

[A] Acts of Violence: The World War II Veteran Private-Eye Movie as an Ideological Crime Series

According to Antonio Gramsci, serial tales are 'a powerful factor in the formation of the mentality and morality of the people.' 'The serial novel,' he suggests, 'is a real way of day-dreaming' whose heroes 'enter into the intellectual life of the people ... and acquire the validity of historical figures' (Gramsci, 1991, pp. 34, 349-50). The cultural power Gramsci attaches to fiction might be claimed with even more authority for the movies. During and immediately after World War II average weekly motion picture attendance in the United States reached an all-time high: between 1941 and 1945 it numbered 85 million; between 1946 and 1948, 90 million (Schatz, 1999, p. 462). And from 1944 onwards, the figure of the war veteran appeared as the protagonist in an increasing proportion of the films watched by these huge audiences. Demobilized servicemen and women featured as leading characters in films of all genres, but it was in a cycle of dark, violent private-eye crime thrillers released between 1945 and 1949 that the returning veteran most vividly entered the intellectual life of the people, taking on the validity—and the complexity—of Gramsci's 'historical figure.'¹

These dozen or so films form a coherent crime series due to the close proximity of their release dates, the centrality of the war veteran as protagonist and primary investigator, and the recurrence of themes, plot devices and motifs that linked the stories in the minds of reviewers and

audiences. But they are constituted as a series at a deeper level still by the ideological work they perform. For the investigative projects forced upon the veteran compel him to re-evaluate domestic civilian life in light of the shocks and traumas of his overseas wartime experience. This experience grants him the alienated, detached and in some cases oppositional consciousness of the social critic, forming a lens through which he interrogates the new social order constructed in his absence. Moreover, the investigative structure of the private-eye narrative allows the makers of these films—some of them committed leftists who would become victims of the anticommunist blacklist—to engage in a similarly critical examination of that order. Yet the combined influence of Hollywood storytelling conventions and a rising tide of postwar conservatism prescribed that these narratives ultimately offer comfort to audiences and affirm the social order. Thus, vacillating between social critique and mythic reassurance, the war veteran private-eye series points to a set of broader tensions within postwar America connected to the displacement of a New Deal ethos of progressive reform by the corporate authoritarianism of the emergent Cold War epoch.

On 22 June 1944, preparing for the release of nearly thirteen million Americans from the armed forces, Congress approved the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill of Rights, the largest single welfare measure in US history (Adams, 1994, p. 152). The same week, producer Walter Wanger assured Motion Picture Herald that

Hollywood would play its part in the peace effort just as it had in the war effort. Announcing that 'post-war is now,' Wanger identified 'the reincorporation into our national life of the men and women of the armed forces' as 'the most urgent homefront problem to be dealt with by screen and press' (in Doherty, 1993, p. 200).

A prominent Hollywood liberal, Wanger envisaged that postwar problems would continue to be handled in the moderately progressive manner that characterized the movies' treatment of social issues during the war itself. Encouraged by the government Office of War Information, which for the duration assumed film censorship duties from the industry's internal Production Code Administration, a New Deal ethos of collectivism, inclusivity and pro-labour sentiment pervaded wartime movies (Koppes and Black, 1988, pp. 142-46). Yet a conservative countermovement was underway well before hostilities ceased. From 1944 the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals devoted itself to combating what it described as 'the growing impression that this industry is ... dominated by Communists, radicals and crack-pots.' Its hard-line anti-Roosevelt leadership was committed as much to driving New Deal themes from the screen and militancy from film-industry labour unions as it was to inaugurating a 'new Red-baiting era in Hollywood' (Ceplair and Englund, 1980, p. 211). Consequently, movie treatment of postwar social issues would become the site of intensifying struggle between left and right.

