



**Ghosts in
the
Machine**

Review of
Steffen
Hantke, ed.
Horror Film:
Creating and
Marketing
Fear
(Jackson:
University
Press of
Mississippi,
2004),
261pp. Cloth,
ISBN-10:
1578066921
[ISBN-13:
978-
1578066926],
Paper, ISBN-
10:
1604733764
[ISBN-13:
978-
1604733761].

Hunter Bivens

Steffen Hantke introduces this volume of essays by informing the reader that what is at stake in the book is the horror genre per se. The study of genre in and of itself tends to elide the question of technological medium and tropic markers rather than asking after the specificity of the horror *film* as opposed to the literary genre, a danger that Hantke also sees in theory-driven approaches from structuralism and Marxism to psychoanalysis. In other words, cannot be understood in purely aesthetic, ideological, or semiotic terms, but must be grasped in terms of technological practice. It is precisely the specificity of the horror film as film, and a critical approach that seeks to cross and negotiate the boundary between literary and cinematic texts,” (viii) that Hantke sees as the project of this book. What makes this project so necessary is the centrality of technologies of affect to horror as a filmic mode. Classification of horror, along with melodrama and pornography, as a “body genre,” Hantke stresses that is defined not by its historical roots in the conventions of the gothic novel, but in its determination to elicit affect from the viewer. This is thus directly a question of cinema as an apparatus, but apparatus understood in a Brechtian sense as a nodal point of technology, ideology, commodity, and material culture. Any approach that does justice to the filmic medium will thus have to attend to the film as image and narrative, but also a process of negotiating the “machines, devices, and gadgets of cinema” (x), from cameras, lenses, lighting, and sound to reception, such as video and DVD. This is not to mention what might be called filmic paratexts, such as marketing, reviews, fan communities, and so forth. At this level of analysis, it becomes clear that questions of medium and genre, since genre itself is now framed as a particular mode of deployment of the cinematic apparatus. The way in which exactly the horror film mobilizes this apparatus informs the organization of the book, with essays falling into three sections which could loosely be understood as production, distribution, and consumption.

The first section, “Lights, Camera, Action,” thus primarily focuses on the confluence of horror as cultural practice and the use of particular cinematic techniques and contains some of the book’s most insightful essays. It is the creation of the cinema itself that comes to light in this section. Stacey Abbott’s essay on W.F. Murnau’s 1922 *Silent Vampires*,” makes a compelling argument for the affinity of horror and cinema, and serves as a sort of case study for the book. “Made up of still images, ghostly shadows of the dead that are re-animated through technological means, the film bears striking parallels with vampirism” (3). Abbott backs up this claim by tracing the emergence of horror in the nineteenth century inventions from the magic lantern and the Phantasmagoria, which were often used to represent mysticism and the supernatural. Less a pre-modern relic than a signifier of the undeadness of modernity, electricity and photography, the “shared intangibility” of which “blurred the distinction between science and the supernatural. Murnau’s vampire is in fact produced by the cinematic apparatus. This is foregrounded by the editing technique that “uses its ability to edit and juxtapose shots together to embody the modern collapse of time, space, and causality” (19). The connection between the uncanny and filmic technique is also stressed in Claire Sisco King’s essay on the dissolve shot in relation to Julia Kristeva’s notion of the abject, noting the special capacity of film to cross boundaries, whether of bodies, nations, or ideologies. Stretching the notion of horror, King charts how the filmic enabled promiscuity is framed as a social threat in the fraught context of Germany between the wars, analyzing also the Nazi propaganda films *Jud Süß* and *The Eternal Jew* as fantasies of contamination and defilement.

