UC San Diego

UC San Diego Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Eagle or the Cross: Rome, the Bible, and Cold War America

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rm0z4ws

Author

Williams, Douglas

Publication Date

1996

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

The Eagle or the Cross:
Rome, the Bible, and Cold War America

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in

Communication

by

Douglas Williams

Committee in charge:

Professor Helene Keyssar, Chair
Professor Michael Cole
Professor William Fitzgerald
Professor Daniel Hallin
Professor Tracy Strong

1996

UMI Number: 9714841

Copyright 1996 by
Williams, Douglas

All rights reserved.

Copyright

Douglas Williams, 1996

All rights reserved.

The dissertation of Douglas Williams is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm:

University of California, San Diego

1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Signature Page iii

Table of Contents iv

Acknowledgements v

Vita, Publications and Fields of Study vii

Abstract viii

One: Introduction

Part One: Theory 1

Part Two: Narratives and Leviathans 66

Two: The Bible Film

Religion and Identity 107

The Bible 140

Three: The Ten Commandments 162

Four: The Story of Ruth 262

Five: The Rome Film 346

Six: Spartacus 426

Seven: The Fall of the Roman Empire 585

Eight: Conclusion: Death and Transfiguration 701

References 753

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A dissertation is an epic quest, one that the author may begin before he or she is aware of it, but is never completed without struggle. If I claim the role of hero in this epic, however, it is also true that without the assistance of powerful and sometimes supernatural beings, all heroes come to naught and leave their bones to bleach in the desert sands. Chief among those beings is my advisor, Helene Keyssar, whose support reminded me of my goal, and whose criticism sharpened my vision; she is my wizard. I would also particularly single out Michael Cole, whose efforts to place the right books in my path helped to lead me forward, and whose timely research assistant grant allowed me to remain in graduate school. I would also like to thank my other committee members, each of whom offered comments, book recommendations, and other support. As with my masters thesis, I must again thank my friend Gregg Rickman for his help in preventing library fines, his assistance in obtaining research materials, and his ability to procure through subterranean channels such unobtainable rarities as Sign of the Pagan. Duncan Cooper saved me much research time and provided

many helpful comments and information on Spartacus. When the Circean enchantment of further research beguiled me, my patient wife Sheri Jurnecka restored me to my sanity, and recalled me to my mission. Finally, I must thank George Lucas, whose Star Wars and Raiders of the Lost Ark first led me to wonder about Rome, the Bible, and the United States.

VITA

October 27, 1959	Born, Eugene, Oregon
1982	B.A., University of Oregon
1985-1991	M.A., San Francisco State University
1990	Teaching Assistant, Department of Cinema, San Francisco State University
1991-1994	Teaching Assistant, Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego
1992	Research Assistant, Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition
1997	Ph. D., University of California, San Diego

PUBLICATIONS

"The Seafarer as an Evangelical Poem", Lore and Language Vol.8, No.1, pp.19-30 (1988).

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Communication

Studies in Linguistics
Professor George Lakoff, University of California, Berkeley

Studies in Cognitive Science
Professors Phillip Agre and Donald Norman, University of California, San Diego

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Eagle or the Cross:

Rome, the Bible, and Cold War America

by

Douglas Williams

Doctor of Philosophy in Communication

University of California San Diego, 1996

Professor Helene Keyssar, Chair

From 1949 to 1966, Hollywood studios produced Biblical and Roman epic films. The Bible and Rome films have received little critical attention, in spite of the continuing popularity of films like The Ten Commandments, and of Rome themes in Science Fiction film descendants like Star Wars and Star Trek. Where they came from, what purpose they served, and why they disappeared or became transformed either has gone unnoticed, or has been a mystery.

In this study I analyze four films shot by shot. I combine this close reading with an analysis of the Rome and Bible genres, and link

them to social and political contexts. This investigation shows that these films (and television programs) are widely broadcast narratives that canalize and supplement both dominant and critical interpretations of the United States through Roman or Biblical analogies. Audiences use these analogies as contexts with which to frame understanding of issues in the public sphere.

Extant studies do not explore why these narratives, in particular, were chosen as analogies for the United States. Nor do they explain what cognitive function analogical narratives serve for people individually and collectively. I use contemporary cognitive theory (Vygotsky and Activity theory, and Cognitive linguistics) to explain how such narrative frames work, why they are necessary to form social and political consensus, and how the Rome and Bible analogies have informed identity-struggles in the United States from the colonial period to the present.

CHAPTER ONE

> A capacity to recognize certain specific speech genres and their patterns of privileging would provide an analytic tool, one that is currently all too infrequently encountered, for understanding sociocultural settings and the psychological processes associated with them. This in turn would allow us to free ourselves from undesirable patterns and create new patterns.
>
> James V. Wertsch, Voices in the Mind[1]

THEORY

In 1951 filmmaker Cecil B. DeMille completed his film The Big Top, which would go on to win the Academy award as best motion picture of the year. But he was dissatisfied. The times were perilous, and called for a more important film.[2] He had made a film called The Ten Commandments in 1923, but now he felt that it was dated. He wanted to make another version that would reflect the world's changed state:

> The bible story was timeless. It was also timely. It is a story of slavery and liberation, two words that the world's experience since 1923 had saturated with more vivid meaning, with more real fear and with more anxious hope. When Moses stood before Pharaoh voicing the divine demand, `Let my people go!", the same two forces faced that confront one another today in a world divided between tyranny and freedom. When Moses led his people to Mount Sinai, they learned, as the world today must learn, that true freedom is freedom under God.[3]

When DeMille finished his new Ten Commandments, he made free prints available to prisons, and offered to distribute it free of charge in the Soviet Union if the government would not censor it. He liked to call it his most modern

picture.[4] In a speech to the new DeMille Jr. High School in Long Beach, California, in 1957, in a moment that was perhaps the epiphany of his pedagogical purpose in making the film, he had this to say:

> Are men the property of the State? Are men to be ruled by law or by the whims of an individual? The answers to these timely questions were given some three thousand years ago on Mt. Sinai.... [The film's] purpose is to portray the state of civilization at the time when God saw that mankind was ready for the first proclamation of freedom under law--and to tell the story of the man whom God prepared to recieve the law.[5]

Others besides the school district administrators in Long Beach apparently also saw The Ten Commandments as a timely and important film. Ten months after the film had been finished and distributed in the United States, on the eve of the film's European release, the government of France awarded DeMille the Cross of the Legion of Honor. Pope Pius XII granted DeMille an audience. The President of the Italian Republic decorated him. "In Germany," DeMille wrote, "President Theodor Heuss received me and I had long talks with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the heroic mayor of brave Berlin, Willy Brandt, both men who understood The Ten Commandments...."[6] DeMille invited Roosevelt's "kitchen cabinet" advisor Bernard Baruch to a special screening. "He sat through it all without moving, and at the end he said to me, `This could be a turning-point.'"[7]

But what kind of "turning point" was this film? What did DeMille's audience see? Many film analyses are based on the idea that films reflect their social context, but DeMille, Baruch and others regarded The Ten

Commandments as something that could change the social context. Like John Milton in the aftermath of the Puritan revolution, DeMille thought that the United States was in danger of becoming decadent. He wanted to create an epic, a story that would reinvoke the core beliefs of his society. DeMille wanted to tell a story that (in Milton's phrase) would be doctrinal and exemplary to the nation.

The epic is the genre with which this social identity formation is most associated. In fact, as I will discuss, all art tends to fulfil the defining role of the epic as a symbolic embodiment of a society's identity. But for artists, writers and filmmakers to chose to make something that self-consciously is "epic" strongly suggests that they feel a particular need to define society for themselves and for their audiences. Not every subject is suitable to be treated in epic fashion. In order for a narrative to be epic, and for that epic to be relevant to its age, it must first invoke as its subject the central narrative myths of its audience's society. Secondly, the problems that are presented in the narrative must be both determinative of civilization as a whole within the artificial world of the narrative, and related to the central issues of the society for whom the narrative is created.

In the twelve years from 1949 to 1961, many Biblical epic films were made. None were made in 1948, and the last major Bible film, The Bible (1966), was supposed to be the first of a series that was never completed. The Roman films emerged as a subset of Bible films, beginning with Quo Vadis (1951). In this film, as with many others, Rome was the nation of oppression in contrast to the Christian protagonists. With Julius Caesar (1953), Serpent of

the Nile (1953), and Sign of the Pagan (1954), however, Rome emerged not as the antagonist nation, but rather as the protagonist nation threatened by internal or external forces; Rome's survival or fall became the epic subject. The last successful Rome film was A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum (1966), a comedy rather than an epic. The Rome and Bible genres emerged and disappeared at the same time. Why? If these films as epics were particularly directed to the central problems of identity in the United States, then the following questions must be answered: What problem did this society face between 1948 to 1965 that these films symbolized? How were these genres particularly suitable to represent this problem? Where have they gone?

The place to begin to answer these questions is to look at the source of the genre, and to examine how that basic story has been employed by different groups in American society over time. No genre arises in isolation. Every society whose history we know has some sort of narrative which gives it an identity and a mission in the world. Some are more successful than others. Some stories are forgotten as their societies have disappeared. But for those which persist, the stories which a culture tells about itself become more complex and interactive over time. In very ancient cultures, such as China, even the most oblique references--flowers, for example, in a stylized drawing--can evoke poems of incompetent bureaucrats of dynasties from past millenia, and complex conversations of long ago through which the author criticizes bureaucrats of today.

The linguist Paul Grice noted that communication in general is structured within what he called the Cooperative Principle, that communication was constrained by maxims of relevance, brevity, perspicuousness, and sincerity.[8] Genres of stories which persist through time in a given culture must be meaningful to that society. The Rome and Bible genres did not arise in the 1950's but flow across American history like vast rivers, now on the surface, now flowing underground, but ever-present. They have also evolved, and the modern instances of their invocation show the traces of that dialogic interplay between history and culture up to and during the Cold War period in which the Rome and Biblical epics were made. These epic films were popular in their time--and some continue to be--because they embodied the central mythological narratives through which the United States has from its beginning used to create and define its identity. They retell our national myths, the preferred symbolic systems thorough which the United States has staged its arguments over American ideals and identities. Because these arguments extend across American history, the contestations between groups and people in the epic films of the 50's and 60's echo conflicts in the past, and prefigure current contestations over the American identity. The purpose of this study is therefore two-fold: To understand both the individual instance of the Rome and Bible genres in the fifties, and to begin to outline the way narrative genres inform social identity.

In order to understand how narratives can shape our understanding of the world, I will first outline the theoretical basis of narrative's cognitive role for individuals and society. The United States is hardly unique in its use of narratives to shape identity; remediation through paradigmatic or syntagmatic narratives is a fundamental medium through which all human societies form and maintain strategies of behavior for themselves in relation to the world, even in their most basic understandings. I begin with this problem: How does one understand a new idea, or a new word, or remember a place? This is a daily occurence which we take for granted, because we have an expectation of competence that experience with ourselves and others rarely calls into question. Most people can learn a new word, or a new idea, with a little bit of concentration. Most people recognize objects particular to a given place.

But what about extraordinary people? S.V. Sherashevsky, a man who earned his living as a mnemonist, described his process of word-recall thusly:

> I recognize a word not only by the images it evokes, but by a whole complex of feelings that the image arouses. It's hard to express...it's not a matter of vision or hearing, but some overall sense I get. Usually I experience a word's taste and weight, and I don't have to make an effort to remember it--the word seems to recall itself[9]

If most of us were to think carefully about how we recognize a word, some of this would no doubt be common to our own experiences--except for the references to apparently irrelevant sensual associations with words, and the effortlessness of recall. This description of word recall is from a man who suffered from synesthesia: the stimulus of a word or an object would be accompanied by a

flood of other sensory perceptions. He described a fence he had seen once as having a salty taste, feeling rough, and possessing a sharp, piercing sound. Probably not coincidentally, Sherashevsky had total recall. Almost everything for him had a unique assortment of sensory responses associated with it. Again, not coincidentally, this man found it almost impossible to think of abstract ideas. Everything for him was concrete and unique.

Here is how another person, L. Zasetsky, recalled words:

> I had tried to think of the word before the need for it came. I had run through words that came to mind--*doctor?* ...no, I knew that wasn't right...*sister?* (I couldn't think of the word *nurse* either and used *sister* instead)...*bird*...no, it's--*bedpan!* Suddenly I remembered about that *bird* or *duck*, the word we used for bedpan.[10]

on another occasion, Zasetsky wrote:

> I'll see a letter or number but won't be able to think of the word for it right away, or hear a letter or number mentioned and not be able to visualize what either one looks like. I've often thought that's why my speaking and memory have gotten so bad--sometimes it takes me an entire day to think of a word for something I've seen and be able to say it. And vice versa: I'll hear a word (or say a particular number) but not be able to visualize it right away or form any image of it. It may even take a long while for me to remember what it means.[11]

Again, much of this should seem familiar to anyone who has searched for the right word in a given situation. What is odd is the train of associations (words in reference to people in hospitals; to women; to objects with protuberent extensions) which led to the correct word is a bit unfocussed[12] in the first quote. It is also rare for most people to struggle to recall a word they know, or recall the

meaning of a word, for a whole day. This man suffered a bullet wound that destroyed a portion of the parieto-occipital region of the left hemisphere of his brain, the part of the brain which recognizes patterns. He knew as a matter of rational knowledge that he should recognize certain objects, but his ability to process patterns of associations unconsciously had been to a considerable extent destroyed.

What is common to each of these processes of recall is that they do not seem tightly focussed within what we would consider to be the common-sense relevant areas of associations for words. Their process of thought is at once familiar yet disconcertingly strange, for they do not organize the world in ways that we take to be self-evident. For most people, it is not relevant to describe a voice as "yellow and crumbly," as the mnemonist once did.[13] For most people, it is not conceivable that one could stand with a plane in one hand and a piece of wood in another, as the wounded man once did, and know what each was, and that something was to be done with them and be unable to figure out what.[14] One person has an excess of associations, and one not enough, and so neither see the world in what we take to be a normal way; their perceptions are too unique.

But do common perceptions have common meanings? Imagine a green rectangular field whose widest point is horizontal to the viewer, on which there are a series of chalk lines. What is this field used for? To someone from France, the field would self-evidently be for soccar. To someone from the

United States, the field would self-evidently be used for football. Here is another example, a set of words: crowd; peanuts; cracker-jack; strike. What do these words signify? To our person from France, the words (translated, of course) might mean nothing at all. Perhaps they might invoke the imagery associated with a boxing match, or a soccer game. To most people from the United States, thanks in part to a song from an obscure Broadway show in the early 1900's, they mean baseball.[15] In some unconscious sense, these words are part of the web of associations which helps the citizens of the United States to feel connected with others around them, to exchange ideas that don't seem like they come from left field, but somehow are in the ballpark. Because we live in a culture where "Take Me Out to the Ballgame" is a folk-canonic narrative of a common cultural activity, these are not arbitrary words, but rather self-evident evocations of a particular type of event. It would not be off-base to say that this event provides us with common associations of thought.

Such cultural patterns of associations are pervasive. They are also dynamic, and in the guise of genres or continuing narratives, they can become quite complex. It is precisely in our becoming thoroughly acculturated to the cognitive genres of our culture that we are able to create individual identities through their dynamic interaction. I will use as an example a contemporary narrative model with which most people in the United States (and increasingly, the world) are familiar, the television show Star Trek: The Next Generation.[16] Patrick Stewart, the actor who portrays Captain Picard on Star Trek, once

commented on a television talk show that he deeply admired Picard, and would himself like to be more like him. The fact that Steward looks at himself playing a character as a being in some ways better than he himself is--a confusing idea on the surface--leads to an important question about narrative characters: Who--what--is "Picard," this person with whom each of us, player and audience members, find ourselves engaged? Why do the conflicts in his imaginary world concern us? He is not a real person, and yet each audience member knows him. We know his patterns of thought, we know his strengths and weaknesses as a person. We know of his function in his imaginary world as a mediator between the justness of intentions and the consequences of actions. Moreover, we know and recognize certain elements of his society, the "Federation"--its respect for the individual, and for self-determination of social groups; its "prime directive," not always followed yet always respected, that a strong society should not interfere with the natural development of other societies. This knowledge has not arisen in a day or a week, but over the course of years in which we have shared Picard's hopes and fears, his passions and sorrows, his mistakes and the knowledge he gained by them.

The complexity of this knowledge may be made clearer if I use myself as a subject of analysis. I myself know Picard and his world far better than I know that of most people I have met. I know the way in which Picard gazes uncertainly at a speaker whose words are making him rethink his own beliefs; I know the struggle in his face as he tries to control his anger as his friends or

members of his crew are wantonly hurt by others, claiming right to do so by some higher morality. I know, before the characters on the program do at times, what is true to their society's beliefs and what violates them. I know this and more of a person whose portrayer I have never met, who never has and never will exist, whose whole society is a fantasy. The actor Patrick Stewart is paid to be Picard, and as a requirement of his job must reflect considerably about how his character thinks and feels, and of what his philosopy of life consists. But I certainly am not paid to watch and think about Star Trek, and Steward is not paid to admire the role he plays. What is this role--this artificial person--to us?

Steward's comment about the admirability of Picard is an important clue to his significance. I admire Picard as well. His openness to unfamiliar beliefs and ideas has an influence on my own philosophy of life. Again, in this I am not alone. The actor Christian Slater reportedly sees one Star Trek episode, "Tapestry," in which Picard is given the chance to relive his youth, only to discover that his mistakes are part of his strengths, as a parallel to his own life, and the mature Picard as an ideal to which he aspires.[17] Like Christian Slater, I think of some Star Trek episodes as representative of events in my own life. Events from my own life seem to take on a greater solidity and contemplatability when I can project them into the developing characters and relationships in the Star Trek world. Picard is a representative of the moral beliefs of his society, and in his struggles to reconcile the conflicts between what he believes and

what he does, I see a mirror through which I understand similar conflicts within myself and my society better.

Perhaps this cognitive function of narrative for the individual in society will come more into focus in comparison with a similar narrative from another time and another society, Antigone, as analyzed by Jean-Pierre Vernant:

> Of course Creon, as a chief of state, is right in not wanting to allow the burial of an enemy who is a traitor. `Why is he right?', one may ask. I would say, `He is right from the Greek point of view' because he acts according to the laws of the Greek City-State.... When I say that the City calls itself into question [through Antigone], I mean that Creon is right from the point of view of the City. Creon is doing what would be done in Athens; and yet at the same time there is a questioning which results from the City's looking at itself objectively through the intermediary of heroic myths, the old legends which belong to the City's past. In the distance of objectivity afforded by these myths the City examines itself, seeking to determine what it has incorporated and what is alien to it.[18]

In the guise of Picard,[19] as the Athenian took on the guise of Antigone and Creon, we audience members of a society not dissimilar in many respects from the Federation look at ourselves looking at another version of ourselves. And this examination, in which I participate with the actor and with all the large audience of the Star Trek genre, is one unit of the United States contemplating conceptions of itself over time. Picard is one of many fictional characters who are part of my thinking, fictional characters whose behavior provide models both to emulate and to avoid. But there are perhaps thousands of narrative characters in my mind that I share with others in this nation and this world who,

like Jimmy Cricket in Pinocchio's ear, offer hints and strategies for my own behavior.

Narrative characters only scratch the surface of influences on my thinking. There are persons from history who guide my thinking. As Cognitive linguists have shown, objects like the computer serve us all as handy means of expressing ideas: "Please repeat what you said, I'm processing things a little slowly today." There are pictures which come readily to my mind as expressions of ways of seeing, ways of thinking. Van Gogh's olive trees twisting up a hillside with their green fire of life have changed the way I look at trees and think of nature. The gothic cathedrals of France embody in their form a sort of ascetic passion and dignity which I find admirable; The elongated stone saints of their facades have a quality of sad stoic confidence that I think of in reading histories of the time. Poetry, architecture, baseball, literature, sculpture, football, painting, theater, film--I could go on with my list, but, in short: Every medium of human culture that I know of has some influence on the way that I think, on what I like and dislike, on how I approach problems, on how I understand the world. These objects and activities seem to embody within them what Kenneth Burke, speaking of drama, called "equipment for living."[20]

But how do we understand these strategies of behavior? How do we apply them? Typically, art and fiction is regarded as non-functional, a matter of personal preference. But if art was valued simply as a mirror of the individual's personality, then it would really have no functional purpose even for the

individual, let alone society. Art, judging from my own experience, and from the ingenuous intentions of DeMille and other creators of art, changes societies and individuals; it does not keep them in or return them to a state of dynamic equilibrium. Art changes the ways we see and interact in the world.

This argument most closely resembles Morse Peckham's explanation of the role of art in human culture.[21] Peckham argues that the social interaction between the artist/mediator and society is fundamentally antagonistic, and that the arts operate as hermeneutic communities which perversely nonetheless are crucial to the societies within which they exist. A society would prefer to remain guided by the fixed rules of behavior that everyone knows.[22] However, in society is an element, "high culture," whose values are completely the opposite. High culture sets the styles for society, but within its own circle operates under a rule of "non-functional stylistic dynamism."[23] Individuals, driven by their own ambition to be recognized as members of "high culture,"continue to rationalize the implicit rules of the guiding metaphors of mediation until, for reasons Peckham does not specify, a new guiding metaphor is promulgated. As with a Kuhnian paradigm shift, the style change is marked by a dynamic continuum of practitioners of the old and new metaphor. For example, the baroque period's guiding metaphor was to maximize problems and discontinuities while following the set rules of form. The Enlightenment chose to resolve problems and discontinuities. These two stylistic traits overlap each other for approximately

seventy years, Peckham argues, or about one generation, allowing for the slower diffusion of culture in the period.[24]

The role that these essentially valueless style shifts have for a society must be crucial, Peckham argues, because style shifts in mediation (particularly the arts) have so little practical value, and yet societies give them a status far out of proportion with their apparent usefulness:

> it is clear that art is useless, that perceiver [critic] and artist are arrogant and indifferent. It is their psychic insulation which makes such cruelty possible. Art tells us nothing about the world that we cannot find elsewhere and more reliably. Art does not make us better citizens, or more moral, or more honest. It may conceivably make us worse. It is easy to become addicted to art; it can be as dangerous as any drug.[25]

What style shifts do accomplish, however, is to train people to think in situations of discontinuity. The rapid style shifts of art, of fashion, of music, of sports, of other impractical elements of society, all train their participants in the patterns of mind required to respond to environmental or social changes.

> Art is rehearsal for those real situations in which it is vital for our survival to endure cognitive tension, to refuse the comforts of validation by affective congruence when such validation is inappropriate because too vital interests are at stake; art is the reinforcement of the capacity to endure disorientation so that a real and significant problem may emerge. Art is the exposure to the tensions and problems of a false world so that man may endure exposing himself to the tensions and problems of the real world.[26]

I would argue that Peckam's model, while correct in its evaluation of the function of art, fails to account for what seems to be the socially constructive elements of other mediation as well. As Peckham represents it, practices of creative

mediation exist in an isolated hermeneutic world of "high culture" separate from society, in which initiates are admitted into a "virtual jungle" full of rending beasts, and soon become rending beasts themselves.[27]

If these communities of mediational practice are kept separate from actual social practice, however, as lions and tigers are separated from cattle and sheep, how is one to account for the degree to which all art, both high culture and popular culture, is responsive to its times? And how does one account for the common features between art in general and other forms of cultural representations? Is high culture alone the area in which discontinuities may be processed?[28] Do not human beings--all of us, in our daily lives--constantly suffer discontinuities, losses, shocks? Do we also not suffer such discontinuties in our social organizations? How is one to account for the various ways in which common group activity narratives like baseball have served as a means of representing the unity of all citizens in the United States, and indeed, of testing and revising that identity?[29] More broadly, how does one understand the role of samurai films in post-war Japan? How is one to account for the typical patterns of French detective films? One could pick trends of narratives and symbols from any age and be confronted with distinct links to their social and historical context, for which Peckham's argument does not serve. These are ongoing evolutions of social identity, not instances of punctuated change.

Perhaps because Peckham is in dialogue with aesthetics more than he is with psychology, he excessively focuses his attention on the arts to the exclusion of social mediation in general within society. I will attempt to retell Peckham's phylogeny of mediation in a more inclusive form. By doing so, I hope to make it apparent that art cannot be separated from society. To the extent that a culture can be said to be distinct, it becomes so through the process of constant mediation and re-mediation of itself to itself, through which a culture constructs and preserves itself, and responds to new problems.

The theoretical premise of my Peckham remediation is that art and other activity create and manipulate models, and that these models are directly emergent from both individual and social conflicts. Societies as a whole at least partially "think" in the activity of creating and experiencing art in the same way that individuals do, and thus art is not either wholly an individual product of transformation that is appropriated for use by the culture, nor merely a training-ground for imaginative thought. It is itself one of the areas of pragmatic social engagement with the world.