The veteran was central to this struggle not just because the scale and topicality of 'servicemen's readjustment' commanded Hollywood's attention, but also because of the peculiar ambiguity that surrounded ex-servicemen in the popular mind. Even before demobilization commenced, feverish public discourse debated whether the veteran should be seen as a hero or a menace. 'He is variously represented,' wrote one exasperated ex-soldier, 'as a simple-witted boy whose only thought is coming home to Mom and blueberry pie' and 'a trained killer who will stalk the land with a tommy-gun shooting up labor leaders and war profiteers.' Was the veteran 'a starry-eyed idealist who will fashion a perfect world single-handed' or 'a mental case whose aberrations will upset the tidy households and offices of America for a generation?' Americans, it seemed, couldn't decide whether he was 'a promise to democracy' or 'a potential threat to democracy' (Bolté, 1945, pp. 1, 6).

Such uncertainty reflected deeper anxieties about the direction in which postwar America might develop. In movie terms, however, the aura of unpredictability and potential violence surrounding the veteran appealed strongly to the makers of thrillers who had been officially guided away from crime subjects during the war years in favour of more public-spirited fare (Koppes and Black, 1988, pp. 106-107). Moreover, so much had changed while GI Joe was away that the figure of the veteran was tailor made to fill the role of unofficial detective probing into the nature of the transformed world to which he was returning. Thus a new inflection of the hardboiled private-eye thriller emerged. And with regard to the

ideological struggle in the postwar film world it was the radicals and New Dealers who got their licks in first.

Cornered, released December 1945, inaugurated the veteran private-eye series. Producer Adrian Scott and director Edward Dmytryk had been behind 1944's hit Raymond Chandler adaptation Murder My Sweet. Now, though, Communists Scott and Dmytryk, with screenwriter and fellow Party member John Wexley, retooled the hardboiled gumshoe yarn into an anti-fascist preachment reminding audiences of the need for continued vigilance against Nazism beyond Germany's military defeat.² Lieutenant Gerard is a demobbed pilot tracking the collaborationist who in the war's last days betrayed his wife, a French resistance fighter, to the Gestapo. Gerard's investigations take him to Argentina where he uncovers a clandestine network of financiers, industrialists and socialites who are plotting a return to fascist world domination. Cornered climaxes with Gerard murdering the shadowy fascist mastermind Jarnac—a celluloid ringer for real-life Nazi fugitive Martin Boorman—after Jarnac gloats that western political complacency and the persistence of poverty and injustice will guarantee the re-emergence of fascism in the world. Thus the leftist filmmakers issue a premonitory warning about residual Nazism while identifying fascism with the capitalist ruling class and suggesting that only progressive social reforms could prevent its recrudescence.

But it was its representation of the veteran rather than its anti-fascist message that sold Cornered to reviewers and moviegoers. Gerard's volatility and moral ambiguity—his hunger for bloody vengeance and his

disgust at the decadence of affluent civilians—chimed with the American public's contradictory image of the war-scarred ex-serviceman, making him an engaging noir protagonist and eliciting critical superlatives (Langdon, 2008). Special praise was reserved for the showdown with Jarnac in which a near-psychotic Gerard beats the Nazi kingpin to death with his fists. 'I guess I was a little kill crazy,' he admits, indicating that the veteran walks not just an emotional and psychological razor's edge but an ideological one too. For killing Jarnac threatens to undermine the painstaking efforts of an anti-fascist cell to trace the full extent of the Nazi conspiracy. This being Hollywood, the hero gets to kill the heavy and see his entire organization wiped out. But the film makes it clear that Gerard's instability and intrinsically American individualism might hinder as much as help the broader anti-fascist cause.

Cornered locates its fascists overseas; Orson Welles's The Stranger, released May 1946, places them in the American heartland. Though not strictly speaking an ex-serviceman, Allied War Crimes investigator Wilson embodies enough of the veteran's qualities and experience to function as a clear surrogate. He returns to the US from war-ravaged Europe on the trail of Kindler, a fugitive Nazi whom he suspects is masquerading as a respected teacher at an exclusive Connecticut school. To flush out his quarry Wilson requires the covert assistance of Kindler's devoted new wife. When she refuses to countenance Wilson's suspicions about her husband, the investigator resorts to shock tactics, forcing her to watch newsreel footage of Nazi death camps in order to shatter her

complacency. Reminded that the horror of Nazism outlives its military defeat, the traumatized wife provokes Kindler into showing his hand and both he and his visions of nurturing a Fourth Reich are terminated.