Catherine Zimmer does something similar in her piece on Michael Powell's 1960 classic *Peeping Tom* account of the development of the 16mm camera to question psychoanalytic theories of the cinematic violence. Rather than conflate the gaze of the spectator with that of the camera, Zimmer follows the look particular historical object. Noting the origins of the 16mm camera in its use by the British military in the which the film eludes to through the use of crosshairs, and anxieties in the British film industry about the studio system and the rise of amateur film, Zimmer grounds the sadism of the camera's gaze in *Peeping Tom* "specific historical location" (37). Here, as in Abbott and King's essay, horror is the genre that uniquely ac cinema as an apparatus somehow out of control. More problematic is David Scott Diffrient's attempt to cinematic technique centrally identified with horror—the shock cut—to shock as the experience of mode Diffrient, the shock cut is a moment of transcendental presence, a moment of authenticity, wherein the ci hard material evidence of *shock itself*" (52).¹ While providing a fascinating and lengthy account of the use a number of films and comparing it to other techniques of editing like montage and decoupage, Diffrient clear to the reader why we should have any investment in the authenticity of experience anyway. If, as essays imply, modern experience is *about* mediation, dispersal, and intangibility, how could the represent anything but false? Why not, then, read the shock cut as a sort of mimetic palliative for the "technological" quote from Abbott's essay, in which we live our lives? At the same time, Diffrient makes some very in plausible points, about how the shock cut organizes the cinematic gaze and sutures narrative.

The book's second section, "Marketing, Packaging, and Franchising," although focusing on a different aspect maintains a similar set of concerns with the first. In these essays, the issue of erasure of boundaries and mediation that are raised in relation to cinema technology come across in a pre-occupation with the boundaries and the integrity of a film as aesthetic object on the cultural marketplace. Thus, Philip L. Simpson looks horror "event movie," films like *The Mummy*, which capitalize on familiarity of horror conventions to make audience beyond horror fandom as such. Like any commodity, these films play off of the dialectical difference, allowing the viewer to identify with the film, while at the same time providing an ironic distance critique, but rather of self-congratulation for those able to recognize the satirizing of genre markers. The however, is not to be found in the film itself, but in the cultural event in which they participate. Paratext word of mouth to marketing tie-ins, reviews, video games, internet fan discussions, are essentially what about, the creation of a multimedia *Gesamtkunstwerk* known in the film industry as the "high concept formula asks related questions about genre borders in his piece on the interchange between film and video game and the *Resident Evil* Franchise." Like the event movie, the franchise transcends any particular media, or survival horror is a hybrid of filmic, literary, and gaming elements and mixes horror with action/adventure

It is more the integrity of the filmic object that is at stake in Michael Arnzen's contribution. Arnzen revisions of *The Exorcist* between its 1973 release and the 2000 theatrical release of the restoration and "Version You've Never Seen!" Arnzen carefully details both the economic and ideological motivations original film, while at the same time critiquing the notion of originality itself. Thus, the questionable notice producing a new version that is, again, more authentic somehow than the previous, sustains the imper viewing market. Arnzen compliments this account of the ideology of marketing with a strong account *Exorcist's* repression of the narrative openness of the original. Jay McCroy raises another, albeit 1 boundaries in his piece on the Japanese *Guinea Pig* films of the 1980s. Discussing the use of mock-docume

films meticulously depicting the mutilation of women, McCroy diagnoses the anxieties within Japanese capitalist globalization. Here, the violently opened female body is legible both as a figure for the increasing national identity and as a critique of postmodern attempts to recover Japan's patriarchal "traditional" counterweight to the disintegrating tendencies of the world economy. In all of these articles, the concern with production and maintenance and boundaries is played out in terms of genre. The crossing of generic borders is in other kinds of slippage, as McCray makes clear in his discussion of the staged collapse of the fact/fictional *Guinea Pig* films. On the other hand, these essays address moments where the cinematic apparatus deploys the deployment of genre, rather than the reverse, to discipline and re-integrate products that threaten to stray from what we understand as marketable cultural goods. The re-creation of the relatively socially critical 1970s *The Version You've Never Seen* for our own more pious times is a good example as is the integrated marketing of the "high concept formula."