In order to see what this means in practice, I would like to return to Captain Picard. As a type, Star Trek: The Next Generation is a romance narrative. Picard, like Odysseus to the Greek culture, is a representative of a particular identity ideal. He leads his crew around a galaxy, encountering the unknown, in which this ideal, as embodied in the crew of the Enterprise, undergoes tests. The crew, and Picard in particular, are personifications of

values; to use C.S. Pierce's term, Picard is an icon of a philosophy. The character Picard is a distillation of an identity which the audience shares, an object for contemplation of our common identity in practice. In John Dewey's words, the aesthetic object develops as follows:

> There is inception, development, fulfillment. Material is ingested and digested through interaction with that vital organization of the results of prior experience that constitutes the mind of the [creator]. Incubation goes on until what is conceived is brought forth and is rendered perceptible as part of the common world....An object is peculiarly and dominantly esthetic, yielding the enjoyment characteristic of esthetic perception, when the factors that determine anything which can be called an experience are lifted high above the threshold of perception and are made manifest for their own sake.[30]

What makes Picard different from the object Dewey describes is that the fulfillment of his creation develops over time in narrative; Picard is the representation of a genre. Star Trek is the continuation of a process of social development of the "Federation" ideal over time. The Captain Picard of 1994 is immensely more nuanced and profound than the Captain Picard of 1988 who began the series, and more nuanced in his awareness of "interspecies" relations than his predecessor in the genre of Star Trek narratives, Captain Kirk. This process of ongoing development of the premises of character is something that the Star Trek audience has experienced in the period when the United States' own international relations as leader of the Capitalist nations became complex. But what kind of experience is this? Certainly it is not "reality," and yet it certainly reflects aspects of our emergent transnational culture. We may learn from it. What seems to be taking place is a diachronic aesthetic experience, in

which the outcomes of certain attitudes and assumptions toward life are imagined and tested in a given narrative environment.

To explain why I think this is valuable for individuals and societies, I will need to look at how individuals and societies function,[31] and then relate their pragmatic activity to the ideal activity represented by narrative. If narrative is vital for human societies, then it must have an adaptive function. I will begin by turning to the science philosopher Marx Wartofsky. He argues that what is distinctive of all creatures is not only biologically given, but also the historically-evolving praxis of the species. This is easy to understand when one thinks of the numerous cases of animals separated from others of their species at birth, who, when they grow up, lack the (if I may say) cultural knowledge of how to act. A kitten not trained to kill mice is unlikely to kill mice as a cat; a wolf raised in a cage has no understanding of the complex social and survival behaviors that define wolves as wolves. This is all the more true for humans, whose characteristic development requires the acquisition of far more cultural artifacts.[32] Even in something seemingly so predetermined as visual perception, Wartofsky argues, the process of perceiving the environment for all creatures is not given, but rather a matter of changing perception into "images," or representations constructed to interpret perceptions; and these perceptions are historically developed rather than an ahistorical response to external stimulus. It is this fact which has crippled so much of the work in artificial intelligence, where the form but not the praxis of thought-activity is recreated. A

perception is, Wartofsky argues, a conceptual artifact, or tool, "a processed response, attuned to a certain end, or goal."[33] Humans are far more dependent than other species on conceptual artifacts:

> The crucial character of the human artifact is that its production, its use, and the attainment of skill in these, can be transmitted, and thus preserved within a social group, and through time, from one generation to the next. The symbolic communication of such skills in the production, reproduction and use of artifacts...is the context in which *mimicry or the imitation of an action becomes a characteristic human mode of activity.* It is, in effect, this ability to *represent an action* by symbolic means which generates a distinctive class of artifacts, which we may call representations. [italics in original][34]

Wartofsky calls these symbolic representations through which knowledge of how primary artifacts like axes and bowls are made and used "secondary artifacts." These artifacts are essentially fossilized cognition, the material manifestation and preservation artifacts of previous generations. "I take these artifacts (tools and languages) to be objectifications of human needs and intentions," Wartofsky says, "already invested with cognitive and affective content."[35]

The implication of our becoming dependent upon secondary artifacts is that human societies themselves begin to turn into something like organic creatures, virtual organisms designed to serve the needs of the individuals of whom they consist. Because this practice is successful, the functions of individuals over time have become less shaped by the pursuit of their own immediate needs, and more shaped by the secondary artifacts of their culture, through which the individual's desire to shape the world in accordance with

his/her needs is more easily and completely satisfied. Secondary artifacts function roughly in the fashion of an artificial genetic code, and the societies organized by them serve as the expression of that code: "...the artifact is to cultural evolution what the gene is to biological evolution," Wartofsky says.

Other creatures seem to have prototypical primary and secondary artifacts, the latter expressed and transmitted in the form of mimetic imitation. Humans on the other hand are the only creatures which have culturally transmitted abstract secondary artifacts--languages of signs and sounds--through which knowledge is communicated. This abstraction of the secondary artifact system seems to be crucial for the separation of thought from action, and for the ability to alter behavior rapidly.[36] Abstracting activity into a symbolic repesentation allows conscious manipulation of the symbols, which do not require consistent repetition of the same pattern to be coherent, into new symbolic representations.

If a secondary activity functions somewhat like a computer program, in which there is a list of steps to be performed by an individual (or a group), the secondary symbolic system functions more like a story, in which a symbol or icon functions within a sequence of symbolic events. Symbolic categories make possible models of experience, one step removed from reality, in which non-functional elements of the experience function like algebraic representations that can stand for new activities, or reinterpret past activities. In this form it becomes possible for them to represent ideas that cannot otherwise

be considered rationally. The analytical knowledge implicit in the creation of narrative symbols becomes available to the audience in the activity of imagining themselves in the imaginary world the narrative creates.

Vivian Gussin Paley provides an example of such an implicit "algebraic" experience through narrative in Boys and Girls. One of her charges, Franklin, is disruptive of other children's play. He wrecks other children's activities by trying to control them:

> "Franklin, will you please look around," I say. "Everyone is gone." "Why?" "Why? Because you're being very selfish, that's why." Franklin looks worried. "I ain't selfish. I ain't said they hasta go." "You're just like the fox in `The Blue Seed.' Remember that story? He wouldn't let anyone share his house, so the house blew up?" Franklin nods, squinting to take the measure of his building. "Can I finish my house now?" The moral of the fox story is of no concern to Franklin. The offending party never sees the connection to his own behavior in a morality tale.... My approach is useless. He can picture every detail of the ten-story house he plans to erect but nothing of the scene he just had with Jonathan and Teddy. Yet Franklin knows how to listen to dialog and stay in character.... What he needs is an objective view of the scene he just played. The analogy of the selfish fox is too abstract and direct criticism too personal.

Rational discussion of the narrative analogy is useless--Paley and Franklin talk past each other, and true communication does not take place. But she persists, this time acting out the story:

> "This is a guessing game," I tell everyone. "I'm acting out a true story. You have to guess who I'm pretending to be. You two boys pretend you're building something, and I'm going to keep interrupting." Self-consciously the boys begin to build a road. I rush over and grab several blocks. "No, not that way! Give it here! Do it this way!" I shout. The boys are momentarily startled but continue to lay out blocks. I yell at them again: "Stop doing it that

> way! You're spoiling my road!" By now everyone is looking at Franklin, who is pounding his thigh and laughing. "That's me! you're pretending you're me! Is that really me?"... Pretend disarms and enchants; it suggests heroic possibilities for making changes, just as in the fairy tales.[37]

Narratives, as well as other art, by creating an alternative world, disarm the fossilized beliefs and feelings that accompany real world events. This is true for children, as Paley's transcript illustrates. It is also true for adults, as Vernant shows, in ancient Greece. As my "Picard" example illustrates, it continues to be an important way through which the social identities adults create and participate within in society are shaped and expressed. And it is precisely in telling stories about ourselves that we are able to bring into being new ways of behaving and thinking in the real world. Language and stories are the cultural tools through which abstraction is achieved.

To understand this, let us return to the mnemonist I mentioned above:

> Sherashevsky was perplexed and overwhelmed when faced with abstract ideas, the way young people are when they first realize that abstract ideas cannot be understood in graphic terms. But most adolescents shift from thinking in concrete terms to dealing with abstractions, and the problem ceises for them. The role that graphic images once played in their thinking is replaced by certain accepted ideas about the meaning of words. Their thinking becomes verbal and logical, and graphic images are relegated to the periphery of their consciousness. But this is a transition that Scherashevsky never made. He was unable to grasp an idea unless he could actually see it....[38]

The case of Scherashevsky is of a person who was fundamentally a normal human being, except that he perceived each event as a unique event. Wartofsky points out that images are a matter of interpreting biological input

within historically evolving cultural systems of meaning. Scherashevsky's biological input was beyond the expected range of that cultural system, and so the clash of his sensory experience with the embedded range of sensory experience in language obstructed his ability to use it to construct abstract categories:

> "[T]rying to understand a passage, to grasp the information it contained, became a tortuous process for Sherashevsky. The images kept rising to the surface of his mind, and he continually had to struggle against them in order to concentrate on what was essential. Inasmuch as his images were particularly vivid and stable and recurred thousands of times, they soon became the dominant element in Sherashevsky's awareness and came uncontrollably to the surface whenever he touched on something that was linked to them even in the most general way.[39]

Luria describes Sherashevsky's situation from the perspective of normal senses; but it is perhaps easier to understand its implications if we were to imagine what it would be like to be the only person in the world to see color. How could he ignore the differences between red and green, and how could he understand concepts which required them to be the same? The synesthesia which made possible Sherashevsky's extraordinary memory also placed a barrier between himself and the accumulated understanding of his culture. Sherashevsky lacked an ability to use the associations and genres of thought in his culture to organize things and experiences into types.

Children are embedded in a community organized through symbolic mediation. The child's ability to understand speech precedes the ability to use it; this understanding itself is a conceptual artifact, one in which the human

infant has undergone training from the moment of birth.[40] It is being brought up in this environment of representations that provides the model for a human infant's own attempts to represent the world to itself. Even the activities of human cultures which children observe are themselves artifacts of the complex symbolically-mediated cultures in which we live, and by their nature are informed by representations about people and the world. It is thus arguable that all of what we regard as characteristically human thought is embodied, not in the individual as a genetic predisposition, but in the creative mediation and remediation by the individual in concert with others of their perceptions and understandings through the tools of cognition that are provided by culture. We must therefore understand how these tools become part of the human child's perceptual toolkit, and how these tools evolve in cultural interaction.

The concept of a socially grounded development theory is central to the Soviet cultural-historical school of psychology, and I will turn to its founder, Lev Vygotsky, to clarify the means by which the child acquires these artifacts of thought. Vygotsky, inspired by the Marxian dialectic in social development, argued that there was a "general genetic law of cultural development:

> Any function in the child's cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, the formation of concepts, and the development of volition ... [I]t goes without saying that internalization transforms the process itself and changes its structure and functions. Social relations or relations among

> people genetically underlie all higher functions and their relationships.[41]

It is thus the internalization of cultural systems which allows the child both to become an individual and to come into coordination both with its family, and with the society at large.

Social remediation would seem to be a natural corollary to the cultural-historical theory. As much of the work the cultural-historical psychologists carried out was on the means by which children acquired skills, and injured adults re-acquired skills that had been lost through disease and injury, the broader social applications of the theory are less elaborated than they are at the level of individual and small-group mediation. But in Thinking and Speech, after noting that thinking is not expressed but completed in the mediation process by the individual, and proving that internal thought begins as an external dialogue with others, Vygotsky concluded his book by saying that mediation of the individual was only part of a more general problem,

> the problem of the relationship between the word [or other symbolic mediation process] and consciousness.... [T]hinking and speech are the key to understanding the nature of human consciousness. If language is as ancient as consciousness itself, if language is consciousness that exists in practice for other people and therefore for myself, then it is not only the development of thought but the development of consciousness as a whole that is connected with development of [symbolic mediation].[42]

In other words, one could begin to study the process of thought by looking at individual acquisition of consciousness through mediation tools, but beyond that is the question of how mediation tools themselves developed over time in

response to experience. This indeed was the subject of a study conducted by Vygotsky's coworker A.L. Luria in the early 30's,[43] but due to difficulties with the Soviet government, this aspect of the socio-historical school has only recently begun to be developed.[44]

Cognitive linguistics has provided evidence that language is not a self-contained system existing somehow outside of and prior to thought, but rather is inherently symbolic, even to the level of grammar structure.[45] In saying that language "conveys" rationality, for example, or that it is "structured" by models, I am not speaking rationally about the objective nature of language. I am comparing language, an invisible, immaterial experience, to objects. Implicit in this sentence is an irrational but nonetheless pragmatically functional metaphor that IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, with the respective variants that "Ideas are Constructed Objects" and "Communication is Transfer," also known as the Conduit metaphor.[46] Objectively, I have deceived my reader into assuming that language is something that it is not. On the other hand, if that is true, one must then deal with the problem about why my reader is so readily deceived, and if, having abandoned such deceptive means of conceptualizing language, we will have any means at all of speaking about language.[47]

We do not perceive such metaphors as "ideas are objects" as metaphorical because they are, in Vygotsky's phrase, "fossilized thought." My reader will not stop short at the word "transference" in relation to language because this metaphor is a deeply embedded cultural artifact of thought, the

predicate to an enormously diverse range of cultural activities in the world. It is very difficult to become aware of such metaphors as adults because so much of our thinking is predicated on their habitual acceptance. Children are aware of their strangeness, and occasionally will shock adults into recognizing metaphors by their literal interpretations of such phrases as "Your grandfather is over the hill, my dear" by insisting that Grandfather is right in front of them.[48] However, such responses disappear over time as they internalize the networks of fossilized thought that underlie linguistic expressions. We learn to see the world through the mental tools that such metaphors provide. Ideas need not inherently be objects, for example, but it is a fact that using this model gives the person who uses it both a complex model for understanding thought and its implications, and--because it is a model shared by the culture as a whole--a means of representing one's understandings in a conceptual framework shared by the listener.

Until recently, most linguists have argued that language is an abstract system of rules and relations through which experience is represented. Cognitive Linguistics has made a strong argument however that language provides conventional tools, but that it has no abstract existence apart from human activity and experience:

> [Cognitive grammar] assumes that meanings are always characterized relative to cognitive domains, i.e. knowledge structures or conceptual complexes of some kind.... Neither language in general nor semantics in particular is an autonomous system or a seperate module that can be characterized in isolation from other aspects of cognition. There is no nonarbitrary

> distinction between semantics and pragmatics, hence semantic analysis ultimately presupposes the characterization of conceptualization and knowledge structures... for the description of specific linguistic elements.[49]

Cognitive linguistics provides evidence that even in the case of grammar structures, speakers unconsciously structure their speech acts in accordance with context-dependent schemas and metaphors, semantic structures which serve as predicates implied by words.[50] Anything like a Cartesian rationality is thus impossible; the rationality of all meanings rests less on the supposed objectivity of words than on the predicates which inform the words.

Meanings reside in the application of different schemas and metaphors to their object, rather than in either the object itself, or the words used to describe it. The speaker has a considerable degree of agency in choosing which of several schemas to apply in his or her own speech acts:

> A predication typically invokes multiple domains, which characterize different aspects of the profiled entity. Semantic contrasts often hinge on the inventory of domains, as well as their ranking for relative prominence. For instance, the physical specifications of *bay* and *harbor* are quite comparable, but *harbor* evokes more saliently than *bay* its role as a haven for ships.[51]

"cow" and "beef" are not so comparable, yet like "bay" and "harbor" they are applied to the same object. In this case, the object is literally transformed by calling a cow "beef." That transformation is not <u>required</u> by the language, however. The speaker changes the meaning of the object by applying a word with different predications to the object. It is this ability to select the terms of conceptualization--and indeed, to modify them even in the same sentence--that

makes it possible for humans to shape and react to their environment in complex ways:

> "A foundational claim of cognitive semantics is that an expression's meaning cannot be reduced to an objective characterization of the situation described: equally important for linguistic semantics is how the conceptualizer chooses to construe the situation and portray it for expressive purposes."[52]

The question in the case of each of the terms then is not how they control their speaker or receiver, but rather the speaker or receiver's acceptance of these terms as the most accurate representation of the object. Language can be a prison-house, but only to the extent that human activity is routinized. When that happens, inappropriate outcomes will cause people to re-mediate objects through new terms.

Cognitive linguistics provides a model for understanding how language comes to be constructive of understanding, but the fact of its constructive nature has long been recognized. Language is enormously complex, and with the preservation of its forms of expression by writing over time, the available domains of experience with which we may remediate our understanding seems almost limitless. Just as the English serf called cattle "cows" and the Norman lords "beef," and in their differing perspectives (animal husbandry as opposed to food consumption) provided us with two separate conceptual domain terms of use for the same creature, so most objects have more than one term of reference, with different perspectives implied by each term. Each word has as its predicate an implicit narrative of action, an implied schema of behavior for

which the word itself is shorthand. The duplications of vocabulary in language ensure freedom of thought, as George Orwell recognized by his negative example of "Newspeak" in 1984.

Moreover, even old terms develop multiple domains of meaning as individuals take fossilized knowledge from one domain and apply it to others in order to modify concepts of the world. As Chukovsky noted, this is a common artifact of children's language acquisition from the ages of three to five, but this ability does not end at five. Through language, every speaker has the potential of becoming a charismatic authority. The power of language to provide implicit assumptions for behavior is considerable. It is apparent from the above examples, however, that the existing patterns of language do not so much restrict thought as provide tools through which new representational models may be created, and the social order remediated.[53]

Vygotsky's work indicates that children engaged in what Piaget referred to as autistic, or "egocentric" speech, are actually in the process of using social speech to guide their behavior. As the child matures, its external monologues become internalized. But this internalization process of behaviors transforms them, because making the social model personal exposes it to the individualizing influences of a person's experience. Even if the internalization process is completely successful, the behavioral model will become progressively less in synch with the external model without constant remediation. The individual's internal affective states cannot remain in perfect

coordination with the generalized other and the overlapping leviathans of the social system in which s/he is engaged. Internal speech, by virtue of being directed to someone who always knows the sequence of events and association of meanings connected with any incident, becomes transformed from statements to tropes employing abbreviation and fragmentation. These tropes increasingly begin to reflect the unconscious processing of experience and representation-models into unique combinations, which may then be remediated to the social collective--there to wither as incomprehensible, or to become a new tool of thought for society as a whole.

By "abbreviation," Vygotsky means the actions or systems that are predicates to the meaning of a given symbol. He argued that "[t]he rapid tempo of oral speech presupposes a simple volitional action, one with significant elements of habit."[54] Metaphor structures of the sort I have described above are probably the most common example of this. Another instance is J.L. Austin's concept of performative speech, in which the actual purpose of a speech act is not the content of a phrase, but rather the timing and form of its utterance in a social speech activity.[55] Extreme predicativity, however, rarely occurs except in the case of internal speech, in which pure predicativity tends to be the rule.[56] Generally, people tend to have enough different contextual frames that they require some explicit reference to define the relevant frame. Grice's maxims of speech suggest that speakers will attempt to maximize the meaning of their words, which implies routinization.[57] Vygotsky's work suggests that activity

based on routinized predicates underlies social construction. Vygotsky and Cognitive linguistics show us that the extent and the complexity of predicativity in normal speech interaction permeates individual understanding. Individuals construct themselves and interact with others constantly on the basis of internalized pragmatic social narratives. That social systems remediate their identity the same way has been much less explored. However, Vernant's work strongly suggests that narrative serves just this purpose for societies.

As I noted above, internalized narratives become abbreviated into tropes. Externalizing these tropes in narratives, as cognitive predicates, can coordinate and reinforce collective schemas. But collective schemas may also be re-mediated into new forms. This is an insight the filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein developed in his montage theory, which takes advantage of social predicate schemas of type categories and narratives. He argues for the creation of dynamic film narratives which assume their audience's ability to take as the meaning of juxtaposed images, not their actual content, but the predicate that may be invoked by reducing the range of potential meanings of two individual images to a predicate schema in which the juxtaposition is relevant.[58] Observers can misinterpret intentions with schemas, but even misinterpretations underline common predicates. Eisenstein relates a story about a man who saw a woman in black, crying at a grave. The man interpreted these two elements as part of the schema "widow," and assumed that she was crying for a dead husband. "`Console yourself, madam.... There is another man somewhere,

beside your husband, with whom you can still be happy.' `There was,' she sobbed--`there was, but this is his grave.'" This sort of mistake reminds us just how much of our interpretation of events in society is built on habitual predicate schemas. Eisenstein's man processed the event he observed on the basis of clothing language, behavior, and socially correct character types, and on that basis came up with a complete narrative of the event--startling both in its exactitude as well as its falseness.[59]

Eisenstein did not wish simply to invoke fossilized predicate schemas; he wanted to change them by creating out of his juxtaposition of invoked schemas new social themes.[60] As a filmmaker with a pragmatic purpose, he needed to become conscious of the means by which cinema could insert itself into social schema production. His contemporary Kenneth Burke approached the problem from the position of interpreter: What stories did the society as a whole seem to seek out, and in what context? That Eisenstein's man's interpretation of the event he observes is wrong is precisely why this event, real or imagined, became a story. What this story communicates is that the assumed role of woman as passive object of male desires is false; women are independent persons. The story is told as a joke, but as Freud reminded us, jokes may well reflect concerns that it is difficult to conceive of directly--not because of repressive psychic drives, however, but rather because we lack commonly available community narratives by which we can represent such concerns. This particular story is a snapshot from the past of a suppressed idea beginning

to emerge, a miniature A Doll's House. Kenneth Burke argued that narrative in society as a whole was a means of placing into context new ideas and new understandings. According to Jerome Bruner:

> Dramatism, in Burke's sense, focuses upon deviations from the canonical that have moral consequences--deviations related to legitimacy, moral commitment, values. Stories must necessarily, then, relate to what is morally valued, morally appropriate, or morally uncertain.... Stories, carried to completion, are explorations in the limits of legitimacy, as Hayden White has pointed out. They come out "lifelike," with a Trouble morally explicated if not redressed. And if imbalances hang ambiguously, as they often do in postmodern fiction, it is because narrators seek to subvert the conventional means through which stories take a moral stand.[61]

Narrative fiction, in other words, may reinforce existing narrative schemas, or they may create new ones.

To create new narrative schemas is not, however to create a new society. Individuals who continually come up with novel interpretations of the social order are more likely to be thrown into an insane asylum than they are to effect change. What pressures cause new fictions to develop? Individuals can remediate events, but how do they come to be accepted by society? Group identity is not self-evident to members until it is made so by a collective fiction. Interest groups based on gender, as suggested by the examples I have used, might seem to suggest that to some extent changes in social interaction result as a product of action by pragmatic common-sense groups within society. But as Simone de Beauvoir reminds us, for a female to become a woman is a process of social construction, not "nature." It is precisely because so much of

human behavior is constructed by social interaction rather than determined by biology that fictions become so important. Societies change in proportion to changes of the terms of debate, and the narrative models through which they and the communities of which they consist are conceived and maintained. But the entities on which these terms act are social groups. If we take as an assumption that human interaction as a whole is becoming more complex and rationalized, and if we accept that this interaction is constructed in the form of interest groups, then we must turn to the nature of such interest groups: What are they?

Michael Callon and Bruno Latour conceive of society as a big leviathan, a "macro-actor" which consists of the interaction of little leviathans. Their conception of a leviathan is a massive secondary artifact whose function is to fossilize a network of social interactions beyond the initial interactions which formed them. Unlike the primary artifact societies of baboons, for example, who use symbolic social behaviors to create networks of interactions, but must always maintain them moment-by-moment in action, human society preserves interactions through time in secondary artifacts:

> [I]f you transform the state of nature, replacing unsettled alliances as much as you can with walls and written contracts, the ranks with uniforms and tattoos and reversible friendships with names and signs, then you will obtain a Leviathan.... Let us then imagine a body where differentiation is never fully irreversible, where each cell attempts to compel the others to become irreversibly specialized, and where many organs are permanently claiming to be the head of the programme. If we imagine such a *monster* we shall have a fairly clear idea of the Leviathan's body, which we can at any moment see growing before our eyes.[62]

Membership in one leviathan does not preclude membership in others; quite the opposite. Any individual, as Vygotsky reminds us, is in fact the product of social structures, and to be the product of only one leviathan structure would be to be woefully incomplete, a satirical figure like Voltaire's Candide. Our actual allegiance to any of the multiple identities which all of us maintain is in dynamic flux. However, to the extent that the objects and habits produced by a given leviathan channel our behavior, and to the extent that other people interact with us on the assumption of the "natural laws" created by the leviathan, our tendency to break away from that leviathan is restricted. Such secondary artifacts make it possible for leviathans to continue their articulation into more complex forms, relying on the artifacts to preserve the structural elements on which new elements are built. Thus, unlike those of chimpanzees, human social institutions are no longer the creations of individual agents, but social agents.

And yet, it is not "society" which acts, but rather people. "macro actors are micro-actors seated on top of many (leaky) black boxes. They are neither larger, nor more complex than micro-actors; on the contrary, they are of the same size and ... in fact simpler than micro-actors"[63] who want to continue the existence of the macro-agent they constitute. These macro-agents are eternal only to the extent that we accept the "black boxes" of belief on which their narratives are constructed. There are certain fundamental beliefs which perhaps will not be changed at this point. As Alexander Meshcheryakov

discovered in his work with deaf and blind children, even such basic things as facial expressions are social artifacts.[64] But these deeply entrenched black boxes we will never open because they are constituative of what we consider to be human.[65] It is rather at the top of the heap that the boxes are uncertain, and that leviathans are open to negotiation. At this level, the leviathans continue to rationalize their rules of existence, and extend themselves until they become checked by other, competing leviathans.