Welles was an ardent Roosevelt New Dealer rather than a radical leftist, but The Stranger's anti-fascism is at least as far-reaching as Cornered's. The latter indicted the capitalist class as fascist running dogs while keeping its Nazis outside the USA. But Welles suggests that Nazis may find an amenable home in the upper reaches of respectable American society, insinuating themselves seamlessly into 'normal' political and civic life. The Stranger's key scene in which the usually restrained Wilson brutally compels Kindler's fragile wife to watch the concentration camp footage draws its power from the investigator's association with the veteran figure. Grim, relentless and unforgiving, Wilson in this scene displays the impatience and contempt many veterans felt towards a civilian world oblivious to the horrors they had witnessed, and expresses their fear, as one veteran put it, that 'the peace will be fumbled this time as it was last time.' Cornered and The Stranger deployed the veteran private-eye narrative to counteract what many GIs came to understand only as a result of leaving the US—'the political naiveté of most Americans' (Bolté, 1945, pp. 38, 3, 28). But the fact that these narratives made women the principal obstruction in the delivery of this lesson—Gerard is nearly distracted by the blandishments of Jarnac's alluring wife—suggested that the veteran's cultural significance was bound up as

much with his experience on the sexual battlefield as on the military and political ones.

Indeed, public discourse at the time was much concerned that the veteran would return from a shooting war only to find himself in a sex war. Wartime employment patterns and loosened moral strictures had made millions of American women economically and sexually independent. Anxieties about promiscuity surrounded the single woman and the inconstant wife alike, while it was understood (though seldom spoken) that GI Joe might have been less than faithful himself while overseas. Mass demobilization drove the divorce rate to an all-time high in 1946 with the marriages of veterans twice as likely to disintegrate as those of civilians (May, 1988, pp. 68-69; Childers, 2009, p. 8). But the popular press uniformly exhorted women to stand by their men even if, as Good Housekeeping warned, 'he may be a different person when he returns' (in Childers, 2009, p. 69).

This is the context into which navy veteran Johnny Morrison steps as The Blue Dahlia (April 1946) opens. He returns only to find home-sweet-home the site of an orgiastic drinking party presided over by intoxicated wife Helen and her nightclub-tycoon boyfriend, Eddie Harwood. Discovering that Helen has become a good-time girl and that her wantonness caused the death of their child, a seething Johnny roughs her up. Later, regretful, he resolves to work at their marriage but Helen's murdered body is discovered and Johnny is the chief suspect. Thus the veteran turns detective in order to clear his name, in the process

uncovering a web of greed, violence and sexual anarchy that, the film hints, has characterized home-front America while the likes of Johnny have been fighting overseas.

Johnny is a credible suspect for Helen's murder not just because of her aberrant behaviour but because it was commonly assumed that veterans would be prone to crime and outbursts of random violence. 'Trained to kill: the coming veteran crime wave' and 'Will your boy be a killer when he returns?' were two of many similar headlines adorning newspapers in 1944 and 1945 (Childers, 2009, pp. 4, 131). Indeed, the spotlight of suspicion also picks out Johnny's veteran buddy, Buzz, a wounded 'psychoneurotic' prone to violent mood swings and amnesia due to the metal plate in his head.³ Johnny and Buzz represent two sides of the veteran's threatening masculinity: the trained killer on an emotional hair trigger, especially regarding his sexual pride, and the damaged neurotic unable to remember let alone control his volatile impulses.