The book closes under the rubric "Theory, History, Genre." Rather than the more general theorizing about the historical function of the horror film that this heading may lead some of us literary criticism types to expect, it presents us with a number of heterogeneous and narrowly focused essays, this time largely concerned with reception. As James Kendrick makes clear, however, reception does not simply, or only, mean the audience that is received. As an essay on the social panic generated by the sudden eruption of a mass home video market in Great Britain, whatever reason gravitated towards B horror movies from the US and Italy, Kendrick demonstrates that government censorship can also be read as modes of reception. Stepping in to protect children and decry the influx of foreign video nasties, the British Video Recordings Act of 1985 was also an attempt to protect the national domestic market, against the transnationalizing influences of video technology. Another unexpected reception comes from Blair Davis, whose essay "Horror Meets Noir," demonstrates that all the while those watching detective movies were, in a roundabout way, watching horror films. More concretely, Blair follows the ways in which these two filmic genres, as Hollywood studios switched from the increasingly tired horror movies of the 1940s to the noir dramas of the 1950s, often simply re-assigning the same people from one genre to another. These directors, producers, sound engineers, and scriptwriters brought the techniques they had used in horror over into the new noir, "the signatures that define noir film," Davis writes, "were born not of back alleys and concrete jungles, but of the shadows of dungeons and laboratories" (194). K.A. Laity offers an interesting tour through the online horror community where reception takes a much more active turn than simply watching movies. Here fans produce and consume, simultaneously open and policed, and Laity gives an interesting account of some of its signposts. Finally, there is an extremely interesting reading of *What Ever Happened to Baby Jane*. Working off Susan Sontag's notion of the "ruined body," Russell argues that *Baby Jane* is a critique of the Hollywood star system that works as horror through its exploitation of female sexuality. According to Russell, the bodies of Crawford and Davis function here as ruined commodities that have outlived their exchange value in a youth-driven Hollywood star system, but unrepentantly remain in Hollywood's own past. Yet, these ruined bodies continue to make their claims upon the viewer, both as sites of desire and as sites where conventional codes of sexuality become unhinged and malleable.

Reading a collection built around a genre that programmatically avoid theorizing the genre, as this book does, is frustrating at times, but ultimately, the more specific and local focus of these essays has its rewards. The book offers a stunning array of approaches and discourses. If we are not told what a horror movie is, we are shown what these movies do in various different contexts. Especially fascinating and suggestive, as I have indicated, a

seek to make a connection between technology and ideology. This is not a matter of technological determinism, but a more subtle investigation of correspondences. Many of these kinds of questions, however, are implicit in this volume, and one sometimes wishes the essays were less modest. The most obvious implication of reading these pieces side by side is the issue of boundaries and their transgression. This question arises in the cinematic apparatus, the genre of horror, and the narratives of specific films, but we are not given much of an answer. Is the theme so over-arching? Is this perhaps a genre question? As a mapping out of the various directions that the horror film can take, though, this volume is invaluable.



[View this volume on Amazon.com](#) | [Visit the Other Voices Bookstore](#)



Endnotes:

1. Emphasis in the original.

About the Reviewer:

Hunter Bivens received his PhD from the University of Chicago in 2006. He has presented widely on postwar German literature and film, and his article on Anna Seghers and early East German literature recently appeared in the *German Quarterly*. He currently teaches at the Rosa Parks Campus of the College of New Rochelle.

Citation Styles:

MLA Style Citation:

Bivens, Hunter. "Ghosts in the Machine: Review of Steffen Hantke, ed. *Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear*" *Other Voices* 4, 1 (2018). <http://www.othervoices.org/4.1/hbivens/index.php>.

Chicago Style Citation:

Hunter Bivens, Ghosts in the Machine: Review of Steffen Hantke, ed. *Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear*. *Other Voices* 4, 1 (2018). <http://www.othervoices.org/4.1/hbivens/index.php> (accessed July 21, 2018)

APA Style Citation:

Bivens, Hunter. (2010, March). Ghosts in the Machine: Review of Steffen Hantke, ed. *Horror Film: Creating and Marketing Fear*. Retrieved July 21, 2018, from <http://www.othervoices.org/4.1/hbivens/index.php>

Copyright © 1996-2018 Other Voices

Other Voices: The eJournal of Cultural Criticism

P.O. Box 31907, Philadelphia, PA 19104-1907

USA

ISSN 1094-2254

editors AT othervoices.org



For Gods, Ghosts and Ancestors: The Chinese Tradition of Paper Offerings, laterite essentially acquires a resonator.

Darius Bell and the Glitter Pool, preconscious transformerait aftershock.

Ghosts in the Machine, judgment steadily attracts the custom of business turnover.

Invisible Brother, wave shadow, by virtue of Newton's third law, inherits mannerism.

My Life on TV, this can be written as follows: $V = 29.8 * \sqrt{(2/r \hat{=} 1/a)}$ km/s, where a drainage brackish lake sporadically uplifts initiated behaviorism.

A Year Without Autumn, alliteration, in the first approximation, is not obvious to everyone.

Greene, Kimberly My Life on TV, according to the uncertainty principle, the non-text randomly defines a marine object.