Callon and Latour's example of a leviathan war over social reality is Electricity of France's (EDF) attempt in the 70's to establish electric vehicles as the transportation future in France. Internal combustion vehicles pollute, and their fuel source is running out; electric vehicles must replace them:

> EDF begins to translate the deep desires, the technical knowledge and the needs and aptitudes of a large number of actors. EDF thus structures a reality by building up a gigantic organizational chart in which each black box, each carefully demarcated islet, is linked to other boxes by a set of arrows.... And *you really believe this*, you identify with the actor and will help him or her with all your strength, irresistibly attracted by the differences in level he or she has created.... [A]n actor says what I want, what I know, what I can do, marks out what is possible and what impossible, what is social and what technical, their parallel developments and the emergence of a market for zinc taxis and electronic mail vans.[66]

Renault, an internal combustion car manufacturer whose independent existence would disappear under EDF's plan, fights back in order to preserve itself. Where is the conflict between these two entities fought out? In the same place that it began: not in courts, not with facts, but with <u>stories</u>. Each side has facts, of course, but the interpretation of facts is on the basis of assumptions

which the other side contests. Their domain of conflict is transportation, but each attempts to enlist aid from other agents affected by the transportation domain. The successful party is the one who can tell a better story which appeals to other agents in society--the side which can construct a narrative whose premises are more thoroughly imbricated with other narratives. In this case, Renault told a better story, and EDF lost.[67]

One can see this pattern of narrativity in a variety of border areas in which our reality is being constructed. By imagining possible futures, and acting in accordance with the goals that these possible futures imagine, we change the material form of the world around us. Furthermore--as is commonly the case in the sciences--the rationalization of a paradigm can lead us into unexpected paths. Suppose a drunk driver kills a pregnant woman. Should he be charged with two counts of manslaughter? If this is done, then what are the implications for our categorization of the fetus? Is the fetus human, or is it a nonviable organism with the potential of humanity? Facts are less relevant than the paradigm one uses to interpret facts. Because as a society we believe that individual identity is genetically predetermined--a matter which still cannot be proven--laws are interpreted in accordance with that belief to make the fetus human at progressively earlier stages. Medical researchers strive to achieve fetal viability at earlier and earlier ages. Belief--and thus our sense of certitude--is constructed, as Bruner reminds us, in narrative:

> [S]tories have to do with how protagonists interpret things, what things mean to them. This is built into the circumstance of story--

> that it involves both a cultural convention and a deviation from it that is explicable in terms of an individual intentional state. This gives stories not only a moral status but an epistemic one.[68]

Even in our most basic interactions with the physical world, as Ludwig Wittgenstein points out, our knowledge is pragmatic rather than objective. We come to terms with the world always through mediation, not directly. Our concern is not just with the objective world, but also the social world which defines the meanings and implications of events around us. These definitions are made not on the basis of objective reality, but rather on the elements of reality society recognizes as relevant to its goals. Explanations about the world are "language games," heuristic interpretations of reality which have become progressively more functional relative to our goals but are not necessarily true.[69] These models provide ways of seeing which we accept as long as they are functional for our ends.

Leviathans, then, are the instruments through which remediation takes place. They do not arise in a void, but are constructed through mediating narratives. These macro-actors consist of the material and social fossilized artifacts of charismatic micro-actor narrators, who break old leviathans, remediate existing black boxes--metaphors, practices, material artifacts, social structures, all the unquestioned signs, symbols and other mediating artifacts in which these narrators find themselves--into new forms, and find converts to reify this new vision into a community, which embodies its common beliefs into an institution. Such remediations cannot arise *de novo*, because they require

linkage with existing models in order to be understood and accepted--just as Cognitive linguistics has shown with language.

Power shifts between leviathans tend to operate on the basis of remediating common and often unspoken goal-predicates or context-predicates of an audience of affected leviathans from one paradigm to another. Between EDF and Renault, for example, the basic narrative of a society in which everyone has a car, and in which social relations are mediated through private transportation, is a black box predicated in each macro-actor's discourse. The zone of dispute between them is whether or not an electronic vehicle can properly mediate a driver's sense of identity between him/herself and the performance of his/her vehicle. Is the electronic car a suitable "body" for the "spirit" which will inhabit it? Will drivers feel socially empowered, or will they feel weakened? Will additional taxes be charged? Adherence to a paradigm of vision literally changes our understanding of the object.

Second, leviathans produce and rationalize narrative schemas. This is an area where power is less important than something like narrative aesthetics, which I would define as a need to discover in a schema a general correspondence with unconscious predicates. Narrative schemas are the means by which macro-actors and micro-actors negotiate pragmatic interactions--not as individuals in discussion, but as actors in a play whose meaning is emergent not in their individual roles but in their collective activity. The society as a whole is a macro-actor, but fragmented into contradictory and

competetitive lesser macro-actors.[70] Individuals are the metaphorical basis of leviathan construction, and individuals are, because of their participation in multiple--and sometimes contradictory--communities, the driving force of change.

Because institutions are neither internalized completely, nor are learned under monopolization conditions, individual variations are inevitable.[71] Micro-actors bring these different sensibilities to their interactions in their role as the constituent agents of macro-actors. Although the macro-actor role by definition regularizes and simplifies the range of individual expressions micro-actors make, small functional variations are vital for the adaptibility of the leviathan, and charismatic changes cannot be prevented. Micro-actor interaction within leviathans creates consistency--but at the same time a means of propagating functional variations to others through the various identities an individal has. Macro-actor interaction between leviathans form Kenneth Burke's social dramas. In these dramas, at each level actors confirm each other's identity by their mutual recognition, and yet as Morse Peckham notes, dramas are always a matter of interpretation. "Faced with an unpredictable situation, the individual may either categorize it in such a way that he [/she] can select a rule to govern his [/her] behavior, or, if appropriate rules are unavailable, he [/she] can interpret an existent rule to cover the situation"[72] This situation is true of very large leviathans like nation-states as well as small leviathans, like the family. In each case, there is a normative narration of identity which actors in communal

interaction with each other confirm, and which identity within different communal paradigms destabilizes.

Here we find the answer for why societies invest such time and resources in narrative fiction. Could all of this social construction that I have discussed above could take place in reasoned social interaction? Presumably it must be more efficient to apply these resources to symbolic representation of ideas and beliefs in art instead of overt, rational goal-negotiation activity.[73] If this were not the case, social leviathans which wasted time on art would have disappeared long before now, as non-artistic, rational leviathans would have had a competitive advantage.[74] Vivian Paley's transcripts of Franklin in the classroom suggest a reason for this: It is easier to bring reason to bear through abstracting narratives than through confrontation with the actual problem, embedded as it is in habits and emotional responses. And as the Renault/EDF narrative conflict suggests, it is entirely possible that individual participants in a social narrative do not possess themselves knowledge of the entire narrative and its implications. Social reasoning is emergent in the collective narrative activity, not prior to the activity.

Does art help to stabilize and extend leviathan structures? Yes, to the extent that art serves as a mnemic device, and to the extent that it serves as an instrument of propaganda through which communities of interest are created. The role of the earliest examples of narrative in society are particularly instructive instances of this purpose:

> The traditional epic poet, reciting before his audience, must hold out to them a coherent world-picture, with everything in it.... Such a world picture shows certain unvarying constants. Men should be in their proper ranks and roles in society, with the proper behavior and values carried out at each rank....By "proper" I do not mean that good triumphs in the end or that all problems are successfully solved.... I mean an outcome that validates and reinforces a variety of beliefs held by the poet's audience. Central among these are the religious and quasi-philosophical values and social values held, and the personal values imagined or pretended to, by the listener.[75]

A story of identity has immense regulating and cohesive power. "Without vision, the people perish" is no tired platitude; there is no "people" without a narrative.[76]

Narratives (and other forms of art) which have simplicity and yet depths of complexity in their conflicts and characters may endure for a long time, in accordance with Grice's maxims of speech. As with any communicative act, listeners (or readers) of a narrative interpret it on the basis of their own sense of relevance, which is emergent from the social and personal context of their exposure to the narrative. Communication is never transmission, but rather interpretation. Narratives which depict deeply embedded aspects of social behavior have the power to seem contemporary, even if they are centuries old. This quality of assumed relevance is why the same narrative, or even a recitation of the same history (to the extent that it is a sequence of uncontested events) can mean different things to different ages--and different things to the same people at different ages--and why popularities of narrative types rise and fall over time. To the extent that a narrative lends itself to retelling in

accordance with the needs of its times--as have Arthurian legends, and Robin Hood stories--it may become perpetually relevant.

Narratives also reinforce beliefs and identifications with their content. Bruner remarks that "narrative `truth' is judged by its verisimilatude rather than its verifiability,"[77] which is to say that it is judged by the degree to which it reminds us of what we already believe to be true about the world. New problems have to be reconciled with existing narrative truths. Bruner refers to problem-orienting narratives as "subjunctive discourse," possible worlds which discontinuity evokes into being:

> Begin with the familiar case of speech acts and Paul Grice's extension of the idea to what he calls the Cooperative Principle governing ordinary conversation. He proposes maxims of quantity (saying only as much as is necessary), of quality (saying only the truth, and saying it with perspicuousness), and of relevance (saying only what is to the point).... [T]he existence of such maxims...provides us with the means of violating them for purposes of *meaning more than we say*.... To mean in this way...is to create gaps and to recruit presuppositions to fill them.[78]

While this seems to suggest a certain degree of instability, as I have discussed above, leviathans operate on the expectation of variability. It is their participants' duty to see the constant pattern behind the momentary variation. Even the most conventional stories have gaps in them, both because to describe things completely would be an impossible task, and, more importantly, to engage the reader by forcing them to invoke their own schemas of social interaction and interpretation to fill them. Such stories present particular instances of problem types whose answers we already know. The pleasure of

such narratives is to recognize the place where the new problem may be fitted into the existing schemas and resolved.

Popular culture often consists of what might be called non-canonic regulatory texts. Horatio Alger stories are one obvious example of narratives which serve to reinforce models of social interaction--a narrative series which emerged, probably not by coincidence, in a period of high immigration and social turmoil. But there are many more recent models. Television programs typically serve this function, as the following quote from a newspaper article illustrates:

> Michael A. Chambers used to spank his 7-year-old son. But a year ago he changed his way of thinking as he watched re-runs of his favorite program, "The Andy Griffith Show."
> "I saw that the character played by Andy Griffith never laid a hand on his boy but talked through their problems," he said. "It made me realize that there was a better way."
> Chambers, 32, a graphics designer from Houston, is not the only fan who says he has gotten more than laughs from the show about the cozy Southern hamlet of Mayberry. Among the roughly 5 million people who visit Sheriff Andy Taylor, his son, Opie, and Aunt Bee each day are parents who use the show to teach values, ministers who quote it in Sunday sermons and other viewers who use it as a moral compass in a sometimes frightening modern world.
> "It's like religion to a lot of people," said James Clark, founder of the Andy Griffith Show Rerun Watchers Club, which he says has 20,000 members. "Andy's very wise, he's the Solomon, the Abe Lincoln of Mayberry. And so many of us in real life will ask: `What would Andy do? How would he handle this situation?"[79]

The last paragraph is revealing. As Picard is the icon of Star Trek's evolving moral order, Andy Griffith is an icon both of biblical and civic morality in "Mayberry", revealing in his interactions with others on the show an active

representation of each moral code which each audience member may use to help coordinate better their own behavior with the living community of interests symbolized by the Mayberry narrative. One might know the bible verse, "do unto others as you would have done unto yourself," but the message becomes manifest in action as members of the Andy Griffith Rerun Watchers Club pretend to be citizens of Mayberry. "Robert J. Curtis of Colorado Springs, Colorado... encourages his 5-year-old daughter to watch as one way of sharing his own childhood with her."[80] I might add that he both communicates dominant cultural values to her at the same time as he engages her in a community devoted to making habitial these values in contemporary symbols. The difference between the written and unwritten laws of Mayberry and the Star Trek Federation is that Mayberry preserves an archaic world of small-town community values, remediated in new symbols and responding to modern stresses, while Star Trek presents a futuristic vision of multicultural community that is in part our own, and in part what our own community might become. In the Bible and Roman narrative to which I will turn, Moses and Marcus Aurelius similarly both preserve as well as reinterpret the present age through the alternative worlds they invoke.

Marx Wartofsky provides us with a description of such worlds and their potential functions:

> `[T]ertiary' artifacts...constitute a domain in which there is a free construction in the imagination of rules and operations different from those adopted for ordinary `this-worldly' praxis.... The perceptual alternative [tertiary artifact] provides the possibility of a

> practical alternative, as, so to speak, a perceptual hypothesis. Such imaginary worlds I do not take as `dreams' or `in the head', but as embodied representations, or better, embodied alternative *canons of representation: embodied* in actual artifacts, which express or picture this alternative perceptual mode. Once the visual picture can be `lived in', perceptually, it can also come to colar and change our perception of the `actual' world, as envisioning possibilities in it not presently recognized.[81]

The example of a tertiary object mediating activity that I have provided is Michael A. Chambers and his five-year-old child, reconciling modern attitudes toward corporal punishment with traditional beliefs. But this is a relatively slight remediation of existing relations. Less conventional narratives create possible worlds and expose them to novel, less easily resolved discontinuities. Possible world narratives have the potential through their poetic violations of expectations to re-educate our understanding of the actual world by teaching us to see the world differently.[82] Tertiary artifacts

> can come to constitute a relatively autonomous `world', in which the rules, conventions, and outcomes no longer appear directly practical, or which indeed, seem to constitute an arena of non-practical, or `free' play or game activity.[83]

Why is such free play important? Play creates a ZOPED. Vygotsky argues that the discoordination between child players interacting with each other on the basis of preconscious schemas forces them to become conscious of their activity. Activities which they once performed unconsciously and haphazardly, and completed only in group interaction, begin to coalesce over time into abstract rules and models of behavior that are collectively shared.[84] I would suggest that in a ZOPED, slight discoordination constantly creates small

montages: versions of ideas which are similar but discontinuous transform in *praxis* into more pragmatic concepts. It is precisely in the process of remediating the conscious and preconscious roles, rules and schemas which govern our behavior in what Wartofsky refers to as "off-line" situations that individuals--and as Callon and Latour remind us, social institutions as they are roles played by individual actors--become capable of growth and innovation. The process which the Socio-Historical school analyzes in children is also a process which anthropologists interested in symbolism, such as Victor Turner and Dan Sperber[85] have observed in "off-line" adult interaction. Robert Nisbet has noted of major world-view revolutions that they are

> quite often no more than the mutational replacement, at certain critical points in history, of one foundation-metaphor by another in man's contemplation of universe, society, and self. Metaphoric likening of the universe to an *organism* in its structure will yield one set of derivations; derivations which become propositions in complex systems of philosophy. But when, as happened in the 17th Century, the universe is likened instead to a *machine*, not merely physical science but whole areas of moral philosophy and human psychology are affected.[86]

It is this quality of transformation that John Dewey had in mind when he noted of tools of classification in any human art that they are not "a bare transcript or duplicate of some finished and done-for arrangement pre-existing in nature," but rather "a reporatory of weapons for attack upon the future and the unknown."[87]

* * *

NARRATIVES AND LEVIATHANS

The Bible and Rome epic movies were one of the weapons through which representatives of different groups sought to define the United States to itself in the 50's and 60's. They arose because the United States' social paradigm, the semi-conscious premise which helped to identify the nation to itself and to guide its behavior, came into contradiction with its material power, and its concomitant relations with other societies. In order to see why this is so, and why the Bible and Rome genres particularly arose in the process of re-creating an American identity, I will need to provide a short history of some of the social paradigms through which the United States' identity has been shaped, and to look more closely at the question of how societies create and perpetuate themselves through arguments over traditional genre narratives of identity.

Durkheim noted that religion and myth frequently were the medium of the "collective sentiments and the collective ideas" of a society.[88] Science as an international process has formalized and rationalized many of our collective ideas today about ourselves and the material world, and has for the most part taken the place of religion and myth as our fundamental narrative of identity. But as Northrop Frye has pointed out, the most common expression of these collective concepts still is to be found in a given society's narratives. These create "mythological universes" which separate its members into cultural leviathans, and provide them with conceptual schemas:

> The reading of an individual romance, say a detective story or a Western, may be in itself a trivial enough imaginative experience. But a study of the whole convention of Westerns or detective stories would tell us a great deal about the shape of stories as a whole, and that, in its turn, would begin to give us some glimpse of still larger verbal structures, eventually of the mythological universe itself.[89]

In accordance with the Leviathan-construction model, I would add that the "mythological universe" is the epic Leviathan-identity, the web of concepts that defines religious, national, and social groups. Literature and other symbolic activity may be thought of in Vygotskian terms as the internal monologues of Leviathans, through which pre-conscious self-awareness is manufactured and maintined, and problem-solving occurs.

Core epic myths of identity are taken up in narratives and retold in contemporary terms. It is the quality of this mythic knowledge that narratives create and evoke in their audiences that is particularly interesting. In order to understand how narrative symbolic activity works, I will take as an example perhaps the most important myth of identity for the United States, the Western.

The Western has evolved enormously over the 150 years, roughly, in which the genre has taken form. But this narrative activity of identity formation has taken place for the most part as an unconscious activity. By unconscious, I do not mean that people who, for example read or watch Westerns, or write or film Westerns, have been wholly unaware of the themes and patterns which structure the genre. But the predicates of these themes and patterns have been worked out by academics long after the Western genre had established itself.

The Western is throughly informed by the metaphorical analogy, dating back to John Winthrop's serman "A Model of Christian Charity," of the history of America to the history of the people of Israel, and in particular Exodus. The Moses character, whether he be called the Virginian, Wyatt Earp, Shane, Ethan Edwards, or The Man With No Name, persists through time. Concepts of promised land, Cattle-Barons/Pharaohs, Indians/Philistines, sin and redemption, and many others follow directly from this analogy. This is perhaps the single most important and consistent defining epic of Trans-European North America.[90] Yet few people who like Westerns are able to articulate this aspect of their structure, even though they must be aware of it both to tell and understand the stories.

The following is a rough outline of the process underlying the articulation of the Western as a genre for the purpose of illustrating how the epic identity as predicate of a genre functions. I would first say that this articulation is not unique; Northrop Frye has proposed that the entire history of Western literature in the Christian era has as its basis the recreation of the Christian myth in terms of the ascendant religious or social ideals of each age.[91] In accordance with this postulate, the prehistory of the Western Romance began with the systematic application of the predominantly Christian beliefs Europeans used to organize their own social structures and activities in North America. Prior to and during the early years of the Western as a genre--and, for that matter, other genres in the U.S.--a number of writers drew explicit parallels between the people of

America and the people of Israel, so frequently that it was a common assumption in sermans and commentaries of the colonial period.[92] Both had gone out of a corrupt land and into a promised land--filled with inhabitants, to be sure, but inhabitants "whose Land the Lord God of our Fathers hath given to us for a rightful Possession," as Increase Mather noted in his history of King Phillip's War.[93] This parallel provided one of the systematic basis of structure--a paradigm--which helped to form a national identity. Once this identity became established, however, conscious articulation of it began to drop out of narratives.

What this implies however is not that the Christian symbolism disappeared, but that the purely abstract nature of the epic identification of "United States is Israel" became so familiarized and unquestioned that it became a fossilized cognitive model, a conceptual system which serves as the predicate to new transformations and extensions of the genre, rather than the subject of the genre.[94] It became a "black box" whose foundations determined the patterns in which other narratives were built. As with the predicate schemas of metaphors which cognitive linguistics analyzes, the implications of a given narrative schema tend to become articulated over time as it is used in new situations and novel ways. The Western audience's awareness of the epic significance of Westerns has been, to use a term of Vygotsky's, preconceptual, because the Western has been used to think about social identity, and the use of the Western as a tool does not enable of itself an ability to think

introspectively about the underlying elements of identity of the Western.[95] In his study of the development of concepts in adolescents, Vygotsky made the following observation:

> The adolescent will form and use a concept quite correctly in a concrete situation, but will find it strangely difficult to express that concept in words, and the verbal definition will, in most cases, be much narrower than might have been expected from the way he used the concept. The same discrepency occurs also in adult thinking, even at very advanced levels. This confirms the assumption that concepts evolve in ways differing from deliberate conscious elaboration of experience in logical terms. Analysis of reality with the help of concepts precedes analysis of the concepts themselves. [my italics][96]

It is precisely for the problem of analyzing reality that Leviathans generate systematic conceptual systems such as the Western. They are, in effect, the Leviathan version of the collective monologue which Vygotsky observed children engaged in order to guide behavior and solve problems.[97]

Conceptual narrative systems are necessary for the function of Leviathans, but as the interaction of narrative and behavior in the history of the "promised land" of America suggests, they are not unambiguously good things. Moreover, as Walter Lippmann observed in Public Opinion, the enormously complex structure of modern society has made us ever more dependent upon Leviathans and their communicative systems. To the extent that people's identity is increasingly bound up in epic Leviathan structures, pseudoconceptual narratives may have enormous influence. In the absence of an appropriate narrative system, even a self-destructive narrative may be

seized upon to present an illusion of structure for society. This, as I will discuss below, is precisely what happened in the early Cold War years.[98]

More commonly, however, mass-mediated narratives in society like Star Trek or The Andy Griffith Show--or, for that matter, as Barbara Hinckley has shown in The Symbolic Presidency,[99] presidential addresses--provide an abstract realm in which the implicit metaphors and scenarios of society, epic and mundane, are reinforced, and in which new problems are identified as fitting into the framework of beliefs that its readers, viewers, or listeners already understand. Conceptual narrative systems are most commonly used ritualistically to preserve the status quo social identity or to shift it slightly, rather than to recast that identity into radically new forms. As Havelock notes, it is perhaps this pre-rational conservative aspect of narrative which Plato had in mind when he specifically prohibited poetry in his ideal republic. But the relative efficiency and functional necessity for its use in Leviathan intra- and inter-communication has made it impossible to eliminate.[100]

NARRATIVES AND THE COLD WAR IN THE UNITED STATES

I would like to turn now to the conditions and metaphors which led to the development of the Rome and Bible narrative schemas I will examine in depth, and to begin with a discussion of Cognitive linguistics terms I will use.[101] An allegory is the conversion of a doctrine or thesis into a narrative, whose

characters represent abstract concepts. Roles are sometimes signified by names, and at other times by attributes of the characters as defined by the concept. Instead of arguing by reason, the allegorist argues through his or her characters. The aliens of many 50's movies--the giant ants of THEM!, or the hermaphroditic collective plant creature of The Thing, for example, were an allegorical representation of the U.S.S.R., constructed out of the negative traits which the U.S. commonly ascribed to its opponent.[102]

Cognitive tropes exist prior to, and are constituent of, allegories. The implication of Vygotsky's studies, the Pragmatist philosophers, and Cognitive linguistic theory, is that almost all knowledge is based in one form or another on socially determined tropes developed over time, and founded on our shared physical experience of the real world. Metaphors and metonymies are social artifacts through which artists establish identities, and clarify the meaning of abstractions. The Bible, an apt referent considering the narratives I will examine, will serve as a source to show this difference. "Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord? And who shall stand in his holy place?" asks King David in Psalm 24. This may seem straightforward, but in fact a predicate to understanding what David says is to know implicitly that MORAL IS UP/IMMORAL IS DOWN. Morality itself is an abstraction, but our experiential knowledge of spatial relations gives us a cognitive tool through which we can better conceptualize morality. Furthermore, there are entailments that follow if we identify morality with up. Morality is not easy. Immoral desires are gravity;

they constantly pull at us, but we must resist if we are to be moral. If we wish, in this instance, to stand in front of God, we must climb to that moral height; it will not come down to us. To call one person an eagle and another person a mole in an allegory is thus not arbitrary, but motivated by a network of such controlling cognitive schemas.

The United States, just prior to the beginning of the epic film period of 1949-1964, faced a cognitive schema crisis.[103] As I have already noted, the metaphor identity UNITED STATES IS ISRAEL is a very old and influential narrative schema. Many early European settlers in North America intended to set up utopian religious societies, and given the novelty of a democratic republic in modern history, and the relative weakness of the new nation to the European powers, it is hardly surprising that the conception of the United States as a political model should continue to be cast in the metaphoric role of Israel.

