknowledged that Schatz (1993) argues for the term "New Hollywood" being used to describe the post-1975 revival in financial fortunes rather than, as here, what might be called the New American Cinema or American New Wave "independent" ethos of the preceding decade.
5 Rockwell's *The Problem We All Live With* (*Look* centerfold, 1969) incidentally – Wasser does not discuss this dimension – shares compositional qualities that make Spielberg's work so successful. The lateral perspective on a young, pigtailed, black girl in a white dress, marching determinedly to school in hostile circumstances, is an intertext – employed as an ironical historical comment on the situation – in the scene in *The Color Purple* when Mister pursues Nettie. This is particularly important as that scene has been interpreted negatively (Diawara 1988) as sharing the ideological positioning of *The Birth of a Nation* (D.W. Griffith, 1915), on the basis of similar dramatic structuring, whereas Spielberg typically, and more than is convenient for much politically motivated criticism, uses allusion to stage discursive conflict and acknowledge contradiction. Formally, too, Rockwell's painting achieves identification with the subject's plight through techniques subsequently employed by Spielberg. Inscription of space outside the frame (see Buckland in this volume), here suggested indirectly and with great economy by the rotten fruit, is a Spielbergian instance of metonymy that simultaneously makes present an unseen threat (as in *Jaws* and *Jurassic Park*) and symbolizes the corruption and misappropriation of a culture that, a century after Emancipation, should nourish and nurture. More straightforwardly, as in *E.T.*, adoption of a child's-level view reduces, through the framing, adult authority to a faceless, anonymous, incomprehensible mass.

References

Barthes, Roland. 1975. *S/Z*. London: Jonathan Cape.
Britton, Andrew. 1976. "*Jaws*." *Movie*, 23: 27–32.
Britton, Andrew. 1986. "Blissing Out: The Politics of Reaganite Entertainment." *Movie*, 31–32: 1–42.
Buckland, Warren. 2006. *Directed by Steven Spielberg: Poetics of the Contemporary Hollywood Blockbuster*. New York: Continuum.
Chion, Michel. 1994. *Audio-Vision: Sound on Screen*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Diawara, Manthia. 1988. "Black Spectatorship: Problems of Identification and Resistance." *Screen*, 29.4: 66–76.
Fiske, John, and John Hartley. 1978. *Reading Television*. London and New York: Methuen.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Friedman, Lester D. 2006. *Citizen Spielberg*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hall, Sheldon, and Steve Neale. 2010. *Epics, Spectacles, and Blockbusters: A Hollywood History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Haskell, Molly. 1975. *Jaws* review, *Village Voice*, June, 23: British Film Institute microfiche.

Heath, Stephen. 1976. *"Jaws*, Ideology and Film Theory." *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 231.

Hoberman, J. 2012. *Film after Film: Or, What Became of 21st Century Cinema?* London: Verso.

Holliday, Fred. A. II. 2008. *"Directed by Steven Spielberg: Poetics of the Contemporary Hollywood Blockbuster* by Warren Buckland, *Citizen Spielberg* by Lester D. Friedman and *Empire of light: the Cinema of Steven Spielberg* by Nigel Morris." *Film Criticism*, 32.3: 91–95.

Jameson, Fredric. 1979. "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture." *Social Text*, 1: 130–148.

Kendrick, James. 2014. *Darkness in the Bliss-Out: A Reconsideration of the Films of Steven Spielberg*. New York: Bloomsbury.

King, Geoff. 2000. *Spectacular Narratives: Hollywood in the Age of the Blockbuster*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Maltby, Richard. 2003. *Hollywood Cinema*, 2nd ed. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

McBride, Joseph. 2009. "A Reputation: Steven Spielberg and the Eyes of the World." *New Review of Film and Television Studies, Special Issue: Steven Spielberg*, 7.1: 1–11.

McBride, Joseph. 2011. *Steven Spielberg: A Biography*. London: Faber & Faber.

Morris, Nigel. 2007. *Empire of Light: The Cinema of Steven Spielberg*. London: Wallflower Press.

Sarris, Andrew. 1968. *The American Cinema*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Schatz, Thomas. 1993. "The New Hollywood." In *Film Theory Goes to the Movies,* edited by Jim Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins, 8–36. New York and London: Routledge/American Film Institute.

Wasser, Frederick. 2010. *Steven Spielberg's America*. Cambridge: Polity Press.