The Blue Dahlia deploys the veteran private-eye narrative both to explore public anxieties regarding the veteran himself and to expose the venality and seediness of a home front officially represented in terms of collective sacrifice and co-operative endeavour. A 1945 Saturday Evening Post feature registered veteran dismay at the 'cant, greed, luxury, hypocrisy, lust and avarice' they found at home, and recorded their disgust at 'the lascivious nightclub air of those who have fattened on war and death' (in Childers, 2009, p. 212). In this respect the film is a socially-critical, demythologizing text, especially in its linking of playboy

racketeer Harwood with the capitalists and entrepreneurs who made home-front hay while the bullets flew. Yet Johnny's investigative activity partners him with Harwood's estranged wife, Joyce, the incarnation of feminine fidelity whose testimony is vital in exonerating Johnny and Buzz. If the unruly Helen is the cause of the mayhem that engulfs Johnny on his homecoming and the object of his inquiry into the transformed social order constructed in his absence, Joyce is the agent of his successful reintegration into that order. As the attractive helpmeet she's an indication of the restored normality in postwar gender relations strongly encouraged by government and business (May, 1988, pp. 75-91). The Blue Dahlia's home-front critique is tempered by a conservative gender politics in which the threat posed by the war-liberated woman is countered by the wifely nurturer who assumes responsibility for veteran rehabilitation and the restoration of domestic 'normalcy'.

In this it was not alone. Dead Reckoning (January 1947) and The Guilty (March 1947) also portrayed veterans launched upon investigative quests by the unsettling conduct of libidinous sirens. In the former, demobilized paratrooper Rip Murdock discovers that a missing army buddy has been murdered after being lured into a sleazy underworld network by the beautiful but amoral Coral. Though he falls for her, Rip rejects Coral, placing loyalty to his buddy first. 'I loved him more,' Rip informs Coral, coolly watching her expire from injuries he inflicted on her in their eroticized struggle at the film's climax. In The Guilty, ex-soldier Mike Carr investigates a murder, ostensibly to exonerate the chief

suspect, his buddy Johnny, a psychoneurotic veteran whose amnesia leaves him without an alibi. Johnny is cleared, but only after we learn that Mike himself is the killer. Goaded by his girlfriend's pursuit of other guys, including Johnny, Mike attempts to murder her but mistakenly kills her twin sister. His 'investigation' is a ruse to conceal his guilt and implicate Johnny. In its depiction of jealousy and betrayal between battle comrades, The Guilty subverts the romanticized 'band of brothers' mythology that dominates public perception of World War II veterans (Rose, 2008, pp. 1-4). But it locates that betrayal's cause in the aberrant sexuality of the girlfriend who manipulates the vulnerable Johnny and the unstable Mike for her own gratification. Thus the socially-critical aspects of these films, expressed through the veteran's disgust at home-front sleaze and corruption, are recuperated by a regressive gender politics which spills over into misogynistic glee at the demise or discomfiture of bad girls who abrogate sexual norms and callously toy with veterans' hearts.

Veterans reserved particular animosity for those who spent the duration accumulating private wealth. President Roosevelt denounced war profiteers and Senator Truman investigated them, but the considerable financial fruits of increased wartime production were nonetheless monopolized by a concentrated group of corporations and individuals (Adams, 1994, p. 118). The veteran private-eye series articulated unease about wartime corporate expansion, asking whether the war was fought for democracy and the common man or for the benefit of big business. It

hinted at the class-conscious anger that made the period 1944-46 one of unprecedented labour militancy (Zinn, 1990, pp. 408-9).⁴ But its narrative resolutions offered compromise: the working-class veteran's hostility toward the rich and powerful is ultimately subordinated to authority figures who represent the expanded postwar state apparatus and signal a recomposition of the New Deal relationship between labour, capital and government.

In Somewhere in the Night (June 1946) a wounded soldier emerges from a coma with no memory of the 'George Taylor' named in his identification papers. Seeking to reconstruct his pre-combat past, the amnesiac veteran discovers that Taylor is a fictitious identity he invented to enlist in the service and dodge his criminal past. Taylor is really Larry Cravat, a sleazy private dick involved in the appropriation of \$2 million of sequestered Nazi capital and entangled with a network of murderous American businessmen. Horrified by this discovery, Taylor assists the authorities in recovering the money and rounding up the thieves, repudiating the reprehensible Cravat and truly becoming George Taylor, the good citizen forged by military service.