Prior to World War I, the U.S. considered itself a "City on a Hill," a moral example to which other nations should look--and indeed whose behavior would be monitored by God and by the nations. As long as the United States could define itself and its actions in relation to that epic cognitive model, it had a strong identity.[104] The rise of trans-national corporations and the material power of the United States by the turn of the 19th century created problems with this essentially isolationist model. Businessmen and farmers concerned with the expansion of markets for their products, and imperialists such as Captain Mahan, Albert Beveridge and Teddy Roosevelt, advocated--with some success-

-the necessity for the United States to assume the imperial role other major powers played. Carl Schurz, William Jennings Bryan, and various other figures protested that this violated the United States' mission as a moral ideal to other nations, but economic interests could not entirely be resisted.[105] As president, Roosevelt intervened a number of times in the Southern American hemisphere, as did Taft and Wilson. Yet in each intervention, presidents were compelled to justify their right to intervene, and to express their intention to exit as soon as possible; the City on a Hill epic narrative acted as a restraint on overt American imperial behavior beyond the boundaries of the "promised land."[106]

City on a Hill remained the dominant epic narrative identity of the United States well into World War I. But the Wilson administration's attempt to remain neutral during WWI made it clear to President Wilson that the United States had become too powerful a nation with too many global economic entanglements either to be ignored by combatants or to suffer aggression passively. Wilson intuited the necessity of a consonant narrative that would enable the United States to engage in balance-of-power conflicts and intervene to preserve U.S. investment capital and markets in other nations, and yet preserve the traditional idealistic frame of U.S. foreign policy. Wilson attempted to redefine the American role from the example of democracy for the rest of the world to the guarantor and agent of democracy, trying out the idea in the Southern American hemisphere,[107] and later extending it through the League of Nations. His solution was to make the United States the prophet-nation that would lead the

rest of the world to the promised land of peace and prosperity, through the agency of something like a moral, formally organized Congress of Vienna, with himself in the role of a sanctified Metternich.[108]

Wilson sought to make the difficult conception of the League of Nations familiar to the American people by casting it into one of the canonic epic narratives of the United States, the Exodus narrative.[109] It is possible that he did this simply by stating what were for him the preconscious predicates of his own understanding of the United States' role in the world.[110] In this epic, The United States would be the Moses that would lead the nations out from amoral imperialism to a new social order. In his last public speech, Wilson said:

> There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before.[111]

Although this modified epic metaphor met with considerable success[112]--the American public was generally in favor of some sort of participation in the League--Wilson's alteration of canonic narratives did not become a monopoly identity model in the United States--partly because Senator Lodge and many other Republicans personally loathed Wilson, and partly because many feared that the League would resemble all too much the Congress of Vienna, and the United States would find itself supporting the imperial actions of dictatorships.[113] When the Democrats were voted out of office in 1920, the Republicans reasserted the old isolationist City on a Hill model.[114]

Bible narratives appeared in the 20's, but while many of them made allegorical reference to the war, none could be said to make reference to Wilson's story.[115] In the 30's, heroes were more likely to be inspired to action by bread-lines than revelations.[116] The one notable exception was Gabriel Over the White House (1933), in which the angel Gabriel takes over the President of the United States' body, enacts programs to employ workers, and imposes by force world peace--a unilateralist interpretation of Wilson's vision. World War Two proved President Wilson's point that the United States was too entangled with world affairs to remain isolationist, both to political leaders and to a majority of the American public. As Wendell Willkie's One World (1943) and Zanuck's biography film Wilson (1944) indicate, Wilson's prophet-nation epic narrative seemed in retrospect both logical and inevitable. Wilson's former Undersecretary of the Navy, President Franklin Roosevelt, adopted the Wilsonian model of an international council, the United Nations, to be led by an active prophet-of-democracy United States.[117]

The problem with this transnational epic was that it required the belief of all nations in the epic, as made manifest in the institution of the United Nations. The collective bonds of trust and common identity forged in the war would have to be maintained without the help of a common enemy. In his fourth inaugural address, Roosevelt warned that "we can gain no lasting peace if we approach it [the end of the war] with suspicion and mistrust," feelings with which he had to contend frequently during alliance discussions. The war alliance had always

been troubled by charges of bad faith, particularly between Churchill and Stalin, between whom Roosevelt had been at great pains to mediate. On the domestic front, Roosevelt had replaced Vice President Wallace with Truman in 1944 in order to shore up the conservative wing of his party coalition, itself suspicious of the U.S.S.R.

Roosevelt's power to no small extent was dependent on the charisma of his personality. His death weakened both the links between the other Grand Alliance powers and the political party his successor inherited. Truman had neither the ability nor the desire to charm the Soviets, and while the Cold War was probably inevitable, he certainly inflamed Stalin's paranoia.[118] In the U.S., business interests and Republicans, like Churchill, did not believe in the Wilson-Roosevelt epic of the United Nations. They were willing to work with the devil if he would fight Nazis, but only until the war was over. "The possibility of finding security in a world in which Communism ... was present, seemed slight to the many Americans who had long distrusted both Communists and foreigners like the Russians," James Robertson has observed.[119] The U.S.S.R. government's internal cultural practices and beliefs[120] as well as its prior experiences with the League of Nations[121] produced a leadership little given to trust at all, let alone trust in the idealism of world government impulses of capitalist states. After Roosevelt's death, Stalin demanded that the Soviet ambassador and several aides be allowed to see the body to determine whether or not Roosevelt had been poisoned.[122]

The American people, knowing nothing of all of this, expected something like a world made safe for democracy after the war, and an end to international threats.[123] Instead the United States and the U.S.S.R. were soon involved in an ongoing hegemonic conflict, which Bernard Baruch described in a speech in 1947 as a "cold war," a term Walter Lippmann quickly popularized.[124] The term presumably was derived from a prexisting metaphorical antonym, "hot" war, in which the roiling activity of hot fluids was related to an area or a battlefield where a high number of projectiles were being fired. A "cold" war then would indicate the state of war, with the conditions of war present, but without visible military activity. If a "hot" war was especially active, a "cold" war would be "frozen," or move in a "glacial" way.

Conflicts between the two new superpowers about the administration of occupied territory were apparent even before the war ended, which amplified existing mistrust. By 1947 these conflicts of territorial and governmental status were so regular that it was obvious that the United States and the Soviet Union were on opposed sides around the globe, notably in Greece and Turkey. The United Nations was "frozen;" neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. could impose their will due to the Security Council veto. Without cooperation from the major powers, it could not arbitrate international conflicts. After the February 1948 Communist coup in Czechoslovakia--an event that carried the historical resonance of Nazi Germany and imminant world war--Truman admitted that his faith in world peace was shaken.[125] In 1949, the nominally "Soviet-supported"

Chinese Communist Red Army--in fact a very nationalist movement that the Soviets supported indifferently--defeated the American-sponsored Kuomintang Nationalist army. This was perceived as a shocking advancement of a new Communist world order.[126] In addition to this, the U.S.S.R. had just developed its own atomic bomb and ended the United States' monopoly. In the following year the Korean War began. "It looks like World War Three is here--I hope not," Truman wrote in his diary.[127]

Any hope of trust and cooperation between the two nations was lost, and indeed, the hope that Wendell Willkie had expressed in One World (1943) of a common, peaceful world society, a dream of which Franklin Roosevelt spoke in his speeches, was shattered. At this same time the nuclear age and air travel ended the United States' traditional sense of security that oceans and distance had provided. The U.S.S.R. was the enemy in this new and frightening world. Its agents were at work around the globe and within the U.S. to destroy Democracy. World War seemed imminant.[128] The Wilsonian goal of a theocratic United Nations confederacy led by a democratic-prophet United States was replaced with a political theater of Manichean warfare over nations' souls. The U.S. and its allies had to "[climb] from the misty vally of ineffectual good will to the bleak but clearer plateau of the Cold War", as Time Magazine phrased it in 1950. It was necessary to have an American foreign policy that would "recognize and express underlying realities," Secretary of State Dean Acheson said a radio address of March 18, 1949 to announce the N.A.T.O. pact,

the first of many other defensive pacts. "[I]n the compact world of today the United States cannot be defined in terms of boundaries and frontiers."[129]

The failure of postwar ideals destabilized the postwar identity of the United States to such an extent that it became necessary to devise a new narrative. The Truman years are thus of great interest as a period in which different versions of the American epic identity were being formulated and tested. In accordance with the old City on a Hill metaphor, conservatives and liberals initially both complained of a national moral crisis that was the underlying source of failure. Following the pattern of Israel in the Old Testament, God must be punishing the United States for the sins of its leaders or part of its people. For liberals, concerned with preserving the continuity of an activist, internationalist government, the problem had to be in the current national leadership. If "the Soviet threat stubbornly refuses to collapse," Sidney Hertzberg said in a typical article, it must be because the recent history of foreign policy was poorly thought out, or that our leaders lacked the "moral resources" to act in accordance with the nation's own ideals, seemingly forgotten in the present.[130] This would be in accordance with the concept of the leader-as-prophet that is a premise of the messianic nation, as typified by the Saul/David narrative in the Bible, and later, the David whose sins lead to the destruction of Israel (the object, incidentally, of a 1951 film, David and Bathsheba). A leader who is not possessed by the divine vision will lead poorly, and thus is proven to be unfit. Under the metaphor SOCIETY IS A

BODY, the leader is the "head," and injuries to the society can thus be seen as punishment for the leader's failures.

For conservatives, who were inclined to see the Roosevelt period as a betrayal of national identity to begin with, international failures were proof of a tactical metaphor they had been trying, unsuccessfully, to assert for years. They too used the metaphor complex SOCIETY IS A BODY, but they saw the threat as not just faulty leadership, but a systematic infection of dangerous ideas about the social order. Republicans and business interests had been staging fitful attacks on Communists in union organizations, government and in the entertainment business since the mid-30's in an an attempt to slow unionism, with little success. Because the public image of the enemy (or "disease") of the 30's and early 40's was fascism (the influence of which the House Un-American Activities Committee was formed to fight), the anticommunist language of union-bashing seemed irrelevant, and these hearings had little effect. The right's attack on Communism lacked a relevant context, and it was apparent that the target was less Communism than New Dealism. The power of the New Deal coalition, organized around the contradicting metaphor that the New Deal was "medicine" for an injury to society caused by the carelessness of the idle upper class,[131] easily defeated the Republican attempt to switch metaphors. Jimmy Cagney, among many others, was called before HUAC in 1940, and told reporters afterward that claims of Communist domination in Hollywood were "so exaggerated that they are ridiculous." A few days later he was at a birthday

celebration for President Roosevelt, who said, "Jimmy, I see by the papers you've been a bad boy." "All I did, Mr. President, was believe in the things you believe." "Attaboy, Jimmy," Roosevelt replied.[132]

Racist rhetoric since the 20's employed "Communist" as a code-word for its true objects, immigrants from places other than northern Europe, as Neil Gabler has shown; "Anarchist" and "Communist" stood for alien cultures and races in general.[133] Business leaders used the same words in an attempt to canalize these feelings toward anti-union sentiment. The period immediately after the war completely changed the context of this language. The war had meant prosperity, an end to depression, and most people in the United States feared that the end of the war meant a return to depression.[134] Now that a Communist nation was the new international enemy, and in a period prior to the postwar economic expansion, anti-unionists, anti-civil rights and anti-Semites found themselves in the position of having a receptive public for their language. The conceptual expansion of boundaries entailed in the assumption of global power as the Cold War began made it possible to equate Communism with treason, and to link union conflicts with companies to the global conflict--especially as many of the most dedicated and effective union activists were indeed members of the Communist party.[135] As one Time magazine article inverviewee put it, when he saw dockworkers "striking at the gates, I see red."[136]

True Americans, businesses argued, were prepared to sacrifice wage and benefit increases as part of their patriotic duty. Companies began placing ads in popular journals such as the following:

> To my mind what industry vitally needs is increased production caused by a continuity of operations. This can only be brought about by a prompt change of mental attitude on the part of our citizens. Then I think a solution can be attained by proper new laws, fair to labor, management, customers and shareholders alike. The world which we cherish is passing through great and serious changes and has amassed enormous debts during the past ten years. It is now evident that we must work harder and longer and possibly accept less renumeration for our efforts.[137]

The "proper new law" that reflected the thinking behind such publicity, the 1947 Taft-Hartley act, was the sort of anti-union measure industry could never have had passed in the 30's. In the postwar period, it could be framed as a measure to preserve economic security and to prevent internal subversion from foreign agents, attempting to cause strikes on orders from Moscow. What had been a tactical exercise of labor now became re-interpreted in the epic model as a moral failing, a yielding of spiritual purpose in favor of an illusory material gain.[138]

The moral linkage was the key shift. Two separate metaphors became combined together into a system. If the United States was the Chosen Nation, then its enemy was the Anti-Nation, the Egypt to the United States' Israel. To equate metaphorically morality with health, and immorality with sickness, made it possible to portray leftists as "germs," carriers of immorality that would bring punishment on the Chosen Nation if not "purged" with medicine. Republican

politician's language, and the scope of their attacks, also changed accordingly. When Joseph McCarthy, the most prominent of the new demagogues, argued that the New Dealers were treasonous, he only exaggerated the beliefs conservatives had argued all along about Roosevelt's programs.[139] But unlike conservative attacks of the past, he did not attack liberals on the race of their supporters, or the wantonness of their economics, but on their good faith as citizens of the country. They were no longer citizens at all, but "agents." Analysts in liberal journals like Commentary, Encounter and The New Republic only belatedly began to analyze what had happened. Perhaps because he was a literary critic, Leslie Fiedler wrote one of the more penetrating analyses of the language shift. "Robert Taft, for instance," Fiedler commented of the Republican Senate leader for Encounter in August 1954,

> supported McCarthy (despite waverings and reservations) because he himself had long been convinced that `objectively' socialists were no different from Communists, and leftish New Dealers were no different from either; so that calling any supporter of the `welfare state' a Communist might be rude and impolitic, but was not actually wrong.[140]

The new Republican demagogues like Senators McCarthy, Mundt and Jenner, and Representatives Thomas and Nixon, argued that Roosevelt's "New Deal" government had been riddled with Communists, and Roosevelt himself was at least a communist dupe. The nation had suffered "twenty years of treason" that still continued. Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who devised and implemented Truman's "containment" strategy, was the "Red Dean." Truman was a bumbler--again, in the epic U.S. as Israel narrative, a false prophet. Alger

Hiss and Owen Lattimore, who had helped to establish policy in the Roosevelt administration for Europe and China respectively, were labeled as communist agents by congress.

All of this name-calling had a purpose. If Truman was weak, and if policy-makers were Communists, it explained why the Soviet Union succeeded and the U.S. failed: the government was itself "infected" with evil; the New Deal bureaucrats were a pocket of germs in an otherwise healthy body that needed to be expunged. The government sponsored Communist-directed unions, and the government concealed spies. The executive branch of the government, as Senator Jenner and ex-F.B.I. agent Dan Smoot charged, was itself pro-Communist,[141] and Congress had to cure the disease. Over Truman's veto, Congress passed the "Internal Security Act of 1950" which, along with requiring the registration of all Communists in the country, made provisions for internment camps like those in which Japanese-Americans had been placed during World War II.[142]

Truman and the more conservative members of the Democratic party were also committed to discovering subversives--which indeed was Truman's defense in his veto of the McCarran "Internal Security Act." Truman's administration had found some evidence of possible espionage,[143] and while Truman labeled the initial 1946 Republican broadside claims of espionage a "red herring," he was concerned both about the possibility of spys and their political implication--particularly as the Republicans, pledging to "clean the

Communists and fellow travellers out of the government,"[144] won control of congress. Under attack from the right and left for incompetence, the Truman wing of the Democratic party as a tactical expediency itself began adopting the language of HUAC, which drew from the racism which periodically emerges in American history, and identifies ideological danger to society with the biologically alien.[145] Indians, African-Americans, and "alien filth" with "sly and crafty eyes . . . lopsided faces, sloping brows, and misshapen features"[146] had been previous groups mapped to the Philistines in previous expressions of the City on a Hill epic metaphor. But Truman's administration, by way of exculpation, suggested that Communists were different. They were a new kind of alien race, one which looked like everyone else. If there were Communists in the government, it was because the Alien craftily assumed the form of the average citizen. But careful scrutiny, such as would be provided by Truman's Federal Employee Loyalty Program, could reveal the presence in such outwardly innocent indivuduals of the hidden alien virus. A Time article, commenting in 1949 on unions with Communist members, is an example of this new language of concealment and revelation through tests: "The alien cast of Communism's face became plain for everyone to see."[147]

In this metaphoric analogy, Truman's administration selected the less personally threatening option of metaphor mappings that were emergent in society, and purged their choice of some of the anti-semitic, xenophobic baggage that HUAC (as their calling the notorious anti-semite Gerald L. K.

Smith to testify suggests) were happy to keep. Many of the right-wing groups who attacked Communists immediately appealed to the alien race model. In the mob attack on the audience at the Peekskill, New York Peace concert on August 27, 1949, for example, mob participants shouted, "We'll finish Hitler's job! Fuck you white niggers! Give us Robeson! We'll string that big nigger up"[148] and "Kill a commie for Christ," the latter being an innovation on the old antisemitic chant to kill a Jew for Christ.[149] Fiedler commented in his analysis of McCarthy's rhetoric that anti-Communism seemed to be a flag of convenience for many racists who had been saying the same things for 35 years, and that these were the forces which McCarthy "really represents."[150]

What was innovative in the Truman administration language, and what developed as the conceptual metaphor for both right and left, is that the alien other became less someone who was already in some sense "other", and more the ordinary person transformed by an infectious agent: a "cell" that seemed part of the body, but in fact had been transformed into an alien thing. Communism was a virus, awaiting a moment of weakness to attack the healthy body. "Communists," Truman's Attorney-General Tom Clark said, "are everywhere--in factories, offices, butcher shops, on street corners, in private business, and each carries in himself the germs of death for society."[151]

At the beginning of the Cold War, in 1947, Newsweek published a special report, "What Communists are Up To," that reinforced this internal version of the Truman Doctrine. It begins with a traditional description of the

"Italian-born Marzani," a former O.S.S officer and State Department official who fit the old profile of "alien", whom Clark had convicted in May 1947 of concealing his membership in the American Communist party. But the Newsweek article goes on to identify, by Anglo-Saxon name and picture, dozens of "infected" popular authors and people in labor unions, minority rights groups, newspapers, magazines, and Hollywood studios as communist agents. The article's full title extends as a header across its pages, bringing into focus the implications of its charges: "What Communists are Up To: Intrigue and Infiltration By a Few Party Members, Using Many Party Liners[;] In a Score of Ways, In a Babel of Tongues, Are Spread Messages From Moscow to Those Who Toil or Tremble[;] Pulpet, Press, Stage, Screen Offer Sounding Boards, But Men Who Have Learned the Tricks Expose Their Work." The Bentley-Chambers, Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore hearings, the Rosenberg trials, and the House Unamerican Activities Committee investigations of government officials and entertainment workers, increased the feeling in the country that perhaps there really were Communist spies everywhere, contagious, transformed aliens on whom blame for the postwar failures could be fixed. Communism became an internal wasting disease of the social body, like cancer, that one could contract unknowingly, and whose affected parts should be cut out. "We're like a doctor," one of the editors of Counterattack, an anticommunist newsletter, explained to a magazine writer.[152]

McCarthy took up this new theme, and made it his own. It is this quality of ideological infection produced by Communist ideas that Fiedler sensed made McCarthy different, and more dangerous than Parnell. In his analysis of McCarthyism, Seymour Lipset noted that McCarthy and his followers characteristically attacked East-Coast elites, of Anglo-Saxon Episcopalian origins, educated in high-status institutions such as Harvard.[153] Traditional xenophobia and racism tended to alienate conservative minorities. McCarthy went out of his way to stress that minorities were not the dangerous infectious agents, and so he was able to expand greatly the basis of his support:

> The reason why we find ourselves in a position of impotency is not because our only potential enemy has sent men to invade our shores, but rather because of the traitorous actions of those who have been treated so well by this nation. It is not the less fortunate, or members of minority groups who have been selling this nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer--the finest homes, the finest college educations, and the finest jobs in the government that we can give.[154]

The educated elite, in other words, were most likely to be exposed to the communist infection--knowledge itself was the vector of the virus. Universities took the role of movie theaters and swimming pools in other deseases, as places in which the pestilence spread. It is the quality of infection by knowledge that McCarthyites appealed to in the early 50's in making their claims about "thousands of Communist espionage agents in the state department." Bureaucrats' actual contact with Soviet agents was less important than their exposure to the corrupting doctrine, which tainted their ideological fitness.[155]

The vagueness of the infection-metaphor allowed contradictory groups to come together around charges of un-Americanism and Communism. Gerald L.K. Smith denounced Roosevelt as a Communist agent, and Jews a Communist race. A Southerner, according to one observer, denounced as Communistic "defenders of the civil liberties of any of our several racial minorities; then he went on to reproach the North for `not fighting for its civil liberties against that fascist McCarthy.'"[156] At a McCarthy mass meeting in 1954, Racial discrimination was denounced as un-American, and anyone defending civil liberties against McCarthy was Communistic. At the same meeting, a rabbi accused those who accused Roy Cohn of draft-dodging of anti-Semitic intolerance. A representative of Students for America, a student McCarthyite organization, said Cohn's attempt to avoid induction into the military was "the American Dreyfus Case", and concluded that "Roy Cohn and Joe McCarthy will be redeemed when the people have taken back their government from the criminal alliance of Communists, Socialists, New-Dealers, and the Eisenhower-Dewey Republicans."[157]

Along with uniting a group of people around a common theme, if not around common action, the network of implications in the infection metaphor explains the lack of interest in distinguishing espionage from political affiliation. When Dalton Trumbo, one of the "Hollywood Ten," was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee, he tried to have his screenplays put into the record so that they could serve as evidence against the charge that they were

full of subversion. The committee rejected his request. He tried to put in testimonials as to the nature of his screenplays from various government, military, and industry officials, and the committee rejected this as well; it did not matter. As Michael Rogin notes:

> The atomic spy trials of the late 1940's merged with the [HUAC] investigation of Communist influence in Hollywood. Since HUAC exposed both Alger Hiss and the Hollywood Ten and since the accused spies, writers and directors all went to jail . . . . [t]he Red scare joined together as one danger atomic spying, revelations of confidential government proceedings, Communist party membership, membership in `Communist front' organizations, manipulation of mass opinion, and subversive ideas.[158]

The Japanese enemy in World War II had also been represented as biologically monstrous. Much of this sense of a race-enemy which people had been taught to fear seems to have been transposed onto Communists: a race, alien, different, inhuman; but this "race" was a strange mutation of the average citizen, whose humanity had been overwritten by an alien biological code.[159]

This disease-metaphor expressed itself in a variety of films, the most complete of which was perhaps Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1956), in which individual people are turned into "pods", discrete yet unindividuated parts of some unperceived whole--and in the open countryside, too, traditionally the location of America's moral center. Common to all of these films is the presumption of incurability. Those infected must be wiped out.[160] As a predicate of this metaphor, the nation is conceived of as a body, subject to infective agents. Because disease is an internal conflict, this metaphor cannot tell stories about international relations, balances of power, or compromises.

Other nations are irrelevant to the narrative, except in the most general way as other potential victims of the plague or as agents of treatment. Negotiation, compromise, and tolerance are not part of the conventionalized medical discourse. The only international application which the disease metaphor offers is that of quarantine: If one person has the disease, then people should isolate that person with others who are infected, and wait for the disease to take its course. This in fact is what George Kennan's 1947 "Long Telegram" memo urged by proposing that the Truman administration adopt a "containment" policy, and the Truman Doctrine attempted to accomplish. Success is survival, in this metaphor; failure is death.

The sense of a diseased nation whose reality did not reflect its wartime ideals was not just reflected in concerns about international affairs and invasive aliens. Because the United States was now a great international power, internal events had international implications. Intellectuals on the left were frightened of the postwar malaise, and the rightward turn of the electorate cast many liberals into doubt about the independent reason of the American people. Eisenhower's defeat of Adlai Stevenson in the 1952 election was particularly disturbing, both because in comparison to Eisenhower, the witty, articulate Stevenson seemed to liberals so clearly the better man, and because Eisenhower's campaign (with its crude but effective "Man from Abeline" television commercials, and vague promises like "I will go to Korea") seemed to be a campaign of media over substance. "It would be hard for the young to

understand not only our surprise but our shock at the outcome," John Kenneth Galbraith wrote; "...we learned that the natural order had come to an end."[161] "It's not just that a great man has been defeated," a professor said, "it's that a whole era is ended, is totally repudiated, a whole era of brains and literacy and exciting thinking."[162] To the left, Eisenhower's election seemed to confirm that something was wrong in the United States.

The Frankfurt School of communication theorists, and others who had fled countries in Europe where malaise had been the prologue to fascism, had their own version of the opportunistic disease metaphor. They believed that the combination of growth and dominance of mass-mediated popular culture with McCarthyite intolerance of aliens and intellectuals presaged a fascist revolution. Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman wrote of right-wing agitators:

> The agitator seems to steer clear of the area of material needs on which liberal [by which Guterman probably included "traditional Republican"; Republican Senate leader Robert Taft called himself a liberal] and democratic movements concentrate; his main concern is a sphere of frustration that is usually ignored in traditional politics. The programs that concentrate on material needs seem to overlook that area of moral uncertanties and emotional frustrations that are the immediate manifestations of malaise. It may therefore be conjectured that his followers find the agitator's statements attractive not because he occasionally promises to `maintain the American standards of living' or to provide a job for everyone, but because he intimates that he will give them the emotional satisfactions that are denied them in the contemporary social and economic set-up. He offers attitudes, not bread.[163]

T. W. Adorno's analysis of "mass culture" and television, "How To Look At TV", in which he argued that television offered narratives of certainty rather than suspense, diagnosed the first symptoms of the Fascist Plague:

> Tension is but superficially maintained and is unlikely to have a serious effect any more.... The element of excitement is preserved only with tongue in cheek. Such changes fall in line with the potential change from a freely competitive to a virtually "closed" society into which one wants to be admitted or from which one fears to be rejected. Everything somehow appears "predestined."[164]

The Communist party was also quite certain that the radical Right would coalesce into a fascist revolution; the entire second echelon of Party leadership was ordered to become "unavailable"--to go underground--so that in the coming Fascist state a Communist organization could still continue to function.[165]

The right wing was equally concerned about mass culture and social chaos, only the locus of their concern was more frequently imminant delinquency of children rather than imminent fascism in the middle class.[166] In their version of the near future, overworked or lazy parents--especially socially-involved mothers--were not teaching their children core American values, thus making them susceptible to Communism itself, or spiritually empty materialism. "Not even the Communist conspiracy could devise a more effective way to demoralize, disrupt, confuse, and destroy our future citizens than apathy on the part of adult Americans to the scourge known as Juvenile Delinquency," one senator charged.[167]

Sometimes all the objects of fear were combined together, in speeches and in narratives. In one instance of this, a film called The Violent Years (1956),[168] upper middle-class parents are too busy participating in social events to concern themselves with their adolescent daughter. She becomes the leader of a girl-gang that rapes "nice" boys, holds up gas stations, and tries to burn down the high school. Her adult inspiration is a drug-dealing woman who allows the girl and her gang to use her house for sex and drug parties, and who suggests they destroy the school. The woman is, the movie hints, a communist agent. The Violent Years concludes in a courtroom: A judge tells the girl's parents, who seek custody of their dead daughter's infant, that they have "failed miserably" in their most important duty to society and cannot be trusted with another child.

