Hollywood progressives of his generation, Scott’s antifascism was central to his vision of both himself and his country. His decision to make Crossfire, an indictment of American anti-Semitism, stemmed not only from his concern with the rise of native fascism, but from a desire to confirm his “sense of himself as both a political radical and a cutting-edge, even controversial, filmmaker” (144). Scott’s opportunity to take pleasure in Crossfire’s unexpected success, however, was abruptly curtailed when, in September 1947, he was subpoe- 

naded by HUAC.

Langdon cites new evidence from Scott and Dmytryk’s FBI files that suggests an intimate connection between these two events. In May 1947, the FBI provided HUAC with a list of the eleven Hollywood subversives who most concerned them. In Langdon’s estimation, “it cannot be a coincidence that the only two [non-Jewish] Americans on this list were the producer and director of Crossfire . . . Scott and Dmytryk appear to have been specifically targeted by HUAC not because they were Communists . . . but because of their work on Crossfire, a very dangerous film in the eyes of HUAC” (309).

As Langdon demonstrates in the four chapters she devotes to her analysis of the film’s production and reception, in presenting the possibility of an incipient American fascism, Crossfire was seen as a challenge to the spirit of consensus that was rapidly replacing the progressive, New Deal culture of prewar Hollywood (and America).

Although Langdon’s discussion of Crossfire’s reception, particularly the mixed reaction it provoked from the Jewish community, is revealing, she overstates the film’s import. Her claim that it asks the “defining questions of Cold War America” (163)—questions that “resonated as powerfully for Crossfire’s audiences as they did for its producers”—is not supported by the (delightfully articulate and insightful) audience preview cards she quotes. Likewise, her assertion that Crossfire “suggests that noir was . . . an ideal vehicle for dramatizing antifascism” (174) is not backed up by extensive stylistic analysis; her discussion of Scott’s casting choices and the performance of race and masculinity in the film demonstrates Scott’s antifascist vision but not an organic link with the noir aesthetics employed in its expression.

Langdon’s exemplary archival methodology is more effective at illuminating the challenges faced by radical filmmakers in postwar Hollywood, caught between the demands of the studios and those of their Communist Party colleagues. In documenting Scott’s struggles to bring his politics to the screen, Langdon makes clear that while the studios held the power to frustrate such ambition, much depended on the individuals involved. Cornered, intended by Scott as a hard-hitting antifascist drama, was brought down several notches by executive interference (John Wexley’s script was shorn of much of its political content in John Paxton’s re-write), whereas Crossfire retained more of Scott’s vision due to the crucial support of RKO’s new production chief, Dore Schary.

While Scott’s story is ultimately a tragic one of unfulfilled potential, Caught in the Crossfire, which exists in an online version in addition to a hard copy, indicates the possibilities of e-publishing for film history. Like DVD “critical editions,” the online version features a multitude of “extras” such as a high-quality and highly usable digital archive that contains copies of many of the key documents cited by Langdon. Both versions would benefit from the addition of a filmography and an index (the e-version offers a functional search engine) and the hard copy includes numerous typographical and formatting errors.

Caught in the Crossfire differs from other recent blacklist publications, such as Larry Ceplair’s biography of the screenwriter Paul Jarrico, The Marxist and the Movies (University of Kentucky Press, 2007), and Gerald Horne’s comprehensive study of John Howard Lawson, The Final Victim of the Blacklist (University of California Press, 2006), in the specificity of its periodization. In positioning Scott at the fulcrum of the intense cultural debates concerning the meaning of “Americanism” in the postwar years, Caught in the Crossfire suggests that HUAC’s real interests lay less in purging Hollywood of Communism than of the liberal, New Deal values Scott so well embodied. © 2011 Rebecca Prime

REBECCA PRIME is the Libman Professor of the Humanities at Hood College.


DAN STREIBLE

Mining the Home Movie: Excavations in Histories and Memories ed. Karen L. Ishizuka and Patricia R. Zimmermann

Which of the following is an accurate characterization? Home movies are: documents of the everyday; not documents of the everyday; counter-documents; films without an interest in profit; colonized by Hollywood; lost histories of a frequently invisible working class; feminine, as opposed to masculine professional films; a stimulant for nostalgia; a medium of joy; boring for those outside the family; the greatest record of much of our culture; deceptive documentaries; hidden histories of the world; a festival of Oedipal relations.
Each characterization is suggested by one of the twenty-seven contributors to the anthology *Mining the Home Movie*, a timely compendium that reflects the fact that the scholarly analysis of home movies has established a foothold in media studies (though not yet in cinema textbooks).