Cravat and his business associates are clearly surrogates for war profiteers and the film's association of their ill-gotten wealth with the Nazis recalls politicians' wartime denunciations of profiteers as traitors. The Chase (November 1946) likewise draws parallels between the business class and the organized criminal underworld, each characterized by greed and ruthlessness. Penniless amnesiac war hero Chuck Scott

rebels against his domineering employer, gangster-plutocrat Eddie Roman, echoing the spirit of 1946's great strike wave. Yet Chuck is only able to bring Roman down due to the intervention of a kindly Navy psychiatrist who helps him recover repressed memories containing crucial information. Again, the repudiation of the capitalist-profiteer is but a stage on the way to the veteran's ultimate accommodation with the benevolent authority of the state. The same pattern is repeated in Ride the Pink Horse (September 1947). Here, embittered veteran Lucky Gagin hunts down corrupt businessman Hugo who has made a fortune from fraudulent government war contracts. The veteran's moral and ideological ambiguity is indicated by the haziness of Gagin's motives: is he on a vengeance mission for Hugo's murder of an army buddy, or does the impecunious Gagin want a slice of Hugo's action for himself? That he finally cooperates with the FBI to bring Hugo to justice recuperates Gagin's hostility to the business class and his cynicism about Uncle Sam, subordinating these subversive impulses to the imperatives of the postwar state.

These films, then, used the veteran to channel anxieties about the increased power of American business into resolutions that implied there would be no return to the class conflicts of the 1930s, for the state's newly expanded role would manage relations between capital and labour in the interests of all. The postwar press was replete with articles hailing American capitalism's miraculous recovery from depression, invariably attributing it to a new kind of partnership between bosses, workers and

government (Bell, 1949). But the truth was that wartime economic priorities secured 'the triumph of the large corporations,' boosted the dominance of 'a wealthy elite,' and caused New Dealers to retreat from fundamentally reforming capitalism to managing it in the interests of profits and growth (Adams 1994, p. 118; Zinn, 1990, p. 408; Brinkley, 1996, pp. 265-71). The veteran private-eye's hostility to business elites implicitly critiqued this new order, but his narrative capitulation to the leadership of state-sanctioned authority figures affirmed it.

However, certain veteran private-eye films went so far as to link America's postwar pro-business orientation with the fascism that had just been defeated. In Act of Violence (December 1948) ex-prisoner of war Joe Parkson tracks down fellow POW Frank Enley, not for a bonding session but to kill him. Enley betrayed an escape plan to their Nazi captors in return for increased food rations, causing the deaths of ten of his compatriots. And while the traumatised Joe has struggled to readjust to civilian life, the plausible Frank has built a business empire. Before we know the cause of Joe's hatred, he resembles the postwar bogeyman of the unstable, potentially psychotic veteran. Yet when Frank's role in his backstory is revealed Joe is refigured as the righteous nemesis of a business class whose selfishness and acquisitiveness are inflections of the fascist mentality and collaborationist ethos. Indeed, Frank's perfect family and comfy suburban home suggest that the conformity and materialism of the postwar boom are extensions of that mentality and ethos. And Frank's confession that he betrayed his comrades out of a desire to consume—

'ten men were dead and I couldn't stop eating'—indicts both the greed of the entrepreneur and the consumerist foundations of the entire postwar capitalist order. Moreover, Frank's offence is that he's an informer, the film drawing a parallel between Nazism and the anticommunist witch-hunts that were by 1948 already prominent in American public life. Indeed, the film's writer Robert L. Richards was blacklisted after being named as a communist in a fellow screenwriter's testimony to Congress's House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) (Vaughn, 1996, p. 295).