One might say that a film like The Violent Years--or, to name a more well-known, respectable varient of the Juvenile Delinquent film genre, Rebel Without a Cause--not only reflected the new concern that adults of all political persuasions felt about the changing society in which they lived and in which their children were growing up, but also reflected implicitly a belief in custodial responsibilities toward peace in the entire world, now affected by our domestic affairs, and the moral duty that implied. There is an environmental metaphor of disease-causation behind this: The Communism or Fascism disease arose because those responsible failed to exercise care to preserve a healthy environment. George Marshall's speech proposing the Marshall Plan to

stabilize Europe is an early instance of the moral environment metaphor. After describing the "feverish" preparations for war in Europe, and the "breakdown" of its economy during the war and its slow "recovery," George Marshall announced that "the remedy" would be to support the economic stability of Europe, and to act against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos "so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." The aid must come prior to a crisis, because "any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative."[169] In this metaphor, the United States was surrounded by patients living in dens of pestilence, whose health was dependent on the environment the United States provided them. Diehard Isolationists such as Robert Taft spoke out against this change, but most agreed with President Eisenhower when he said of the U.S., "this is our home--yet this is not the whole of our world. For our world is where our full destiny lies--with men, of all peoples and all nations, who are or would be free."[170] Internationalism was inevitable, President Truman said in a speech during the Korean War; "the world is watching us, because all the world knows that the fate of civilization depends, to a very large extent, on what we do."[171]

The disease-metaphor provided a model for behavior in the world, albeit an extraordinarily paranoid model. However, it failed the test of providing a means of guiding national behavior in any complex way. It was not "epic," though in some of its versions it implicitly evoked the City on a Hill epic

narrative. By itself, it did not provide a justification for why the fate of civilization should seem to rest on the United States, and what the future of civilization should be. Moreover, with the failure of the United Nations system to live up to the ideal Truman and others proposed,[172] the Wilsonian modification of City on a Hill did not provide an explanation or guide for behavior.

This was a serious problem if one accepted the argument for an internationalist United States. The unmodified City on a Hill did not fit internationalism; the roles of passive ideal and active leader were incompatible, and the contradiction which Woodrow Wilson resolved temporarily, and isolationism concealed, became manifest again. A 1954 Commonweal article on the position the United States should take regarding Indonesia's claim of part of New Guinea discusses the split of ideal with geopolitical reality:

> Once upon a time the United States was world-famous as not only the exemplar of successful colonial revolution but as a most powerful enemy of colonialism everywhere. American strong-arm tactics in Latin America in the early years of this century did not break the idealized image held by Europeans and Asians; similarly, the hysterical Palmer raids which followed the first world war caused infinitesimal damage to the American image abroad when compared with the damage done by the relatively mild excesses of McCarthyism.
>
> Why? Mr. P. Worsthorne in the November issue of Encounter suggests that the idealization of the past was a result of America's isolation from world affairs. So long as the United States was remote it could be romanticized. Now that it is deeply involved in world affairs, now that it is the shield rather than only the symbol of democracy, its action and its faults have global reverberations and the reaction of the anxious world is to reproach it bitterly for showing itself to be less than a symbol-on-earth....
>
> Such are the unpleasant consequences of responsibility.[173]

In the same year, the Carnegie corporation issued a report entitled "Who Knows America," the point of which was that there was no longer any agreement as to what the United States was, or what its role in the world should be.[174] James Gilbert notes that "a search for the vital center of American civilization preoccupied a multitude of authors in the late 1940's and early 1950's."[175] Time, Life, and the Saturday Evening Post each ran stories on the absence of public goals, and cover-story campaigns to search for "a national purpose."[176]

The implicit paradigm crisis that had begun with the rise of the United States as a great power at the turn of the century became explicit. This is observable in American films of the time, most notably in Film Noir. The mood of identity-crisis may be found across American cinema genres, however, in films like The Best Years of Our Lives (1946); It's A Wonderful Life (1946); The Boy With Green Hair (1948); Fort Apache (1948); Rope (1948); Key Largo (1948); State of the Union (1948), The Dark Past (1948); Knock On Any Door (1949); and many others.

To no small extent, the United States continues to be embroiled in the same paradigm crisis today. The sense of common narrative identity which City on a Hill once provided for the nation still exists, but it has been fractured into quite a number of oblique and contradictory narratives. Leviathans of socio-political identity are at work developing some of the early Cold War themes I have mentioned in this chapter, as well as many others. But I would like to turn

now to the objects of my study, the Rome and Bible metaphors which evolved as new cognitive tools to replace the disease metaphors.

ENDNOTES

1. James V. Wertsch, Voices in the Mind (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 147.

2. Demille's sense of national danger was perhaps heightened by a marathon 1950 director's guild meeting in which he was the principal advocate of a loyalty oath, to be administered by the guild to all members. "If you don't think our country is in danger, you shuold have been at last night's meeting," he told his assistant Phil Koury. Phil Koury, Yes, Mr. DeMille (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959), p. 303.

3. DeMille, p. 412.

4. Gerald E. Forshey, American Religious and Biblical Spectaculars (Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger, 1992), p. 128.

5. Cecil B. DeMille, speech to Demille Jr. High School (Long Beach, Calif.), June 25, 1957. DeMille's private files, Los Angeles, Calif., cited in Gerald E. Forshey, American and Religious Biblical Spectaculars (Westport Connecticut; London: Praeger, 1992), p. 128.

6. DeMille, p. 435.

7. DeMille, p. 434.

8. Jerome Bruner, "Folk Psychology as an Instrument of Culture," Acts of Meaning (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), p. 63.

9. A.R. Luria, The Making of Mind, ed. Michael Cole and Sheila Cole (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979), p. 179.

10. A.R. Luria, The Man with a Shattered World, tr. Lynn Solotaroff (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987 [1972]), pp. 88-89.

11. Luria, The Man with a Shattered World, p. 102.

12. *bird* or *duck* for *bedpan* for us might seem arbitrary, a poetic image-metaphor. But note that he says "we use" bird; this is probably a regional or

cultural conceptual category, and thus a more advanced form of organization; see the description below.

13. Luria, The Making of Mind, p. 179.

14. Luria, The Man with a Shattered World, p. 48.

15. Ken Burns' documentary Baseball (1994) chronicles the history of "Take Me Out to the Ballgame".

16. Star Trek: The Next Generation, building on the original Star Trek, consistently earned audiences that would have placed it in the weekly top ten Nielson ratings had it been a network program. See Larry Nemecek, The Star Trek: The Next Generation Companion (New York: Pocket Books, 1992), pp. 173-174.

17. Veronica Chambers, "Onward Christian Slater," Premiere Vol 7, No. 8 (April 1994), pp. 95-96.

18. Jean-Pierre Vernant, "Greek Tragedy: Problems of Interpretation," in R. Macksey and E. Donato (eds.), The Structural Controversy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1972), pp. 281-282.

19. or, should one take the Lacanian interpretation of film-viewing, in the guise of the invisible choral figure of the "absent one" viewing Picard viewing Kirk--all, truly, one character viewed in cubist terms.

20. Kenneth Burke inspires my thinking of all which follows. That I leave Burke out of the discussion that follows is necessary for three reasons: First, his concept of dramatism implies that people think through metaphors, and indeed is itself a metaphor--Society is a Drama. This does not encompass everything that Burke suggested in his work, but it is his principle frame of reference. Implicit in his work, I think, is a theory of metaphors as models for behavior. He takes this as the predicate of his thinking, however, rather than the subject of his thinking. His implicit theory is thus subsumed in my discussion of models and metaphor theory below. Second, there are multiple versions of Burke, and all of them unusually ambiguous. He is difficult to argue for or against, and while I am generally for Burke, his model is such that it is difficult to reason with. Third, he seems to have as his goal something like the Marxian ideal of freeing humanity from false consciousness, which I discuss below. See William H. Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations 2nd ed. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1982), pp. 134-137; 162.

21. Morse Peckham, Man's Rage for Chaos: Biology, Behavior and the Arts (New York: Schocken Books, 1967)

22. or, to be more precise, to have very gradual shifts in style. various forms of mediation lose their power to compel over time, but there is no direct relationship between this shift, according to Peckham, and the extreme instability of mediation styles in high culture.

23. Peckham, p. 310

24. Peckham, 270-275.

25. Peckham, p. 313.

26. Peckham, p. 314.

27. Peckham, p. 313.

28. To some extent at least, yes, according to Peckham. The problem modern cultural historians face is that, with the rise of mass-mediated culture:

> A kind of cultural Gresham's law took over: inferior culture drives out superior. In the early eighteenth century Alexander Pope made a small fortune and achieved financial independence by writing poetry; in the early twentieth Wallace Stevens, as great a poet, perhaps greater, was a lawyer on the staff of an insurance company.
>
> The revolution in publishing automatically forces the cultural historian into an extraordinarily difficult position. Before the ninteenth century the culltural tradition of the majority of mankind was orally transmitted; little of it found its way into print. Works in print--and before printing, manuscripts--were almost entirely devoted to high-level culture, whether classics from the past or important and novel writings that exhibited the advancing edge of cultural development. For such eras, cultural history is, by comparison with the nineteenth century, fairly straightforward....
>
> In the ninteenth century, however, vast and steadily increasing masses of printed matter were issued for a market composed of that great majority of men who never before had had a written culture. Culturally, they did not live in the nineteenth century at all. The publisher's profit was increasingly to be derived from reinforcing orientations established not only long before the

> nineteenth century but even before the beginning of recorded history, about five thousand years ago.
>
> The problem of the cultural historian is to cut away this fatty deposit from the vital nerve which is embedded in it, that writing which continues the expression of the advancing edge of human consciousness.

Morse Peckham, Beyond the Tragic Vision (New York: George Braziller, 1962), pp. 28-29. I have provided a fairly long quote in order to show in action the implications of Peckham's argument that change is something elites always do first, and then, reluctantly, the masses. I find his general arguments quite compelling, but in this aspect of his logic I think he is quite wrong. I think that most people are indeed responsive to their age.

29. See "Play, the Game, and the Generalized Other," in George Herbert Mead, On Social Psychology (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1964). An example of complex interactions between events, communities, and baseball as a mediating artifact which has guided my thinking is Dan Daniel's editorial on Opening Day, Sporting News Apr. 4, 1941, quoted in Michael Seidel, Streak: Joe Dimaggio and the Summer of '41 (San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 1988), p. 4.

30. John Dewey, Art As Experience (New York: Capricorn Books, 1958 [1934]), pp. 55-57

31. My argument on the whole is very Burkean, but it is precisely this element that seems most to be lacking in Burke. Burke' implicit assumption might be summed up by this aphorism of Wittgenstein's: "If someone asked us, `but is that *true*?' we might say `yes' to him; and if he demanded grounds we might say `I can't give you any grounds, but if you learn more you too will think the same'." [Wittgenstein, On Certainty (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1972), p.28e] I want to provide some grounds for my observations about society on the basis of individual cognition. If, in the end, I cannot provide certainty, I would like to at least narrow the area on which I expect my reader to make a leap of faith.

32. In this I am modifying Wartofsky by arguing that animals have cultural artifacts as well as humans; this seems to be required however by the logic of his definition of artifact, Wartofsky pp.200-201

33. Marx W. Wartofsky, "Perception, Representation and Action," in Models (Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1979), p. 197.

34. Wartofsky, p. 201.

35. Wartofsky, p. 204.

36. Sarah Boysen's research with chimpanzees illustrates this point. In an experiment, two chimpanzees who had been trained to make quantity judgments with the arabic numerals one through six were asked to select which was the larger of two piles of candies. One chimpanzee would point at a pile of candy, and then the selected pile of candy would be given to the other chimpanzee, who was watching. The selector would be given the remaining pile.

The experimenters knew that the chimpanzees could distinguish which was the greater amount, but the object of the test was to determine if the chimpanzees would use their knowledge deceptively, and indicate the smaller pile was "more" so that they would receive the bigger pile of candy. In spite of numerous tests, and, intriguingly, much to their own distress, the chimpanzees could not do this. It was as though they knew very well what the differences in the candy piles were, and understood that when they chose the larger pile they would receive the smaller pile, but they could not help themselves from pointing to the pile of candy that they wanted. The experimentors then asked the chimpanzees to choose between arabic numerals representing larger and smaller amounts numerals. On the first try the selecting chimpanzee was able to point to the numeral it knew was smaller so that it would receive a larger amount of candy than the observing chimpanzee. Sarah T. Boysen and Gary G. Berntson, "Responses to Quantity: Perceptual vs. Cognitive Mechanisms in Chimpanzees (*Pan Troglodytes*)," Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes 1995, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 82-86.

This experiment suggests that secondary artifact systems of mimetic activity are relatively inflexible, always retaining the associations of their immediate context. In this case, pointing was a mimetic activity used to indicate something the chimpanzees wanted. If, as in this case, the rules of the context change, the activity will be unsuccessful, and a new secondary artifact activity will have to be developed over time. Annette Karmiloff-Smith, in proposing a new developmental stage model, refers to this level of cognition as "implicit representation" of knowledge in the activity. See Karmiloff-Smith, Beyond Modularity (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), p.20, for a further description of what she refers to as "implicit" representational knowledge.

37. Vivian Gussin Paley, Boys and Girls (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 85-86.

38. Luria, The Making of Mind, p. 183.

39. Luria, The Making of Mind, p. 182.

40. Karmiloff-Smith, pp.36-39. I will not comment on the degree to which linguistic domains are native to the human infant except to say that, if they exist, they are relatively simple. Cognitive Linguistics suggests that word-order and other aspects of grammar are less innate than based on relational schemas derived from the child's physical experience of the world. See Ronald Langacker, Concept, Image, and Symbol (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990), pp.35-37; 55-57; with examples, 37-55

41. Lev Vygotsky, "The Genesis of Higher Mental Functions," in The concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology, ed. J.V. Wertsch (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E.Sharpe, 1981), p. 163, cited in James V. Wertsch, Voices of the Mind (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1991), p. 26.

42. Lev Vygotsky, Thinking and Speech, p. 285.

43. reported in A.L. Luria, "Psychological Expedition to Central Asia," Science Vol. 74, No. 1920 (1931), pp. 383-384; discussed by Luria in A.L. Luria, The Making of Mind (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979), pp.58-80; note especially the summary, p. 80.

44. See for example Barbara Rogoff, (Girl Scout Study).

45. This is a short summary of Ronald Langacker's description of Cognitive Linguistics in Ronald W. Langacker, Concept, Image, and Symbol (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990), pp.1-2. In addition to Whorf, Sapir and the Pragmatists, whom Lakoff, Turner, and other Cognitive lingusts have acknowledged as precursors of their work, there are other theorists who have developed similar ideas. Among them are the "Cassirer" school (if I may term them so) of Ernst Cassirer and Suzanne Langer; and a number of anthropologists, such as Dan Sperber and Victor Turner. Turner summarizes much of this work in the first chapter of Dramas, Fields and Metaphors (London: Cornell University Press, 1974)

46. My terms are drawn from the October 1991 master metaphor list of the University of California at Berkeley Cognitive Linguistics Group, compiled by George Lakoff, Jane Espenson, and Alan Schwartz.

47. This is, of course, a short summary of Wittgenstein's critique of Positivism, and in particular of the questions he poses in On Certainty (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

48. For many examples of this sort of thing, see Kornei Chukovsky, From Two to Five tr. Frances Clark Sayers (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963)

49. Ronald W. Langacker, Concept, Image, and Symbol (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990), p. 35.

50. Langacker, 33-57.

51. Langacker, p. 62.

52. Langacker, p. 315.

53. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Anchor Books, 1967), pp.69; 173-174 offer an elaboration of how theories of identity are built into the social order.

54. Vygotsky, Thinking and Speech, p. 272.

55. Samuel Johnson anticipated Austin in his comment that, while he might conclude his letters with the phrase, "your obedient servant," he certainly had no intention of becoming the servant of his correspondent. Social custom required the phrase as an indicator of polite respect within the schema of letter-writing.

56. Vygotsky, Thinking and Speech, pp. 268-271 provides several examples to which I refer the reader.

57. For an explanation, see Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, Relevance: Communication and Cognition (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1988), pp. 32-36.

58. Sergei Eisenstein, The Film Sense (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974 [1947]), pp. 4-7.

59. Sergei Eisenstein, The Film Sense (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974 [1947]), p. 5.

60. Eisenstein, pp. 31-32.

61. Jerome Bruner, "Folk Psychology as an Instrument of Culture," in Acts of Meaning (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 50-51.

62. Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, "Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So," in K. Knoor-Cetina and A.V. Cicourel, Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-sociologies (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), pp.284-285.

63. Callon and Latour, p. 286.

64. Karl Levitin, "The Best Path To Man", Soviet Psychology Vol.18, No.1, p. 14.

65. See Karl Leviton, "The Best Path to Man," Soviet Psychology Vol. 18, No. 1 (1979), p. 14.

66. Callon and Latour, p. 288.

67. Imbrication may be an indication of truth, Nelson Goodman argues in Of Mind and Other Matters p. 37, cited in Jerome Bruner, Actual Minds, Possible Worlds (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), p. 98: "we must obviously look for truth not in the relation of a version to something outside it that it refers to, but in the characteristics of the version itself and its relationship to other versions." However, it seems to me that one could as easily imagine a theory that was internally consistent, and coordinated with other theories of the world, and yet was false.

68. Bruner, Acts of Meaning, p. 51.

69. See, for example, Ludwig Wittgenstein, On Certainty, p. 79e-82e, aphorisms 599-620. The whole book discusses this issue, of course, but these seem to me in some ways to state the matter most clearly.

70. This makes the oppressive rationalized bureaucracy that Max Weber feared, and George Orwell wrote about, unlikely to come about; huge bureaucracies, by virtue of their nature as complex adaptive systems, are not subject to one rationalizing will. To the extent that it is there at all, it is emergent from the system.

71. Even in a totalitarian state, absolute control over minds (as Orwell indicates by showing that it requires the strong version of Whorf-Sapir) is impossible. As we have seen in this century, almost absolute control obviously is possible, as Arendt (1966) shows us. Various authors argue a weaker version of this. However, the Weberian horror story would seem to be impossible.

72. Morse Peckham, p. 59.

73. Cognitive linguistics suggests that the ideal of a purely rational understanding of the universe is in any event impossible, as the very words through which reason takes place operate as expressions of predicate schemas.

74. John Dewey discusses just this issue in The Public and Its Problems (Chicago: Gateway Books, 1946 [1927]), pp. 157-158.

75. Joseph Russo, "How, and What, Does Homer Communicate? The Medium and Message of Homeric Verse," in Eric A. Havelock and Jackson P. Hershbell, Communication Arts in the Ancient World (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 45.

76. China and Japan might seem in some ways exceptions to this, but in this case each has a collection of canon-narratives which embody a certain attitude toward the world. In China, for example, governments may change in accordance with the "mandate of heaven," but there is a historical continuity of family, and of ongoing community relationships. In "The Foolish Old Man and the Mountain", an old man, irritated by the mountain outside his window, begins moving it a spoonful at a time. The man's neighbors mock his folly. He rebukes them, saying: true, the mountain will not be moved in my lifetime. But my sons, and my son's sons, and their sons, shall each continue the task. And in the end, the mountain shall be moved.

77. Jerome Bruner, "The Narrative Construction of Reality," Critical Inquiry 18 (Autumn 1991), p. 13.

78. Jerome Bruner, Actual Minds, Possible Worlds, p. 26.

79. J. Peder Zane, "What Would Andy Do? Griffith Show a `Moral Compass," San Francisco Chronicle (Dec. 10, 1991), B3.

80. J. Peder Zane, B5

81. Wartofsky, p. 209.

82. Morse Peckham, Man's Rage For Chaos p. 263, argues that all the arts tend to be regulated through verbal description prior to their realization: "Further, a great many orientations, most of them in fact, are signified verbally in hypostatized metaphysical or middle statements.... The translation of such

middle statements into assumptive, hypothetical (in the Bruner sense) or orientative statements can then be applied to the artist's non-functional stylistic decision-making behavior."

83. Wartofsky, p. 208. Victor Turner, in Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors (London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1974), p. 15, seems to be describing the same process in the following passage:

> In the evolution of man's symbolic "cultural" action, we must seek those processes which correspond to open-endedness in biological evolution. I think we have found them in those liminal, or "liminoid (postindustrial-revolution), forms of symbolic action, those *genres of free-time activity, in which all previous standards and models are subjected to criticism, and fresh new ways of describing and interpreting sociocultural experience are formulated.* (my italics)

84. Lev Vygotsky, Mind In Society pp.103-104.

85. See Victor Turner, Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors, especially chapter one; Dan Sperber, Rethinking Symbolism (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974,) especially pp. 140-148.

86. Robert A. Nisbet, Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 6, quoted in Victor Turner, Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society (London: Cornell University Press, 1974), p. 28.

87. John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957 [1920]), p. 154.

88. Emile Durkheim, Elementary Forms of Religious Life, p. 475.

89. Northrop Frye, The Secular Scripture, p. 60.

90. John G. Nachbar, Focus on the Western (Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974) is a particularly good source for critical analysis of the genre. For those who would point out that Christ, not Moses, is the key narrative figure of the Western, I would borrow from the Medaeval exegesists and say that they are the same figure (in their narrative function), and that it is easier to invoke the slightly less sacred (for Christians) story of Moses as a model than it is to invoke Christ. Each frees a people in bondage (to Egypt, and to the Fallen World,

respectively) and leads them to the Promised land. To model a hero as Christ is to turn that hero into, say, a Joseph Smith rather than Sandy or Travis of John Ford's Wagonmaster. A Christ figure can do no wrong. A Moses figure can be flawed--indeed should be--and the same deed that brings the people to the promised land should also be the deed that redeems the hero, as in The Tin Star, or Shane, or Bend in the River. The Western avenger of, for example, Clint Eastwood's High Plains Drifter may be seen either as the avenging Christ of revelations or the avenging Moses who calls down judgment on the apostates of the Golden Calf. But the key elements of most Western plots are the sense of a journey to a Promised Land, which the hero cannot enter. This is more consonant with the Moses narrative.

91. This idea suffuses Frye's work. A good survey might be found in the "The Word and World of Men" in The Secular Scripture, and of course this is the subject of The Great Code.

92. See Joseph Gaer and Ben Siegel, The Puritan Heritage. America's Roots in the Bible (New York: Mentor Books, 1964), p. 26.

93. Increase Mather, cited in Thomas Wentworth Higginson, "The Hundred Years' War", Harper's New Monthly Magazine No. 396, Vol. 67 (June 1883), p. 21 Cotton Mather, in the same article, is quoted as describing Satan as the "old landlord" of the American Wilderness (p. 22); cf. Henry B. Carrington, Beacon Lights of Patriotism (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 [1894]), which is a late example of this tradition. Note, eg, the Ten Commandments as "The First Constitution," p. 24. See also the Pre-Western background from Kathryn C. Esselman, "From Camelot to Monument Valley: Dramatic Origins of the Western Film"; Richard W. Etulain, "Cultural Origins of the Western", in John Nachbar (ed.), Focus on the Western (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974) As to Arthurian legend's relevance to the Western, note Frye, Secular Scripture p. 58: "The symbolic spread of a romance tends to go into its literary context, to other romances that are most like it in the conventions adopted."

94. The Western is a "possible world", in Bruner's sense. It is an imaginary world in which "Events-That-Might-Have-Happened" in accordance with a cognitive model of the actual American West are enacted. The Western is also an example of what Fauconnier defines as a "mental space," a conceptual field of thought shaped by such cognitive models as "The United States is Israel" (Lakoff, Women, Fire and Dangerous Things, pp. 281-282).

95. For a discussion of this, see Vygotsky, Thought and Language, pp. 128-145; 169-171; 194-208. Vygotsky concentrates on preconceptual thought in

children, but the same principle at work in social group cognition is discussed in Victor Turner, Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), pp. 25-47. The Cognitive Linguistic school also makes the same claim.

96. Lev Vygotsky, Thought and Language (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986), p. 141.

97. See Vygotsky, Thought and Language, pp. 228; Vygotsky, "Tool and Symbol in Child Development", Mind In Society eds. Cole, et al (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 24-27. Such identity-genres are hardly unique to the Western. Even minor genres, such as the Baseball film, can be extraordinarily predicate-rich. A film like The Natural (1984), for example, is not just a story, but rather an embodiment of concepts. It invokes (and reinforces) certain socialized conceptual systems, such as knowledge of the life of Christ, Arthurian legend, baseball, the 1919 Chicago Black Sox scandal, Babe Ruth, Film Noir, the danger of athletes engaging in sex prior to sports activity, and many other elements of religion, history and folk wisdom peculiar to Western culture in general, and the United States in particular. Certain fundamental themes--the Christian mythological superstructure, the young judging the old, and the opposition of corrupt city to pure country (and their iconic emblems, the dark and dingy office of the judge, as opposed to the bright, green and open ballfield of Hobbs) can be found across narrative genres of the United States. There are relatively few formal studies of typical features of U.S. narratives. Perhaps the best is Martha Wolfenstein & Nathan Leites, Movies: A Psychological Study (Glencoe, Il.: The Free Press, 1950).