Writing about home movies is not entirely new. Scholars have sporadically published essays over the past couple decades, although no sustained wave of publication immediately followed the English-language breakthrough work on the subject, Patricia R. Zimmermann’s often-cited *Reel Families: A Social History of Amateur Film* (1995). In 2000, collector Alan Kattelle self-published his authoritative tome, *Home Movies: A History of the American Industry, 1897–1979*, which became an essential reference source. In the ensuing decade, curators and archivists began to pay more attention to these small-gauge films, making them more accessible to researchers. The coalescence of archival, academic, and artistic interests is manifest in the roster of contributors to *Mining the Home Movie*. Most, like co-editor Karen L. Ishizuka, have hybrid identities—archivist-scholar, filmmaker-historian, curator-researcher. But if we go by the chief occupation of each one, the fifteen archivists outnumber the seven academics and five media artists. This archival bent reflects how the study of home movies has recently unfolded. Small-gauge and amateur film enthusiasts are a strong constituency among moving-image archivists. They have shared their interest with evangelical zeal, with worldwide Home Movie Day in 2003 screenings being their most notable achievement (see www.homemovieday.com).

Half of the essays profile archives at which their respective authors work. For readers not familiar with the archival world, these deliver a valuable, succinct introduction. Alongside the major established film archives (the Library of Congress, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, UCLA, Netherlands Film Museum) are important regional institutions such as Northeast Historic Film (U.S.) and North West Film Archive (U.K.), which have established collecting, access, and outreach policies for amateur films that generate scholarship of a quality and magnitude disproportionate to their resources. Karen Sheldon and Dwight Swanson write in detail about Northeast Historic Film’s rediscovery of a series of 16mm shorts, each entitled *The Movie Queen*, made by itinerant filmmaker Margaret Cram in the 1930s. Each reenacts the same script in a different small town in the northeast, with casts of local amateurs. An essay by the late Maryann Gomes analyzes images of working-class people found at North West Film Archive (where amateur films outnumber professionals two to one). Nearly all of the home movies were made by middle-class families, so she gives special notice to the only two working-class cineastes represented in the archive (one of whom made ninety-three films) for their recordings of daily life in 1950s Britain.

The book grants material from the Japanese American National Museum (Los Angeles) more attention than any other set of films. As the editors explain in their introduction, the depth of interest in the home movies of Dave Tatsuno has been exceptional. Most were shot clandestinely between 1942–45, while he and his California family were interned at the Topaz “relocation” camp in Utah. Four essays analyze the significance of this silent 8mm color footage. Ishizuka and Robert Nakamura detail their use of the Topaz films in their documentary, *Something Strong Within* (1994). Robert Rosen then discusses “memory workers” who transform these events and recordings into historical memory: documentarians, home-moviemakers, spectators. After a profile of the museum, Ishizuka and Zimmermann argue that the addition of Tatsuno’s work to the National Film Registry in 1996 helped validate the larger enterprise of studying home movies. While Tatsuno’s rare and atypical films receive disproportionate coverage, the essays make a convincing case for their importance and canonization.

*Mining the Home Movie* is wide-ranging rather than definitive. It does not propose, for example, any fixed distinction between the terms “home movie” and “amateur film” (a broader category). However, as the contributors make clear, home movies are strikingly diverse in both form and content, and it is therefore understandable that some essays digress to explore films which are not strictly home movies (itinerant productions, local newreels, documentary outtakes). Other welcome features of *Mining the Home Movie* include a translation of French film theorist Roger Odin’s provocative work on “family films,” which reminds us that an “amateur film movement” has been apparent in European scholarship since the 1980s and remains strong. Liz Czach’s select filmography and bibliography will prove valuable to readers interested in teaching or writing about this subject. Her annotated list of seventy-two films that make significant use of home movies—and which are actually in distribution—is well selected and her bibliography smartly supplemented with relevant works of critical theory and historiography. © 2011 Dan Streible