The same parallel between American business ethics and the mentality of fascists and collaborators is established in The Clay Pigeon (March 1949). Amnesiac veteran Jim Fletcher wakes from a two-year coma to find he's awaiting court martial for murderous treason. Fleeing, he turns detective to illuminate his past, discovering that he's been framed by a fellow ex-POW who's now running a multi-million dollar counterfeiting business and wants Jim out of circulation. Worse, Jim's antagonist is partnered with a sadistic guard from their Japanese POW camp, now masquerading in the US as a respectable property developer. Like Act of Violence, the film pulls no punches in its attacks on the greed and amorality of business while puncturing the patriotic band-of-brothers myth that by the late 1940s was crystallizing around the ex-serviceman, encouraged by right-wing veterans' organisations such as the red-baiting American Legion (Childers, 2009, pp. 229-30). And The Clay Pigeon's themes of collaboration and informing on comrades likewise rebounded on

its writer Carl Foreman who, like Richards, was blacklisted following a fellow writer's HUAC testimony (Vaughn, 1996, p. 157).

Again, though, these films' trenchant critiques of postwar complacency, consumerism and a quasi-fascist business class, were tempered by affirmative endings in which the veteran is reintegrated into society through the intervention of state agencies and supportive, domesticated women. Yet their oneiric noir stylistics, and the unrelenting cynicism of their protagonists toward elites and patriotic bromides, unsettle these pat resolutions. Collier's magazine observed in 1947 that 'the selfishness, greed and dishonesty which total war has increased throughout the country have poisoned many a veteran's soul' (in Rose, 2008, p. 232). These films suggest, rather, that it is the nation's soul that has been poisoned by capitulation to the imperatives of business and profit.

Playwright Arthur Miller described 1949 as 'the last postwar year' (Miller, 1974, p. 31). Thereafter, 'normalcy' would preside, but it would be a normalcy defined not by the reforming liberalism of the New Deal thirties but by a 'conservative liberalism' of capitalists and cold warriors pushing consumerism and anti-communism (Hodgson, 1978, p. 90). The final entry in the war veteran private-eye series bears this out. In The Crooked Way (April 1949) amnesiac veteran Eddie Rice investigates his pre-war past to discover that he's 'really' hoodlum Eddie Riccardi who joined the service under a false name to evade the wrath of gangland associates.

Appalled at his former self, Eddie seeks redemption by bringing down his old racket while winning back estranged wife Nina who has divorced him and gone over to his former underworld partners. Eddie's rehabilitation is completed as he helps the cops bust the old gang, regains Nina's affections, and trades in the anti-social Eddie Riccardi for the war hero and stand-up citizen Eddie Rice.

As we have seen, the reassuring narrative resolutions of other war-veteran private-eye movies are destabilized by socially-critical themes, disorienting formal manoeuvres, and the protagonists' cynicism and anger. But in The Crooked Way film-noir mood and stylistics are vehicles for a conservative celebration of two central discourses of the postwar order: domesticity and informing. First, Nina's rehabilitation is as important as Eddie's. His ex-wife initially rejects Eddie's advances on the grounds that the war has made her economically and sexually independent, prompting Eddie to resort to kidnap and mild domestic violence to convince her of the desirability of remarriage. Second, the cause of the old Eddie's rift with his hoodlum friends is that he had turned state's evidence against them. New Eddie completes old Eddie's work, assisting the police in busting the racketeers, vindicating his role as snitch and bringing Nina on board as a fellow informer. Testifying against one-time colleagues is the sacrament that blesses Eddie's and Nina's personal rehabilitation, just as 'naming names' became central to discrediting New Deal liberalism and embedding paranoid anticommunism in the postwar order (Navasky, 1981, pp. 3-5).