98. The danger of this has been precisely the concern of communication analysts ever since the full influence of propaganda on people's thinking during World War One was realized. See Walter Lippmann, "The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Heads," Public Opinion (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 3-20. I would approach this problem from a different direction; where Lippmann has faith in "experts" to determine what should be considered true or false, I do not. In the Vygotskian sense, a "pseudoconcept" is a theory about the world that contradicts with that of society at large. In judging the concepts of societies, one does not have such a clear referent of authority. Objectively, all societies literally are guided by "pseudo" concepts, just as all science is pseudoconceptual, because we cannot "know" truth absolutely. But some ideas or notions about society and the world are closer to truth than others, or do not violate key elements of reality that make even clearly false narratives successful. We can determine this both quantitatively, by results, and also

qualitatively, by the quality of and respect for life that results from following a narrative paradigm.

In practice, it is a rare society that is so dominated by a guiding paradigm that it is clearly self-destructive both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is pseudoconceptual for example to regard Native-Americans as "people of the devil," chosen by God to be displaced, as City on a Hill in many of its versions implied. Nevertheless the material forces of population and technology allowed the European settlers to succeed; and indeed, as the amount of Native culture which the European settlers appropriated implies, a considerable amount of European settlers did not invariably guide their behavior by this theory. People confronted with a material reality in which Native culture was invaluable could not maintain such a clearly irrational idea. In the latter half of the 19th century, when European culture had established itself more fully on the continent, it became easier to treat Native culture symbolically again.

But proportionate to the extent that a society governs its behavior through symbolic interactions detached by several mediations from reality, and for this Leviathan epic identity to increase its power and scope in everyday life, it becomes easier for a society to become "irrational." To the degree to which almost all of our activity today is mediated within Leviathan systems augmented by modern communication technology, as Lippmann notes, there are real dangers. While this increases the power of human activity, it also increases the danger of pseudoconceptual narratives. General populations, lacking extensive critical training, are more likely than scientists to believe a questionable "hypothesis" and act on it prior to testing it and generally accepted facts in their mind against other conceptual systems of knowledge, particularly if the problem it explains or resolves seems to be urgent. Nazi Germany is the extreme case of , but there are any number of non-epic, lesser examples. Orson Welles' famous 1938 War of the Worlds broadcast is an example of how a metaphoric narrative which is consonant with the fears and concerns of a period can suddenly crystalize a mass of data into belief and action. David Phillips has shown that a remarkable number of mass-mediated events, from prize fights to accidental suicides, seem to provide preconceptual models which catalyze behavior. David P. Phillips, "Suicide, Motor Vehicle Fatalities, and the Mass Media: Evidence Toward a Theory of Suggestion," American Journal of Sociology Vol. 84, No. 5 (1979), pp. 1150-1174; David P. Phillips and John E. Hensley, "When Violence is Rewarded or Punished: The Impact of Mass Media Stories on Homicide," Journal of Communication (Summer 1984), pp. 101-116.

99. Barbara Hinckley, The Symbolic Presidency (New York: Routledge, 1990)

100. See Eric Havalock, Preface to Plato (1962)

101. I am drawing here from the definitions of metaphor and metonymy developed by Cognitive linguistics, and in particular George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Metaphors We Live By (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980), George Lakoff and Mark Turner, More than Cool Reason (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989), and "Cognitive Semantics", pp. 280-289, in George Lakoff, Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

102. Michael Rogin in Ronald Reagan: The Movie discusses some of these films. I will note here in passing that the Romulens of Star Trek are also an allegory, a cognitive domain blend of Sparta (to the Federation's Athens) and Rome (to the Federation's Christians). They have, in contrast to the more simplistic Klingons, positive traits of duty, strength and honor, yet these positive traits are employed to materialist, amoral ends. This topic will be taken up in more detail in my discussion of post-Roman narratives in the final chapter.

103. Among several sources for a more detailed analysis are: Sacvan Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (Madison: University of Wisconson Press, 1978); James Oliver Robertson, American Myth, American Reality (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980); Edward McNall Burns, The American Idea of Mission (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1957)--which is, more than most histories, also a primary text of purposefully constructed narrative identity.

104. I am leaving out the Civil War, of course; but that was, I would argue, more a conflict of interpretation over the meaning of slavery in that identity rather than a disagreement over whether or not the United States was a chosen nation. In fact, both sides understood themselves as the true heir to the "chosen nation" identity, and the other side as a morally fallen nation.

105. Lloyd Gardner, Imperial America: American Foreign Policy Since 1898 (San Francisco: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976), pp. 16-22, describes the situation briefly.

106. Even in Roosevelt's seizure of Panama from Columbia, perhaps the United States' most imperial act, Roosevelt justified it in terms both of interest and the self-determination of Panamanians. The verbal justifications Roosevelt felt required to use in his intervention in the 1906 Cuban revolution are instructive. He argued that if the U.S. did not intervene, European powers would; and that, unlike the European powers, the United States "...wishes nothing of the Cubans save that they shall be able to preserve order among themselves and therefore to preserve their independence." See John Morton Bloom, The Republican Roosevelt (New York: Athenium, 1972), p. 129.

Gardner, pp. 31-82, documents more fully this interesting period of self-determination rhetoric and more or less covert sphere-of-power behavior of Roosevelt, Taft, and, to a lesser extent, Wilson.

107. Wilson's "tryout" in the role of "Democracy-Prophet" is discussed in Gardner, pp. 63-74

108. Gardner, pp. 82-89 briefly presents some of the economic and social pressures under which this idea developed.

109. The degree to which Exodus may be said to be a canonic narrative of the United States may be gauged by Henry B. Carrington, Beacon Lights of Patriotism (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 [1894]). Carrington says his book is to provide "incentives to virtue and good citizenship" for "Young America" (p. 3). He begins it by describing the Hebrew's arrival in Egypt, and their deliverance to the Promised Land. The Ten Commandments are listed under the title "The First Constitution" (p. 24).

110. John Maynard Keynes, after observing Wilson firsthand at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, made a number of interesting observations of the President, including the following: "The President waw like a Nonconformist minister, perhaps a Presbyterian. His thought and his temperament were essentially theologicaal not intellectual, with all the strength and the weakness of that manner of thought, feeling and expression." John Maynard Keynes, The Economic Consequences of the Peace (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1920), p. 42, cited in Francis Farmer (ed.), The Wilson Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956), p. 248.

111. Woodrow Wilson, Address at Pueblo, Colorado, September 25, 1919, quoted in Francis Farmer (ed.), The Wilson Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956), p. 222.

112. Others besides Wilson were casting the United States as the instrument of Divine Will. D.W. Griffith's Hearts of the World (1918) ends its war with the appearance of Christ and the Heavenly Host--a pretension Wilson himself never claimed, although Clemenceau ascribed it to him.

113. Gardner, pp. 94-97, again provides a good brief statement of all of this.

114. see May, pp.84-85

115. For example, Cecil B. DeMille's 1923 The Ten Commandments has as its context not the competition between true and false religion around the globe, but rather the inevitable justice of God, which will come, even when long delayed, and the stern punishment to be given to those who knowingly flout the divine law. The modern narrative of the "good" and "bad" brothers in the film has no reference to international affairs at all, except for its invocation of "Yellow Peril" racism in the figure of the "bad" brother's mistress, whose venereal disease literally "pollutes" him. The "bad" brother, who insists on breaking all of the Ten Commandments, suffers implosion of his existing personal world rather than the destruction of his society. Just as the church he has built out of weak materials collapses on his own mother, so his own body falls apart as a result of his "alien" desires.

116. Rome was different, however. Roosevelt's critics seem to have employed comparisons between Roosevelt and the Emperor Augustus several times, including in films. I will turn to this below.

117. It is hardly an accident that Daryl Zanuck's Wilson (1944) was made toward the end of the war, or that individual heroes gave way to collective heroism in war movies. See Brian Neve, Film and Politics in America (New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 77-78; pp.81-82.

118. A good treatment of this is to be found in Stephen E. Ambrose, Rise To Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), pp. 67-72; 98-111

119. James Oliver Robertson, American Myth, American Reality (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980), p. 337.

120. "Politics in general [in the U.S.S.R.] is seen as a life and death struggle between irreconcilable forces--an outlook aptly summed up in Lenin's favorite maxim, the not precisely translatable Russian expression `Kto Kogo?' (Who whom? or Who wins?). While Lenin observed limits in his vendettas against those who opposed him within the party, Stalin carried the doctrine into literal practice not only against outside enemies but against opponents, real and imagined, inside the party." Carl A. Linden, Khrushchev and the Soviet Leadership: With an Epilogue on Gorbachev (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), pp. 11-12.

121. Namely, the 1919 Archangel expedition staged against the Soviet Union by Britain, France and the United States.

122. Recollections of Elliot Roosevelt, in Helene Keyssar and Vladimir Pozner, Remembering War: A U.S.-Soviet Dialogue (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990), p. 229.

123. At least for soldiers, this was another "war to end wars," if the famous oath American and Soviet soldiers took at the Elbe represents a general sentiment: "We raised a toast to victory and to never having another war, and we swore that neither we nor our children nor our grandchildren would ever know war again." --William Beswick, cited in Keyssar and Pozner, pp. 206-207. In the United States, this was not automatically the case. Eliot Janeway, in "The Midwest's Mood: Part One," Life V. 15, No. 11 (Sept. 13, 1943) specifically states that the Midwest did not expect a postwar world made "safe for democracy." However, even in the former center of isolationism, the expectation was that the United States would and should become involved in some form of international world-governing organization. The issue was not one of whether such an organization should be formed, but rather how powerful it should be, and whether the Republicans would nominate someone who would be as strong or stronger than Roosevelt as an advocate for the interests of the United States within such a body. (p.12)

124. Eric F. Goldman, The Crucial Decade and After: America 1945-1960 (New York: Vintage, 1960).

125. Eric F. Goldman, The Crucial Decade--And After: America, 1945-1960 (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 77-78. Truman and his government, as the British ambassador commented at the time, seem to have themselves been much more guided by the "One World" ideal than revisionist historians have credited them for. See footnote

126. Stalin actually distrusted Mao, and had little interest in the Red Army's success. Indeed, he even communicated with Chiang regarding a possible alliance against Japan, should it become a military power again. See Ambrose, p. 81; Gardner, p. 194

127. Truman, quoted in David Halberstam, The Fifties (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1994), p. 69.

128. See Goldman, p. 78.

129. Dean Acheson, "Speech for the North Atlantic Treaty", in Richard Hofstadter (ed.), Great Issues In American Hostory Vol 2 (New York: Vintage Books, 1958), pp. 428-429.

130. Sidney Hertzberg, "The Crisis in U.S. Foreign Policy" Commentary Vol. 17, No. 6 (June 1954), p. 524, p. 532, is the source of this argument, but it was made by several others. Commonly, this argument was made using implicit or explicit metaphorical comparisons of the U.S. to Athens and to Rome. See "Hope and History," Saturday Review 36: 24-25 (July 4, 1953); Gilbert Murray, "'Liberal' Civilization Wrecked by War," The New Republic 130: 17-18 (March 8, 1954); "The Suspicious State," The Saturday Review 35: 22-23 (Aug. 23, 1952)

131. Note, for example Claudette Colbert's careless upper-class pilot-fiance, and the bus driver who doesn't pay attention to the road in It Happened One Night (1934). Dance, Fools, Dance (1931) manages to blame both the depression and gangsters on idle socialites.

132. Cited in Neil Gabler, An Empire of their Own (New York: Crown, 1988), p. 354. His excellent discussion of the conflation of anti-unionism, anti-semitism, and anti-New Dealism from pp. 344-386, informs my understanding of the period.

133. see Gabler, pp. 355-360.

134. Robertson, p. 334.

135. See Vivian Gornick, The Romance of American Communism (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 99-101; p. 127. Unionism and communism became intermingled because the Communist party provided a supporting institution--a leviathan--within which unionism was valorized.

136. "Eh, Brothers?", Time Vol. 52, No. 1 (July 5, 1948), p. 28. This specific quote is from an article on a dockworker's strike in England, but similar, if more subtle, language can be found in reference to "Red-liner" Harry Bridges and a West-coast Dockworker's strike, "Long Siege?", Time Vol. 52, No. 11 (September 13, 1948), p. 24.

137. Robert C. Stanley, International Nickel Company, Inc., "What Industry Vitally Needs!", Newsweek (June 2, 1947), p. 12.

138. In its cover-story article on Eugene Dennis, U.S. General Secretary of the Communist Party, "The Little Commissar", Time Vol. 53, No. 17 (April 25, 1949), p. 24, Time alleges that Dennis controlled labor unions, and caused a strike during the Hitler-Stalin pact in order to sabotage U.S. war material production on orders from Moscow.

139. See Daniel Bell, "Interpretations of American Politics," in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right 2nd. Ed. (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1964), pp. 65-69.

140. Leslie Fiedler, "McCarthy and the Intellectuals", in An End to Innocence: Essays on Culture and Politics (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 66.

141. See John Stormer, None Dare Call It Treason (Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964), pp. 209-217 for details.

142. James Gilbert, Another Chance: Postwar America 1945-1968 (New York: Knopf, 1981), p. 97-98

143. The Truman administration point of view regarding this is, I think, represented reasonably well in Cabell Phillips, The Truman Presidency (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1966), pp. 351-377. These fears were no doubt augmented by the fact, as McCarthy reported(!), that government officials did indeed knowingly hire Communist party members for government positions--indeed, even sought them out for their organizational skills. See Vivian Gornick, The Romance of American Communism (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 118.

144. Phillips, The Truman Presidency, p. 360.

145. See, for details, Alexander Saxton, The Rise and Fall of the White Republic (New York: Verso, 1990). For continuities between earlier use of racism in politics and the Cold War period, see Seymour M. Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right", in The Radical Right (New York: Anchor Books, 1964), pp. 307-371.

146. Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, 1919, quoted in Rogin, p. 238-239.

147. "The Little Commissar", Time Vol. 53, No. 17 (April 25, 1949), p. 25.

148. Howard Fast, Being Red (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), p. 231

149. Fast, Being Red p. 234.

150. Fiedler, p. 57. For more detail of this, see Seymour Lipset, "Three Decades of the Radical Right: Coughlinites, McCarthyites, and Birchers", in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right.

151. Robert Justin Goldstein, Political Repression in Modern America (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), p. 328-29, cited in Michael Rogin, Ronald Reagan, the Movie (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1987), p. 239.

152. John Cogley, Report on Blacklisting (New York: Fund for the Republic, 1956), p. 3.

153. Fiedler, pp.57-59; Seymour M. Lipset, "The Sources of the Radical Right", in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right (New York: Anchor Books, 1964), pp. 361-362. My argument here is drawn from pp. 361-365.

154. Congressional Record, February 20, 1950, p. 1954, cited in Seymour M. Lipset, "The Sources of the `Radical Right'", in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right, p. 361.

155. Fiedler, p. 65. John Cogley's Report on Blacklisting is a particularly good source for what sorts of activities followed from the language Fiedler analyzed. Cogley's two volumes detail both the lack of hard evidence for any trace of "subversion," and the hysteria whipped up by extreme anti-communists in politics, and by such publications as Counterattack and Red Channels. Seymour Lipset, in "The Sources of the `Radical Right'", cited above, provides a more comprehensive analysis of themes, particularly of McCarthy's scapegoating of the educated elite.

156. Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite", in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right (New York: Anchor Books, 1964), p. 166.

157. material quoted from Peter Viereck, "The Revolt Against the Elite", in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right, pp. 166-167.

158. Rogin, p. 239.

159. The best representation of this is of recent vintage, in the Charles Burns sequences of Raw Magazine during the 80's.

160. Rogin, 263-271, is my primary source for this material.

161. John Kenneth Galbraith, A Life in Our Times, quoted in Gary Wills, The Kennedy Imprisonment: A Meditation on Power.

162. Eric F. Goldman, The Crucial Decade, p. 235.

163. Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman, Prophets of Deceit (New York, 1949), cited in Richard Hofstadter, "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt", Daniel Bell 9ed.), The Radical Right (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1964), p. 85. On the term "liberal" for what we would consider today to be conservative, see Sidney Blumenthal, The Rise of the Counter-Establishment (New York: Perennial Library, 1988), p. 30.

164. T.W. Adorno, "How To Look at Television", Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television Vol. 8, No. 3 (Spring 1954), p. 216. I would recommend attention to Adorno's footnote 2 on p. 218; ironically, I think it is probable that Adorno himself was unable to "read" cinematic imagery. By 1965, Michael Harrington could write "The helpless, brainwashed people of the democracies are actually without the ability to make significant decisions, but they are so mesmerized [by Mass Culture] that they do not even notice the fact. In such a massified society, the countervailing capacity of the voluntary organizations has been either diminished or reduced to zero. With all of the paraphernalia of elections, discussion, and debate, a de facto totalitarian system has come into existence." (Michael Harrington, The Accidental Century [Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966], p.231.) As I am writing in the aftermath of the 1994 Rush Limbaugh/Pat Robinson mass media campaign, I find my assurance that Adorno, Harrington, and others had exaggerated fears somewhat shaken, but not broken.

165. Vivian Gornick, The Romance of American Communism (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 158-159

166. I would hasten to add that I do not mean to imply an absolute division of concern on the part of the left over the middle-class and on the right of children. Frederic Wertham, the author of the articles which started the comic-book scare in 1948, was particularly concerned about racist and fascist indoctrination of children via comic books. On the publication of Wertham's 1954 book, Seduction of the Innocent, C. Wright Mills, two years away from publishing The Power Elite, wrote Wertham to praise his efforts, and wished him "Good Luck: Hope you're read widely." Yet it is generally the case that social conservatives saw children and adolescents as the endangered group, and social liberals and radicals the transformation of the public into a mass society. See James Gilbert, Cycles of Outrage (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 92-108.

167. Senator Hendrickson, quoted in New York Times, 29 June 1954, p. 29, in James Gilbert, Cycle of Outrage (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986), p. 75.

168. Written by Ed Wood, Jr.--who seems to have had a talent for distilling various narrative ideas into their absurd extremes.

169. quotes drawn from George C. Marshall, "The Marshall Plan", in Richard Hofstadter, Great Issues in American History Vol. 2 (New York: Vintage, 1958), pp. 416-419.

170. President Eisenhower, Second Inaugural Address, Richard Hofstadler (ed.), Great Issues in American History Vol. 2 (New York: Vintage Books, 1958), p. 444.

171. cited in Burns, p. 10

172. Including Eisenhower's soon-to-be Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who helped to frame some of the debates which led to the United Nations.

173. Commonweal, Dec. 17 1954, pp. 301-302.

174. Cited in Edward McNall Burns, The American Idea of Mission: Concepts of National Purpose and Destiny (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1957) p. vii. Burns notes that "[w]hether so inclusive an indictment is justified may be open to question, but no one can deny the urgent need for more insight and understanding."

175. James Gilbert, Another Chance: Postwar America, 1945-1968 (New York: Knopf, 1981), p. 236.

176. Cited by Benjamin R. Barber, "The Compromised Republic: Public Purposelessness in America", in Robert H. Howard (ed.), The Moral Foundations of the American Republic 3rd ed. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986), p. 42.

This page has been left blank intentionally

CHAPTER TWO

> For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us....
>
> --John Winthrop
> Governor, Massachusetts Bay Colony[1]

THE BIBLE FILM

RELIGION AND IDENTITY

The search for a new interpretation of America began with religion. In order to understand why this was the case, I will provide a brief review of the role of religion in framing and structuring social and political issues in the United States. It is a truism that Protestant religious movements have profoundly shaped U.S. history. Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism argues that Protestant religious fervor created societies of self-denying aesthetics, but that the power of religion itself to reconstruct the social order has ended. However, Protestantism is not an incident in time, but rather a leviathan system, such as I have discussed above; it embodies not just the values of a particular time, but rather a narrative pattern of thought through which understanding of the times have been shaped and interpreted. Furthermore--and this is a point I would particularly stress--it is not a monolithic system, but rather one with a dynamic interplay of interpretive themes. Thus it is incorrect (as Weber suggests) to say that charismatic change is confined to the beginning of social construction. The role of Christian movements and political alignments in the United States is an example of this in practice; religious

declines have been followed with regular revivals, through which cultural conflicts are expressed.

Religious beliefs provided a mythology of identity for the American British colonies. In turn, these colonies served as the subject of a mythology of identity for the United States, whose institutional force continues to serve as the framework for religious and political movements. The Puritans believed themselves to be a new chosen people, given a new promised land. As Joseph Gair and Ben Siegel note in The Puritan Heritage,

> [T]he Puritans easily discovered numerous similarities between themselves and the Israelis. They...viewed England as their Egypt, James I as their Pharaoh, the Atlantic as their Red Sea. They were also an embattled people obviously chosen to carry out divine plans for the world's redemption. They too had been driven from their homes, not as punishment, but to build a promised land. The only significant difference they could see between ancient Israel and themselves was that they were expected to convert the very wilderness to a promised land.[2]

As Christopher Hill has shown in the case of the Puritan revolution in England, Puritanism was comprised of contradictory elements: an elitism of the divinely elected (predestined or otherwise), with strict hierarchy; and an egalitarianism of mystical unity between the individual and God. Given these contending ideals of regulated order and individual conscience, it is hardly surprising that even in small, closely-knit communities, conflict would arise.

I will concentrate my focus on the Massachusetts Commonwealth, which was perhaps the most influential colony of this period. The colonies perhaps began, in the words of Governor John Winthrop,[3] "knit together in this work as

one man," but as early as 1644, the Massachusetts authorities felt sufficiently threatened by those who questioned the sanctity of baptizing infants as Christians to pass an anti-Baptist law. In 1648 the clerical authorities joined together in a series of synods and passed the Cambridge Platform, which proclaimed it an "ordinance of God" for each church to submit to the authority of the university-educated clerics in synod, in spite of objections from some in the laity that these sort of laws amounted to a crypto-presbyterian infringement on congregational liberty.[4] The Massachusetts commonwealth outlawed lay preachers in 1653, yet laity continued to insist on freedom of conscience in religious matters, as a natural law. As a Baptist group put it, it was fundamental that the spirit of God is not "locked up within the narrow limits of Colledge-Learning."[5] Out of frustration, the Massachusetts General Court passed a series of progressively more severe measures against Quakers, who clearly were outside the boundary of orthodoxy, culminating in the death penalty in 1658--a measure so extreme, that the public forced its repeal in 1661. In 1679, several Puritan leaders in synod complained of a decline in godliness, a rise of such abominable antinominian heresies as Anabaptism and Quakerism, and an increase in pride among inferiors toward their betters in the Protestant religious hierarchy, particularly among those inferiors who were becoming wealthy.[6]

Wealth and the levelling influence of cheap land, which encouraged individualism over social collectivism and brought new settlers, was a problem for the Puritan hierarchy. The first settlements were conceived of as unworldly,

utopian communities, marked by mutual concord, submission to the will of God, and to His manifest saints on earth. Within a decade, this unity began to collapse. Many new colonists were not particularly religiously inclined, and rebelled against efforts to enforce conformity. In other cases, Anglicans came to predominate in the formerly strict Congregationalist colonies. Some individuals from the beginning also threatened the de facto theocracy of the commonwealth by stubborn adherence to their own interpretations of the Bible. Notably, Roger Williams fled Massachusetts and founded the Baptist Rhode Island colony. In the light of such failures, and as the utopian communities became urban, the charismatic clergy who had led communities began to rely on bureaucratic procedures and the authority of scholarship to ensure orthodoxy of faith, and hegemony of the Elect.[7] But as commerce and trade flourished, social class barriers deepened and the clerical hegemony over communities and colonies declined. The implicit anti-communitarianism and levelling skepticism toward religious authority inherent in Protestantism served as a vehicle to express the shift of power and interest from the upper social class to the more secular (or deviantly religious). Religion became less a unifying factor in these communities than it was the field on which social conflict was enacted.

Just prior to the "Great Awakening" religious revival, circa 1725-1765, perhaps as few as 4% of the colonials were regular churchgoers, and church attendance itself had become a performative signifier of the "better sort" of people as much as it was an expression of religious faith.[8] However, on the

frontiers where populations were too dispersed to support organized formal institutions, there was considerable informal religious activity.[9] Many of the religions the Congregationalist and Anglican urban elite despised--the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, the German Pietist Mennonites and the Quakers, the Anabaptist German "Dunkers," the Catholics--were to be found on the frontiers to the West and South. Far more common were the "disordered" Congregationalist and Non-conformist groups who defied synodic regulation. Such groups fled to the wilderness, or asserted their collective will in the urban centers and forced an uneasy tolerance of religions; Boston received its first Baptist church in 1665, and Plymouth Colony began to tolerate Quakers in the next decade. In 1681 William Penn's new Pennsylvania colony joined Roger Williams' Rhode Island in offering complete freedom of worship, and within twenty years became the third largest colony.[10]

This flight from structure and from ideological consensus changed the nature of colonial life. As Weber points out--and certainly this is true by any quantifiable measure--the religious communities were secularized by the early 1700's. Nevertheless, an informal religious identity underpinned colonial society, and religious issues occupied public attention. Indeed, heresy was punishable not only in Puritan states like Massachusetts, but also in relatively cosmopolitan colonies like Virginia.[11] Following one's own conscience in regard to religion was acceptable, professing none was not. The nature of the Chosen People myth made conflict almost inevitable between sects in spite of

their tolerant surface, and the social and economic pressures in the colonies provided the energy to drive this conflict into the open. The Great Awakening which followed this period of secularization was so widespread because it canalized pre-existing religious attitudes, even among those Weber notes were secularized.