For many veterans, war experience made it necessary to question power and criticise hierarchy: 'the men once revered and dominant, the institutions and ways of society which confined us,' confessed one, 'have lost much of their magic power to awe and oppress' (Bolté, 1945, p. 5). The veteran private-eye series reflects this spirit, depicting the veteran as an 'historical figure' large in the popular imagination around whom a struggle over the meaning of the war and the ensuing social order revolves. Gramsci notes that total war can prompt a progressive turn in 'national-popular consciousness,' breeding 'a deep-seated bond of democratic solidarity between directing intellectuals and popular masses' (Gramsci, 1991, p. 325). The left-inclined, socially-critical aspects of the veteran private-eye series illustrate this. Yet The Crooked Way turns the subversive, questioning and volatile veteran into a compliant informer and apostle of the 'marriage boom' that underpinned a new political consensus in which 'cold war policies abroad and anticommunism at home' became tied 'to the suburban family ideal' (May, 1988, p. 208). The film exemplifies how the democratic bond between intellectuals and masses nurtured by war could be colonized by the dominant culture 'which, to exercise [its] hegemony better, accommodates part of proletarian ideology' (Gramsci, 1991, p. 363).

Ultimately, the veteran private-eye series fell victim to the cold-war culture its narratives showed emerging. In 1947 the major studios instituted the anticommunist blacklist. The same year ex-business mogul and new Motion Picture Association chief Eric Johnston instructed

Hollywood that 'we'll have no more films that show the seamy side of American life' (in May, 2000, p. 177). With left-leaning creative film personnel on the run and even progressive veterans' organizations forcibly disbanded as communist fronts (Childers, 2009, p. 230), the industry prioritized movies that celebrated American business, family life and capitalist democracy. And the embittered, volatile and interrogative veteran was replaced on celluloid by the unambiguous heroes of the postwar combat film, embodiments of a new movie regime in which World War II was presented in terms of 'sanitized guts and glory' (Doherty, 1993, p. 272).

Notes

1. The AFI Catalog suggests that some 70 films featuring war-veteran protagonists were released between 1944 and 1949, about five per cent of total film production for the period.
2. John Paxton, who revised Wexley's first draft, took final writing credit. Scott, Dmytryk and Wexley were later blacklisted, though in 1951 Dmytryk turned informer for Congress in order to salvage his career (Ceplair and Englund, 1980, pp. 323-360).
3. Ten per cent of servicemen—1.3 million soldiers—were treated for psychological trauma, causing public paranoia about 'psychoneurotic' veterans (Childers, 2009, pp. 8, 230).
4. During the war industrial production doubled, US GDP and corporate profits nearly doubled, and from 1943-1946 over ten million American workers went on strike at some point.

References

- Adams, M. C. C. (1994), The Best War Ever: America and World War II. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bell, D. (1949), 'America's un-Marxist revolution'. Commentary, VII, 207-15.
- Bolté, C. G. (1945), The New Veteran. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock.
- Ceplair, L. and Englund, S. (1980), The Inquisition in Hollywood: Politics in the Film Community, 1930-1960. New York: Anchor Press.
- Childers, T. (2009), Soldier from the War Returning: The Greatest Generation's Troubled Homecoming from World War II. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Doherty, T. (1993), Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture, and World War II.
- Gramsci, A. (1991), Selections from Cultural Writings. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hodgson, G. America in Our Time. New York: Vintage.
- Koppes, C. R. and Black, G. D. (1988), Hollywood Goes to War: How Politics, Profits and Propaganda Shaped World War II Movies. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Langdon, J. E. (2008), Caught in the Crossfire: Adrian Scott and the Politics of Americanism in 1940s Hollywood. New York: Columbia University Press.
- May, E. T. (1988), Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era. New York: Basic Books.

May, L. (2000), The Big Tomorrow: Hollywood and the Politics of the American Way. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, A. (1974), 'The year it came apart'. *New York*, 30 December, 30-44.

Navasky, V. (1981), Naming Names: New York: Penguin.

Rose, K. D. (2008), Myth and the Greatest Generation: A Social History of Americans in World War II. London: Routledge.

Schatz, T. (1999), Boom and Bust: American Cinema in the 1940s. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Vaughn, R. (1996), Only Victims: A Study of Show Business Blacklisting. New York: Limelight.

Zinn, H. (1990), A People's History of the United States. New York: Harper Collins.