The first Great Awakening began as a protest against secularism--but in effect, the secularism of tolerance for laxity and deviance. Presbyterian circuit preachers began the movement, lamenting the materialist influence of the new cities, and the pervasive influence of deviltry everywhere. Some of the urban Dutch Reformed, the Congregationalist Calvinist and the Anglican leaders responded, decrying the heretical sects beguiling the lower classes, and the Awakening movement began to sweep the colonies. Both groups were stimulated to increase their parishioners' sense of identity with ther group out of fear of the antihierarchical heretic religious faiths new emigrants brought to the colonies: "Antinominianist" Quakerism and Mennonitism, which held that the Bible was one of many paths to divinity, and that salvation was offered to all who believed in God and lived a reverent life; the German and English Baptists, who opposed clerical authority and the sanctity of infant baptism; and the "Arminianist" Anglican heresy of Methodism, which denied the doctrine of predestination, and advocated moral growth toward sanctification. Both feared the effect these infernal plots were having on the chosen people--whichever they were--of the new promised land.

The new faiths also had their evangelicals--notably the Methodist George Whitefield, whose abilities as a speaker the actor David Garrick greatly admired.[12] Under Whitefield's influence at a revival, Benjamin Franklin himself, Weber's model of the secularized Protestant, emptied all the pennies he had saved in his pocket--and even his shillings and pounds--into a collection plate for fear of his soul.[13]

After 1740, however, the willingness of the laity to follow their religious leaders in their crusades against worldliness and heresy began to burn out. People became sick of revivalism and religious hegemonic politics over what form society should take. The competing versions of religious truth during the Awakening created a situation of institutional instability which caused a weakening of all religious ideological and hierarchical forces, and an unleashing of radical Puritan individualism. Drawing from the Enlightenment, the movement "turned away from the religion of the pulpit and the Seminary to the religion of inspiration and the open fields," as Henry Steele Commager put it.[14] Many Churches' memberships broke apart, particularly those founded on premillennialist themes of predestination. Many others, as was often the case with the Anglican Churches, became more amenable to local control, and increased their tolerance of dissenters. The Awakening continued, but it did so through "new light" religions like Methodism, which emphasized the redemption of the individual through a freely-chosen covenant with God, and Unitarianism, which rejected synodic authority, and emphasized tolerance of a divergence of

opinion on religious matters. These were compelling in part because they were consonant with the more individualistic, skeptical approach to religion the Awakening had fostered, and in part because they expressed the new, less constrained and hierarchical social relations that were developing in the American colonies. More fundamentally, by destroying the traditional religious communities through constant skirmishing, the Awakening facilitated the development of natural law, rather than revealed truth and institutional tradition, as a guide for understanding and behavior. The community of the church became secondary to the human community, founded on natural rights of individuals.

After the Stamp Act of 1765, the religious discussions of rational covenants and liberty of conscience became part of the ideology of resistance to Britain, especially as it meshed well with Locke's conception of social contract--itself a product of the English Puritan revolution. Religious fervor became absorbed into political fervor, to such an extent that it seemed to disappear, or at least became hard to distinguish from the political crisis. Excessively hierarchical clergy were suspected of Tory sympathies.[15] While many of the leaders were deists (like Jefferson and Washington), the popular consensus was that the Colonies, and later the Republic, succeeded in overthrowing British rule as a result of a national Old Testament covenant with God.[16] But the hierarchical religious conflicts had changed the attitude of the public toward religion and the state. The state was organized to mediate

between interpretations of natural law by individuals and factions so as to diminish the secular power of religion. The Puritan idea of a divine covenant with a predestined few living in the City on a Hill was, by subordinating religious doctrine to state law, liberated so as to be unconfined to a particular city of the chosen; members of the several churches were united in, as Robert Bellah has called it, the civil religion.[17] The covenant was now a secularized religious ideal which defined a nation.[18]

Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, two products of the secular revolutionary period, lived to see and discuss the second "Great Awakening", circa 1810-1850. The remarkable timing of their deaths, both on July 4, 1826, were taken as a sign of particular divine favor toward the United States, and a proof of its "City on a Hill" mission; America and its constitution was, Ralph Waldo Emerson would say, "the hope of the world."[19] Yet the means by which the United States might continue to remain in favor were in doubt. Churches were in turmoil, particularly in New England, as the last state religions were being disestablished, and theologians argued over the role of the church in a heterogenous-faith Republic. Again, as in the years prior to the Revolution, the stress of new social, economic and political divisions between the frontier West and the mercantile East, the wealthy political elite and democracy, and the issue of free or slave labor, first found a medium of organization and articulation in the religious revivalism of the 1810's, 1820's and 1830's.

In contrast to the first decades after the revolution, the troubles facing the United States in the first decades of the 19th century could not all be blamed on Britain or other foreign powers. The old elites--the Jeffersonian farmers, and the Hamiltonian traders--were being displaced by a new class of bankers, manufacturers, and, in the West, land speculators--such as Andrew Jackson. Belief in a spiritual mission was becoming displaced by materialism. Ralph Waldo Emerson reflected the attitudes of the old classes to the new order of things when he noted with approval the "wholesome" destruction wrought on commerce by the financial panic of 1837: "This invasion of Nature by Trade with its Money, its Credit, its Steam, its Railroads threatens to upset the balance of man, and establish a universal monarchy more tyrannical than Babylon or Rome."[20] At the same time those who were adapting to the changes capitalism brought--the cash-crop farmers, lawyers, artisans and commercial men, predominantly evangelical Protestants--felt threatened by the expansion of slavery and the concomitant threat to free labor and social mobility that it implied.[21] After the Nullification Crisis brought on by South Carolina and Vice President John C. Calhoun in 1831-32, as well as a number of other incidents involving it, slavery (which many Quakers had attacked in the first Awakening) suggested itself to evangelicals in New England and the Midwest an embodiment of, if not an explanation for, all social ills.[22] The Federalist and Whig parties had been strongest in the Northeast. Most of the Northeast evangelicals had come from Federalist families, and while many anti-slavery

activists were Democrats, the majority were Whigs; many of these political conservatives now became emancipation leaders, often with a progressively more activist, and even radical approach to the slavery question.[23]

The Unitarian and secularized Transcendentalists who, like Emerson, deplored amoral materialism, also viewed slavery as an obstruction to progress toward the realization of human potential. In the aftermath of state church disestablishment and the spread of Unitarianism, education was becoming the consensus choice as a means for inculcating common values in society, and for furthering the advance of the American Mission.[24] Slavery stifled social mobility. It mandated ignorance for the slave, and far from improving themselves and society, the leisured master class, "debauched by idleness, were believed to vent their unbridled lusts in the gaming rooms, at the race tracks, in the taverns, and especially, late at night among the women in the slave quarters."[25] Transcendentalists of all parties saw slavery as regressive, an extreme case of the subjugation of the individual in society as a whole.[26] Thus the slavery issue, framed as a religious, moral, and economic threat to the City on a Hill and its world-mission, united both the old Federalist New Englanders and Democratic Transcendentalists, as well as most of the Protestant immigrant class.

As was the case during the Revolutionary war, the individualistic nature of salvation in Protestantism, directly and through such secularized versions as Transcendentalism, lent itself to radical action against the prevailing social

order. Just as hierarchical clergy before were suspected of being tory, now supporters of slavery were suspected of being insincere or heretical Christians. Speaking of the Fugitive Slave Law, one minister told his parishioners in 1851 that they were under holy "obligation" to defy the law, just as they were required by God "not to lie, steal and murder."[27] Harriet Beecher Stowe, daughter of one of the principal agents of the Second Awakening, Lyman Beecher, reflected this link of true faith with abolitionist behavior in her character Little Eva in Uncle Tom's Cabin, who, on her deathbed, urges her father to become a serious Christian and free his slaves.

The difference from the revolutionary period in these uses of religion as an expression of politics is that the civic social contract conflicted with religious doctrine.[28] As the social contract collapsed and the Civil War developed, the North distinguished the war as one of religious identity rather than civic identity. This can be traced in terms of rhetoric in Lincoln's speeches. Lincoln, though himself notoriously irregular in religion and characteristically pragmatic, increasingly framed the conflict as a religious trial--presumably more from his sense of the nation than from a belated conversion. The lawyerly appeals to reason of the House Divided speech and first inaugural address, and to economics in the November 1861 address to Congress, gradually became transformed to the acknowledgment of sin and necessity for redemption of the Fast Day and Thanksgiving Day proclamations; the Gettysburg Address; and the second inaugural address. The nation needed to "recognize the hand of

God in this terrible visitation," to acknowledge "the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people," and to undergo "a new birth of freedom."[29] It is perhaps not by accident that the Reconstruction congress was one of the most contentious and divisive on record; moral crusades (as Jefferson and Madison had recognized and feared) were not amenable to civil discourse. And though the war and early reconstruction was the apotheosis of the crusade mentality, it consolidated the trend of making sacred the founders' rational contract; Grover Cleveland, on the centennial of the Constitution, could speak of it as the "ark of the Covenant," to be shielded "from impious hands."[30]

Progressivism and Populism were coincident with a third great awakening, the "Social Gospel" movement circa 1880 to 1920. It emerged out of the stresses of industrialization, the high immigration catalyzed by the need for factory labor, and the challenges to doctrine of evolution and scientific advances. It rapidly came to dominate the mainline denominational churches' leadership, particularly in the cities, and most religious intellectual centers. Influenced by Transcendentalism and the German "Higher Criticism" Carlyle and Everett popularized of ancient biblical translations, the Social Gospel movement held that the effects of science, industrialization and urbanization were not inherently evils. They were rather opportunities to better understand God through the revelation of natural laws, and to use social changes as a catalyst to bring about God's Kingdom on earth. Its adherents advocated a "New Theology" that dismissed fixation on abstract matters of church procedure

and doctrine, and emphasized the importance of social transformation rather than just individual salvation of souls. Society had to be reordered in accordance to the "social laws of Jesus;" Christians had a responsibility to "render unselfish service" to the needy and to society as a whole in order to "extend the kingdom of God in the earth".[31]

The Calvinist doctrine of premillenialism held that the world was hopelessly corrupt and depraved beyond redemption, and that only through Armageddon and the Second Coming of Christ could it be purified. But the doctrine did not fit the progressive tenor of the 19th century, and the Higher Criticism theorists pointed out that it had no scriptural support in the synoptic gospels. Many Social Gospel adherents believed in a competing doctrine called "postmillennialism", which held that Christ would return to claim an established kingdom of the religious that would be accomplished by the power of God working in the faithful. Others were Amillennialists, and believed that the Kingdom of God came into being with Jesus' incarnation; the millennium was not an actual period of divine rule, but an ideal of the Christian community living in accordance to the new covenant, and in which the Second Coming is entirely symbolic.[32] Most Christians in the United States prior to the Civil War were informally postmillennial in their outlook--and indeed, this concept extended backward to colonial days. The United States was important to the rest of the world precisely because it, as an example to other nations, could lead to at least

a partial transformation of the world that Postmillennialists believed was necessary prior to the reign of Christ.[33]

The Social Gospel theologists took the existing concept of postmillenialism and extended its implicit logic to critique the behavior of Christians in society. Individuals had to transform themselves not just by faith, but also by efforts to try to create the world required for the Millennium to begin. Revivalists such as Theodore Munger and Josiah Strong drew from the Social Gospel to argue that modern capitalism defied the social teachings of Jesus, and capitalists needed to reintegrate spiritual goals with material ends; social injustice could not be tolerated until the Second Coming: "No matter how great wealth may be, luxury can find no excuse, either economic or scriptural, so long as the world is in want," Strong said.[34] In a Congregationalist pamphlet, Richard Ely attacked unscrupulous capitalists: "[T]he man who oppresses the hireling in his wages is no Christian, but a pagan, whatever may be his standing. What does God say of such a one? He says: `I will be a swift witness against those that oppress the hireling in his wages.'"[35] This moral assault on capitalism implicitly validated the classes displaced and alienated by social changes--the populist farmers, and the progressive professionals and non-industrial middle class--within the context of pre-existing religious doctrines, so it did not alienate traditionalists outright. Moreover, it made it possible to do mission work in the cities. It critiqued the abuses of capitalism on labor, and

provided a means through which Protestantism could be made relevant to workers in the new industrial order.[36]

This religious frame provided a common ideology of beliefs and goals through which such figures as Strong and Ely refocused the traditional churches' mission to address social change, and to maintain Protestant hegemony in the United States as well as (for many of them) to extend it abroad.[37] This conception shaped the public life and beliefs of such political figures as Woodrow Wilson. Following the lead of Josiah Strong, Wilson asserted in 1902 that the United States was "called' to shape the Philippines into a modern nation, and to lead other such nations to Christian civilization. "As we once served ourselves in the great day of our Declaration of Independence," Wilson said, we would now "serve mankind." In 1911, Wilson gave an address entitled "The Bible and Progress," in which he maintained that social reform was mandated by God. It inaugurated his run for the presidency, and remained one of his most reprinted speeches.[38] In Wilson's last public writing, "The Road Away From Revolution," on the Russian Revolution, Wilson noted "offenses against high morality and true citizenship" in capitalism, and concluded that "our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."[39] Such consistency suggests that John Maynard Keynes' observation that Wilson's "thought and temperament were essentially theological not intellectual" and rather resembled that of a Non-conformist minister, likely had a certain amount of truth to it.[40]

The Premillennialists generally followed the postmillennial Modernist lead in social reform, if reluctantly; how could a Saint be for social injustice? If there was a difference in tone, it was more one of emphasis on the purpose of reform activity. Over even so pugnacious a character as Theodore Roosevelt, conservative Progressive-Populism cast an otherworldly mantle:

> Roosevelt's power in the land is a spiritual power. His is not a kingdom of the earth.... It is immaterial whether or not the Supreme Court sustains him in his positions on the rate bill, the income tax, the license for corporations, or the inheritance tax; not for the establishment of a system of statutes was he born into this world; but rather like all great teachers, that by his life and works he should bear witness to the truth.[41]

A pragmatic Progressive, who (if religious) would likely see the passage of such measures as the furtherance of Truth in the world, certainly would think that these issues were material. Nonetheless, their common goals reflected the hegemonic influence of the Arminianist and Antinominian Social Gospel.[42]

But the Progressive-Populist movement had a doctrinal rift, based both on theology and social context. Religion in the former Confederate States in particular was used to create quite a different ideology of society in order to come to terms with quite different social contexts. Prior to the Civil War, the Southern churches were more characterized by the mixture of enlightenment values with religion than the Northern churches.[43] The Civil War split the Northern and Southern religious denominations, however, and as Kenneth Bailey commented in Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (1964), for several generations after the war, "success, wealth and riches have

been less of a hope and less a reality in the South than in the North."[44] If Horatio Alger's Puritan work-ethic novels characterize the postwar North, Ben Lucien Burman's novel Steamboat 'Round the Bend provides an image of this period in the South. Written during the depression,[45] it nostalgically celebrates a post-Reconstruction South of appalling poverty and insularity, that somehow just manages to keep itself going day by day. In such an environment, religion--particularly enthusiast evangelistic revivalism--became central to society. "Revivals flourished...because they fulfilled vital needs in Southern society. They brought hope to many who knew little of hope and release to many who knew little of release," and provided one of the few occasions of social intercourse in a predominantly rural society.[46]

The new Postmillennial Social Gospel movement's optimism did not fit the social context of the South, nor did the South share a faith in progress which allowed the Postmillennialists and Amillennialists to accommodate Darwinism, geology, and other scientific developments. While the North was rapidly changing, the South became more traditional in the aftermath of the war. Industrialization was primarily a Northern phenomenon. The millions of predominantly Catholic emigrants from Europe that began arriving at the turn of the century, whose cheap labor Northern factories required, were regarded with horror by the South and by conservatives in the North. Both feared the new immigrants as harbingers of social disintegration, or even a foreign take-over, as it became clear that the Protestant character of the North was becoming

transformed by its new population.[47] On the occasion of the Chicago Haymarket Riot in May 1886, for example, Northern evangelist Dwight L. Moody spoke for the conservative Protestant middle-class: "Either these people (immigrant workers) are to be evangelized or the leaven of communism and infidelity will assume such enormous proportions that it will break out in a reign of terror such as this country has never known."[48] On the other hand, articulation of these fears usually was expressed so obliquely that politically, the conservatives at times were able to take the leadership of Modernist reformism (under the common flag of trust-busting) and recast it in their image--most notably, in the transformation of the cautiously reformist Cleveland Democratic party of 1892 into the Populist-Democratic union for Bryan in 1896.[49]

However, this lack of clear ideological identity was changing. Under the stress of Darwinism and Higher Criticism, which threatened directly or by implication the accuracy of the Bible, and under the stress of a changing society, the conservatives began to splinter from the main denominations and develop new theologies. In the years after the Civil War, John Wesley's doctrine of sanctification spread from Methodism to inspire charismatic movements in the other Protestant denominations, particularly among marginalized social groups. By the turn of the century, the interdenominational "Holiness" movement began to develop theologies and sects. Among the various conservative churches that developed in this period were the Pentacostals, the Church of the Nazarene, the Salvation Army, the Church of

God, and the Assembly of God. The Wesleyan doctrine was reinterpreted in various ways by each sect, but the common theme which united them was a premillennialist rejection of the material community, suspicion of social reform, Biblical inerrancy, and an emphasis on personal transformation through faith.[50]

Evangelical Protestant conservatives who remained in the mainline denominations, especially Calvinists and Baptists (in the North as well as the South), were becoming influenced by a particularly pessimistic form of Premillennialism known as Dispensationalism.[51] The effect of Dispensationalism on conservatives was that it defined and articulated a Premillennialist theology that justified their resistance to social reform, even for those who did not wholly accept all of the doctrine. Dispensationalists are interdenominational biblical literalists who believe that world history is divided into seven parts, or dispensations, consisting of a covenant between God and humanity, or some segment of humanity. Each covenant ends in the attempt by humans to supplement God, which results in a catastrophic failure. Like the colonial Puritan laity, they reject what they regard as the unjustified authority of scholarship, through which human and satanic error deludes humanity; all knowledge that is not directly from God is suspect. Salvation is not a matter of social transformation, which is suspect as an act of human agency, but strictly a matter of individual salvation prior to death or the destruction of the world.[52] As the Dispensationalist-sympathetic Premillennialist Dwight L. Moody put it, "I look

upon this world as a wrecked vessel. God has given me a lifeboat and said to me, `Moody, save all you can.'"[53]

The Dispensationalist movement spread initially through revivals, and later through organized conferences of conservative clerics.[54] The current dispensation, that of the Church, is the last, and it is in its latter days. "In their view, the religious leadership has always been the chief center of apostasy (as in the case of Israel and the golden calf) while the righteous remnant has been neglected, overlooked, and even despised...," Ernest Sandeen notes.[55] According to their belief, the true Church is not found in an organization in the world, but rather in a spiritual fellowship of individuals. They are outsiders, oppressed by the state and society within which they live. Dispensationalism had particular appeal to groups without power in society at large, or whose power was diminishing, threatened by institutional changes out of their control.[56]

In 1913, Josiah Strong was one of the first to comment on the schism in Protestantism, in a rather disingenously defensive way:

> There are two types of Christianity, the old and the older. The one is traditional, familiar, and dominant. The other, though as old as the Gospel of Christ, is so rare that it is suspected of being new, or is overlooked altogether.... [This division was] not to be distinguished by any of the old lines of doctrinal or denominational cleavage. Their difference is one of spirit, aim, point of view, comprehensiveness. The one is individualistic, the other is social.[57]

In the sense that the majority of middle-class parishioners leaned more toward conservativism than modernism, and the South was solidly conservative,

Strong was correct. "Fundamentalists", so-called from a series of Dispensationalist pamphlets begun in 1910 entitled The Fundamentals,[58] had widespread support, particularly in the conservative Midwest and South. But the Modernists predominated in the seminaries, and controlled the leadership of the major denominations.[59]

World War I acted as a catalyst to bring out the contradictions between the Modernist Postmillennial leadership and minority conservative evangelical groups within Protestant sects. The war "has shaken our optimism and undermined our faith in the peaceful progress of humanity," a progressive wrote in 1917.[60] It led some postmillennial conservatives to adopt premillenialism or dispensationalism, and radicalized passive premillennialist conservatives--even groups like the Pentacostals, who hitherto had avoided interaction with civic society as much as possible. The Bryan Populists who reluctantly followed Wilson in his crusade to save the world turned their attention back to the way the world was changing the nation.[61] The war, which had underlined recent immigrants' identities with the Old World, stimulated the conservatives' fears of alien influences and social change. The fundamentalists employed in church organizations the anti-Modernist theology they had developed to resist aggressively the theological progressives in the spheres of church and state.[62] One of the secular expressions of fundamentalist political activity was the Ku Klux Klan, which grew rapidly in this period. By 1921, Fundamentalist ministers were offered free membership, in recognition of their ability to bring in new

converts.[63] "[I]t was the World War that gave us our first hint of the real cause of our troubles, and began to crystalize our ideas," the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan recalled in 1926.[64]

The reformers also changed. The Modernists despiritualized their language, and became more like their secularized allies. Furthermore, while the conservatives were radicalized in the 20's, the moderns deradicalized into passivity, or into the cynicism H. L. Mencken typified, especially regarding the credulity of their former rural Populist-Progressive allies.[65] Where reform still existed, it "grew from a moral pursuit of witches to the more cold-blooded business of drawing blueprints for large-scale, but mild, social reconstructions,"[66] as one progressive put it, and began the shift from moralism to the pragmatism that would characterize the New Deal.[67] Typical of Modernist sentiment is Reinhold Niebuhr's observation after visiting an automobile factory in 1925:

> Beside the brutal facts of modern industrial life, how futile are all our homiletical spoutings!... The morality of the church is anachronistic. Will it ever develop a moral insight and courage sufficient to cope with the real problems of modern society?[68]

Where the Modernist-led religions intervened, it was more as social institutions with political goals than saints with a mission.[69] From their point of view, Fundamentalists were at best misguided, and at worst ignorant and dangerous obstructions to carrying out divinely mandated humane reform.

Throughout the 20's intradenominational conflicts erupted, and were conducted through pamphlets and other church media, in the seminaries,

colleges, and in denominational headquarters. The sects particularly affected by the conflict, the Reformed, Presbyterian and Baptist, were the ones in which Dispensationalism had made particular inroads. The fundamentalists split their own denominations, and then rent themselves into various "true" churches. But by the end of this decade of religious civil war, the conservatives had lost the war for hegemony in the main denominations.

Many conservatives themselves were repelled by the disorderly Fundamentalist uprising, particularly as manifested in such organizations as the Klan, which took over the Republican and Democratic parties in some Southern and Midwest states. The 1925 Stephenson case, in which the Grand Dragon of Indiana was found guilty of rape and second degree murder, destroyed much of the Klan's credibility as Knights for law, order, and Protestant ethics.[70] In the same year, Clarence Darrow's devastating interrogation of William Jennings Bryan on biblical literalism during the Scopes trial over the teaching of evolution in the classroom made a pitiable spectacle of fundamentalism. The fundamentalist style, as illustrated by such preachers as Billy Sunday, and as lampooned by Mencken and others, seemed naive; its political goals, such as Prohibition, unrealistic. The New Deal made them irrelevant. "We do not need and we do not use doctrines," New Deal spokesperson Edgar Kemler wrote,[71] and conservatives concurred that they were out of style. "Our age prides itself on being pragmatic. It burns its incense at the shrine of the great god `Results,' a conservative preacher complained. "Action for the joy of action, emotion for

the sake of emotion, belief for the satisfaction it yields, life as an end in itself--in many quarters these are all tabooed."[72]

Part of what the victorious Moderns attempted to make taboo for the fundamentalists was access to the major educational institutions and seminaries, and to the religious media. As victors of most wars wish to do, they wanted to utterly suppress their opponents. The radio networks, almost as soon as they were organized, offered free broadcast time to religious organizations. The Federal Council of Churches, dominated by the Modernists, controlled access to this broadcast time; they banned the Fundamentalists. The Mutual Broadcasting System--the weakest network--alone offered unlimited time to the Fundamentalists, albeit commercial rather than free, from 1934 to 1944. In 1944 the Modernists succeeded in pressuring Mutual to limit broadcasts to 30 minutes on Sunday, and to prohibit on-air solicitation of donations; in effect, they intended to close the Mutual loophole by depriving their enemies funds.[73] While they were not utterly silenced, the conservative evangelicals were pushed to the fringes of both the political and religious community.

While the Modernists suppressed the Fundamentalists, in accordance with their Antinominian sympathies, they advocated increased tolerance to religions of immigrant groups, particularly Catholicism and Judaism. "Writing just thirty years ago, Andre Siegfred described Protestantism as America's `national religion,' and he was largely right," sociologist Will Herberg commented in 1960. "If America today possesses...a form of religious

belonging which is felt to be involved in one's belonging to the national community, it is the tripartite religious system of Protestant-Catholic-Jew."[74]

In the aftermath of World War II, they also began to advocate an international ecumenicalism as a corollary to domestic tolerance, and as a pragmatic means to extend the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. "We will embark, in company with others, on the next great adventure, that of building a fellowship that is world-wide in scope. Out of the perils, the difficulties, the accomplishments of that task, will come again the joy that is reserved to those who seek here to create in God's image," John Foster Dulles said in an address to the Federal Council of Churches' National Mission on World Order in 1943.[75] But he had also noted in a statement he drafted for the Federal Council of Churches on war aims that "We have...set out those guiding principles which, it seems to us, Christians and non-Christians alike can accept."[76] "It is important for Christians to think of their `mission to the world' in new ways. New content must be given to the words `mission field,' `missionary,' `liberator' and `explorer,' the Associate General Secretary of the Methodist Church Board of Missions wrote in 1960.[77] "In the years ahead the political structure of the nation-states will change. The emerging world civilization will make this inevitable. The nation-states have survived 300 years, but no structures are permanent in God's eyes. If the axe of God is cutting at the root of the nation state we should be aware of it."[78]

Modernism's concern with internationalism reflected the change in their sphere of concern; the United States emerged from World War II as the greatest military power on earth. The New Deal pragmatists took up a more secular version of Wilson's postmillennial international federation. The United Nations was Wilson's League of Nations, with Wilson's prophet-nation in charge. Through its agency, the Kingdom "created in God' image" would develop.[79] Once the U.N. was created, however, the Modernist narrative did not have a clear continuation. As the Cold War took shape, it seemed that the secularized version of Wilson's postmillennial extension of God's Kingdom on earth was failing, unable to overcome the opposition of the Communist Anti-faith. The post World War Two United States had to resolve a question Wilson had not: How does a prophet-nation lead?

Prophets turn to scripture, through which, as Wilson had said, the American people should be guided, and through them, the world. Both the Conservatives and the Modernists implicitly cast the United States in the role as the City on a Hill, a superior nation in morality. But the pragmatic secularism of liberal religious Modernists, exemplified in the political sphere by Wilson's ideological successor, Franklin Roosevelt,[80] invited conservative attacks that it was completely secular or even antireligious. Father Coughlin and Protestant fundamentalist Gerald L. K. Smith shared a hatred of Roosevelt, whom both denounced as a Communist (ecumenicalism among conservatives extended this far at least). During the war, Philip Wylie, the son of a conservative

preacher, charged in A Generation of Vipers that national morality was in danger of disappearing altogether. Wylie took his title from John the Baptists' address to the religious authorities of Jerusalem: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance."[81] No one individual seized leadership of a political movement, but collectively, such religious framings of the United States as a "fallen" nation prepared a context in which the failures of the United States internationally could be seen as a moral, religious failure.

In the early Cold War years, religion in general increasingly became a topic of discussion in the public sphere, in reference both to domestic or international issues, and calls for a religious revival came from various quarters. The British historian Arnold Toynbee's one-volume abridgement of his seven-volume A Study of History became a bestseller in the United States in 1947. A popular volume of essays, Civilization on Trial, followed in 1948. They argued in part that civilizations followed a predictable cycle of rises and falls, relative to a society's adherence to its core beliefs in the face of trials. In them Toynbee analyzed the state of Western Civilization, and found it in decline, because its religious beliefs were neglected. "How can the Western nations successfully combat Communism unless they establish an active, working Christianity," he asked in 1950. "The West must learn to fight by a more intense practice of Christian living."[82] Time reported that, according to the Associated Press Managing Editors' Association, "a growing interest in religion is evident all over

the U.S."[83], and that "'evangelistic crusades,' which used to be known as revivals, have been staging an impressive comeback."[84] Church membership rose from 57% to 64% of the population during the 50's. Bible sales increased dramatically from 1949 to 1953. The Robe (1953), a story about an uncertain, tortured Roman Centurion who finds purpose and serenity in Christianity, became both an academy award-winning film and a best-selling novel; five of the six non-fiction best-sellers in the same year had a religious theme.[85] The secular or Modernist-pragmatic paradigm which had dominated the leadership of Church and State during the Roosevelt years increasingly was coming under attack by a more overtly religious, revivalist paradigm.

The Secretary of State position also reflected a shift, at least superficially, from liberal pragmatism to a more self-consciously religious Wilsonian Modernist Postmillenialism. Interestingly, both Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles were sons of mainstream Modernist clerics--Acheson's father was an Episcopalian bishop, and Dulles' father was a Presbyterian pastor. Both had served as undersecretaries in the state department, and both were strong Wilsonian internationalists. But Dean Acheson's image was of the dapper Wall Street lawyer, brilliant, blunt, and aristocratic. His successor, John Foster Dulles, came to his new job after serving for eight years as a director for a theological seminary. Prior to that he had written frequently in popular magazines such as Life on the need of a return to religious faith in the United States, "a righteous faith that is compatible with the welfare and dignity of

others. Unless during this war we regain that kind of faith, then military victory will serve no permanent good. For again new faiths will arise to attack us and in the long run we will succumb."[86]

Dulles' self-conscious embrace of the prophet-metaphor in reference to American foreign policy carried with it some troubling implications, deriving from the implicit "covenant" of the City on a Hill myth. A prophet-nation should not fail to achieve its ends. Divinely-inspired nations do not fail in any endeavor unless they are disobedient to the will of God. If a prophet fails in a task, it is not because the task was misconceived or beyond the nation's powers. The opposition of other nations is irrelevant unless (as one sees repeatedly in the Old Testament) they are the agency of a divinely-ordained chastisement for some misdeed. For the Republicans, the implications of the metaphor could serve as a subtle premise of why the United States under the Truman administration "failed" in China and other places around the globe. The United States, Dulles suggested in 1952, under the influence of excessively liberal Social-Gospel Postmillennials and their secular socialist allies, had broken the covenant between God and the United States, with excessive dependence on material efforts like the Marshall Plan:

> The present extremity of trouble within the nations is not due primarily to a shortage of material things. Of course there are such shortages, but they are relatively less today than ever before in world history. The troubles are primarily due to the fact that more than ever before political influence is being exerted by those who think and act in terms that are calculated on a purely material basis. The great evil of Soviet Communism...is that it put material things first.... But we in America, who have leadership in the world

> that is free, are ourselves not without fault.... We are apt to look upon our great material possessions with pride as themselves proving us to be superior people. The fact is that this superiority in material things is not nearly so important as many of us believe, and we learn that to our dismay when we deal with other peoples. We think that they should admire us because we have more automobiles than the rest of the world put together. We think that they should be grateful to us because in one form or another we have given away nearly fifty billion dollars since the fighting stopped. We think that others are stupid and ungrateful that they do not bow down before such material magnificence.

What was required, Dulles asked? To return to a politics of spirituality:

> Do we care and shall we act out of caring? That is the vital question that confronts our people. Jesus, when he saw the multitudes, was moved with compassion, and then he gave them some material help. He did not give that help because he had calculated that it would be good political propaganda. That is the way for us to follow, making the spiritual primary and the material secondary. That is indeed the traditional American way, and I believe that the American people are eager to return to that way.[87]

Presumably Eisenhower would return to this traditional American way. But this weapon was equally capable of being used against conservative Postmillennialists like Dulles.

The Prophet metaphor, and the series of international failures the United States had endured, provided a context in which the conservative Fundamentalists, and a relatively new group, conservative Catholics, particularly thrived.[88] The Baptist Billy Graham in mass meetings, and Catholic Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen on the Dumont Television Network--combined militant anti-communist messages with warnings of "coming judgment" on America.[89] Billy Graham, whose biographer described him in 1972 as "a

modern prophet Isaiah in the court of an American Israel", and the United States as "the major source of light to the heathen around the globe,"[90] had the following jeremiad to offer in a sermon on New Year's Eve in 1950:

> Ah, yes, the American people refused to give of their substance for world evangelation and the work of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Now, it's to be taken from them for guns, bullets and bombs--a national emergency that will probably extend for another generation.... Christianity seemingly has lost her flame. The early church was so boiling hot, so fervent in spirit that she boiled over into the whole Roman Empire and the then known world in a few years.... Christianity may be losing her day in America because she refuses to boil.[91]

Graham, along with more mainstream conservatives like Sheen, argued (in accordance with the UNITED STATES IS ISRAEL metaphor, and in agreement with Dulles) that the international failures the United States faced were a divine warning about the morality of the United States. But where Dulles whispered, they shouted. Harold Ockenga, one of the central organizers of the Fundamentalist revival, presented a more Dispensationalist argument in a sermon at the Pasadena Rose Bowl:

> [A]s God brought Israel and Judah low in judgment because of the fact that they violated His laws and set up idolatry and injustice and immorality, I say unto you tonight, you can't flaunt God's law individually and then act upon it internationally. It is perfectly possible tonight, perfectly possible, that God should judge us and use the two hundred fifty divisions of the Soviet people to whip us and scourge us and drive us to our knees before him in repentance.[92]

The Bible films reflect these cautionary themes both conservative Modernists and Fundamentalists were sounding; indeed, Cecil B. DeMille's

Samson and Delilah (1949) is very nearly a visual narrative of Ockenga's sermon. It might be argued that any Judeo-Christian religious-based narrative has as its theme sin, repentance and redemption, yet the late 40's and 50's Bible film narratives are, I would argue, distinctly products of the early Cold War years, created as cognitive vehicles by both Fundamentalists and Moderns to interpret the United States in the Postwar world. And while both Fundamentalists and Modernists views can be found in Bible films, it seems that the organizational value of this genre particularly benefitted the Fundamentalists. As I have recounted, they were in a weak position until the Cold War period. The apparent "failure" of the United States world mission made it possible to link Modernist hegemony to "flaunting God's law," in Ockenga's word, and to define political disagreements as heresy and treason.

But what law precisely was being flaunted? For the Dispensationalist-influenced Fundamentalist, it was the social emphasis of Modernism that was at fault--a social emphasis which was secular, humanistic, indeed Communist. "How can you explain the mistakes of our leaders for the last 30 years if there aren't Communists giving them advice," Reverend Billy Hargis regularly asked his readers in The Weekly Crusader, and his listeners on over 200 radio stations.[93] As the idea of a Communist-inspired enemy evolved during the 50's, Fundamentalists became more willing to accuse their Modernist enemies of being Marxist agents. Congregational Pastor Irving Howard claimed in "Protestant Prophets of Collectivism" that the Social Gospel movement had

always been part of an international socialist movement, and that the Modernist-dominated leadership of Protestant denominations were Communist agents or dupes:

> The grass roots reaction against socialism during the twenties did not prevent Marxian Socialists from creeping into strategic positions in the leadership of the Protestant churches. The Marxian strategy was to get a few influential leaders to recite the Marxist line in the belief that many liberal ministers would eventually parrot what the key leaders said.[94]

THE BIBLE FILM

It is useful to compare the structural similarities and differences of Samson and Delilah and other Bible films, for which it served as the prototype,[95] to Film Noir; the Bible film substantially is simply a religious reinterpretation of the secular Noir, with answers to Noir's angst.[96] Asked by a reporter if he thought that Americans were returning to religion, Eugene O'Neill said:

> Back to religion? Perhaps. Perhaps that will be the answer for some. At any rate I realize that I have been putting my faith in values that are gone.... There is a feeling around, or I'm mistaken, of fate. Kismet, the negative fate.... A sort of unfair non sequitur, as though events, as though life were being manipulated just to confuse us.[97]

As Robert Ottoson notes, the Noir film is structurally derivative of the Gothic novel tradition, something that is particularly noticeable in the relatively rare instances in Noir where a woman is the protagonist.[98] Gothics, "comedies without humor," as Frye calls them,[99] are the last stage of comedy, "the phase of

the collapse and disintegration" of the redeemed society that is considered to be the moral norm. Normal society is embodied in the Noir protagonists, a society "become small and esoteric, or even confined to a single individual."[100] Noir films are about a social order in crisis. The Bible film allowed developments of many Noir themes, transposed to an arena where the protagonists and antagonists represent nations, and where actions can have epic and decisive consequences in history. Prototypical Gothic stories have a quality of predestination which the Noir and Bible films share. However, where Gothic narratives are dominated by vulnerable and betrayed female protagonists, both Noir and Bible genres are predominantly stories with vulnerable and betrayed males.[101]

Film Noir and the Bible film are both products of social crisis, but each have different objects whose metaphorical functions are interlinked. Both use the prevailing mythology of women in the post-war period. Betty Friedan, in her influential chronicle of images of women in the 50's, The Feminine Mystique, observed:

> In an earlier time, the image of woman was also split in two--the good, pure woman on the pedestal, and the whore of the desires of the flesh. The split in the new image opens a different fissure--the feminine woman, whose goodness includes the desires of the flesh, and the career woman, whose evil includes every desire of the separate self. The new feminine morality story is the exorcising of the forbidden career dream, the heroine's victory over Mephistopheles: the devil, first in the form of a career woman, who threatens to take away the heroine's husband or child, and finally, the devil inside the heroine herself, the dream of independence, the discontent of spirit, and even the feeling of a

> separate identity that must be exorcised to win or keep the love of husband and child.[102]

I would say that in Noir, family destruction (and by extension, social collapse) and the possibility of reconstruction is the underlying theme, expressed typically through the protagonist's relations with the Feminine and the Fallen woman.[103] The Fallen woman gives into temptation, drinks, has affairs, and kills her child in The Blue Dahlia; she is the object of loathing on the part of her cuckolded war-veteran husband and his friends. The husband wanders, and encounters a woman who seems independent, but, like him, is betrayed; in their union, each discovers themselves, and the social order is restored. Alternatively, the Feminine homemaker and her child are killed in The Big Heat, and the husband loses his identity. He enters into a partial alliance with a Fallen woman in order to carry out revenge on the killers.

Bible films, by contrast, are not conflicts of different social classes in the same society, but rather conflicts between nations. The Noir characters are present, but the Fallen and the Nurturing women tend to be of different nations, and other conflicts equally follow national lines. Samson and Delilah are Hebrew and Philistine, respectively, and although each attempt to deny the significance of nationality in choosing (eventually, in Samson's case) the other, national identity proves to be destiny. In The Ten Commandments, Hebrews and Egyptians are literally different classes, yet it is their nationality that DeMille emphasizes. Nefretiri, the Fallen Woman, is Egyptian; Sephora, the Nurturing Woman, is, as it were, a cousin, descendant of Ishmael. As I will show later,

other slaves, notably Memnet, the personal slave of Moses' adopted mother Bithiah, see themselves as Egyptians. Yet Moses' Egyptian identity simply disappears with the discovery of his Hebrew lineage. One cancels out the other. The slaves of Goshen are never simply "slaves", but Hebrew slaves. Similarly, in Ben-Hur (1959), Ben-Hur and Massala are both part of the Roman Empire, but it is their national identity, signified by religion, that determines their relation as adults, and the different paths they take. The chariot-race in Rome has the connotation of Olympic races in 1936 Berlin; what is at stake is not the victory of individuals, or territorial regions, or even religions, but of nationalities. In The Story of Ruth (1960), Ruth is the same class as her antagonists among the people of Israel, and of the same religion. But her religion and identity are questioned because she is from Moab. The Fallen and Nurturing roles certainly draw from the mythology of women that Friedan cites, but in the Bible film, this mythology is used as the basis of metaphorical characterizations of national identity--a subject I will return to when I examine in depth The Ten Commandments.

Heroes and villains are doomed--by social roles and past actions or circumstances in Noir, and by religious beliefs and the past acts of their nations in the Bible film--to come into conflict as representatives or champions of different moral philosophies. However, where the villain knows from the beginning what he believes, the hero must discover his beliefs. The male protagonists in both film types at one time had a sense of certainty about their

moral and personal identity, but this has either been shaken by the time the film begins, or an event at the beginning of the film destabilizes them. Once destabilized, the male protagonists drift in a state of moral vulnerability, lacking clear values.

In this state of moral vulnerability, the protagonist interacts with the Fallen and the Nurturing Woman. The Fallen Woman is the seductive femme fatale, the "perverse sorcerer" of sexuality, as De Beauvoir terms her. She is a force of undirected nature, opposed to moral and social restrictions, an embodiment of selfishness and ambition--and, because she is a woman, a figure of unbalanced, irrational desire. In Noir, she is the figure of the shadows, of illusions, of the underworld, of crime and betrayal. Kathi in Out of the Past is the paradigm of the type. Jeff Bailey, the protagonist, is not truly deceived by her, yet cannot help but follow her into destruction. In some films, like The Blue Dahlia, the protagonist rejects her utterly, yet becomes caught up in the destruction that follows from her ambitions. In the Bible film, she is the icon of the immoral society; the cause and inspiration of destruction; the embodiment of the false religion which the protagonist must discover and confront. Some Sorceresses, like Nefreteri in The Ten Commandments, or Ildith in Sodom and Gomorrah, are the cause and catalyst of action. In other films, like Samson and Delilah or The Prodigal, the Sorceress is the means by which the hero's true antagonists accomplish their ends. In the most extreme passive case--Bathsheba in David and Bathsheba--the Sorceress is dangerous simply

because she diverts the hero's attention from spiritual and social needs to material and personal desires.[104] In both Noir and the Bible film, the dramatic movement of the narrative is to restrict the Sorceress's ability to act so that, at the end of the narrative, she either dies or submits to the rational/divine social order. But unlike Noir, in which the Sorceress is an independent agent, even if she acts within the plans of others, the Bible Sorceress is first and last a tool in the service of a preordained history. She believes that she controls destiny, but in fact destiny controls her--either directly, as in films like The Ten Commandments and Salome, or through the secretive male controllers of the false social order that she represents, as in films like Samson and Delilah and The Prodigal. The natural force of sexuality which she embodies is always subject to both higher paternal rationalities of God and the Devil.

It follows that just as the Bible sorceress seems to be independent but is discovered to be an agent of the dark side, the Bible protagonist seems to be passive in the face of events and morally adrift, yet is in fact a figure in whom the divine order is imminent, awaiting predestined experiences and events to trigger its expression. As actions unfold, the Bible protagonist is driven intuitively to act in accordance with their sense of what is right. As Moses expresses it in The Ten Commandments, "I do not know what power shapes my way, but my feet are set upon a road I must follow."

Both the Noir and the Bible film usually contrast the Sorceress Woman with her antonym, the Nurturing Woman.[105] The Nurturing Woman, like the

Bible protagonist, has imminent within her the divine order, yet she is not morally adrift. She is unfallen Nature, "nature elevated to transparency of consciousness...but naturally submissive," as Beauvoir describes her.[106] Yet, while she is a creature of consciousness, her role is to observe, and to act only within the limited sphere of unfallen Nature that surrounds her. In both Noir and the Bible film, she often is oblivious to the unnatural anti-society the protagonist must oppose. Janey Place describes the Noir Nurturing Woman as follows:

> She offers the possibility of integration for the alienated, lost man into the stable world of secure values, roles and identities. She gives love, understanding (or at least forgiveness), asks very little in return (just that he come back to her) and is generally visually passive and static. Often, in order to offer this alternative to the nightmare landscape of film noir, she herself must not be a part of it. She is then linked to the pastoral environment of open spaces, light and safety....[107]

The Noir protagonist usually does not immediately recognize or appreciate the Nurturing Woman, but when he does, it is often in her role as the mediary in a male-version of the Annunciation. She is the angel who scolds and guides, but always as the intermediary of meaning, the voice which makes manifest God's will.[108] In The Ten Commandments, Sephora--who lives at the base of "God's holy mountain," Mt. Sinai--comes to Moses to explain to him why he needs her. Through her knowledge of the mountain's identity and their proximity to it, he discovers his calling. The Prodigal perhaps is the most extreme of the Bible film Nurturing Women. In The Prodigal, Micah allows himself to be betrothed to Ruth, whom he "respects" but does not love, and then develops a passion for a high priestess of Astarte. In both times they meet, Ruth stands on a balcony

above him, next to a caged dove, which he bought for her. She looks down at him angrily, warns him that he will repent and return, but she will not wait for him; she then cuts off his reply and tells him to leave. But this independence is deceptive. She releases the dove, which flies away--and then returns. Much later, Micah repents and comes home. Now that he has "come to his senses", their relationship changes. As Micah's servant indicates Ruth will not come to his father's celebration of his return, she appears with her father. She looks up at Micah, and welcomes him not by speech, but by not speaking. She says, "But what if she did come?" an oddly indirect question, and his response is, "If she did come, I would tell her that what cannot be forgotten can sometimes be forgiven." She does not respond, but her father nods. In effect, the Ruth of the balcony does not come; the woman who judges Micah becomes irrelevant because he has become rational, and the need for her to speak is finished. In both the Noir and the Bible film, the protagonist re-discovers the proper social roles and identities that have been lost (when this option is still available, which is not always the case in Noir) by returning to accept the natural divine order which the Nurturing Woman embodies.

The relation of the audience to the narrative is the final constant in the Bible film. Noir films are investigations into the causes of particular instances of social disorder, and neither the audience nor characters know exactly what will be discovered--only that the world that ought to be is no more. Characters may be doomed--many Noir films begin after that doom has become apparent, and

characters tell police or doctors in flashbacks how it happened--but we do not know more about the characters than they do themselves. Bible characters have known fates, and in that the Bible is the canonic narrative of the West, most people are aware of them--if not directly from the bible, then in the thousands of paintings, music, poetry, and other art employing bible narratives, or which make reference to bible narratives.[109] Thus the suspense is different. The dramatic element is not to discover who the character is, and where that knowledge leads him or her, but rather to see, from an omniscient point of view, the prophet-figure undergo trials, temptations and doubts, and overcome them. The epic significance of these narratives is that, as the U.S. was a prophet-nation, it might see objectified its own doubts and failures, and be reassured that such things happened to any chosen prophet, or prophet-nation. The U.S. might also use these earlier prophets as a model for its own behavior in the new battle between good and evil, the Cold War. I will turn now to Cecil B. DeMille's The Ten Commandments, in which we will explore more in depth the Bible Epic.

ENDNOTES

1. Ronald Gottesman, Francis Murphy, Laurence B. Holland, Hershel Parker, David Kalstone, and William H. Pritchart (eds.), The Norton Anthology of American Literature Vol. 1 (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1979), p. 24.

2. Joseph Gair and Ben Siegel, The Puritan Heritage, America's Roots in the Bible (New York: Mentor Books, 1964), p. 26.

3. John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charitie", in Norton Anthology of American Literature (note cit)

4. The phrase, and much background, is from Keith W. F. Stavely, Puritan Legacies: Paradise Lost and the New England Tradition, 1630-1890 (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 111.

5. Quoted in Keith W. F. Stavely, Puritan Legacies, pp. 116-117.

6. This summary of part of The Necessity of Reformation is drawn from Perry Miller, "Errand into the Wilderness", in Frederick Gentles and Melvin Steinfield, Dream On, America (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971), p. 64.

7. Louis B. Wright, The Cultural Life of the American Colonies (New York: Harper and Rowe, 1957), pp. 79-82, describes the caste-like "Covenant Theology," the church-membership restrictions for the right to vote and hold office, and other such bureaucratic procedures. For an example of the contractual resolutions of conflict between influential parishioners and clergy, see Stavely, pp. 117-118, regarding the compromise compact between the Reverend Samuel Stone and his congregation.

8. Jeffrey K. Hadden and Anson Shupe, Televangelism p. 98. See also Wright, p. 79.

9. Jeffrey K. Hadden and Anson Shupe, Televangelism p. 98.

10. Thomas A. Bailey, The American Pageant, 3rd. ed. (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1967), p. 41.

11. Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia, Works (Federal ed.), 4:76, cited and discussed in Walter Berns, "Religion and the Founding Principle", in

Horwitz (ed.), The Moral Foundations of the American Republic (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986), pp. 215-228.

12. Wright, The Culture of the American Colonies, p. 93.

13. Material from Louis B. Wright, The Cultural Life of the American Colonies (New York: Harper & Rowe, 1957), pp. 87-95. As to Franklin, note the section of his autobiography written at Passy, 1784, on his religious beliefs--hardly doctrinaire, yet not quite as nugatory as Weber would have us believe. Indeed, Franklin even served as a ghostwriter for a Presbyterian revivalist! Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1931), pp. 96-107; p. 117. The specific incident of Whitefield's extraordinary wringing from Franklin his hoarded pennies is to be found on p. 127.

14. Henry Steele Commager, The Empire of Reason (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p 168.

15. See, for example, Keith W. F. Stavely, Puritan Legacies: Paradise Lost and the New England Tradition, 1630-1890 (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 292-195.

16. See Louis B. Wright, The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, p. 87-97; Jeffrey K. Hadden and Anson Shupe, Televangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1988), pp. 97-100; James Brewer Stewart, Holy Warriors: The Abolitionists and American Slavery (New York: McGraw, Hill, 1976), pp. 13-14; 18-21. Madison expressed the new consensus in his Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man (1784), that opinions cannot be directed by force, but "only by reason and conviction." Note however that in many areas, particularly New England, established religions continued to exist until the second Awakening. See Sidney E. Mead, The Old Religion in the Brave New World (Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press, 1977), pp. 81-132. Many of the Founders seem personally to be quite secular, and yet emphasized the importance of religion; John Adams' cousin Samuel captured this mix in his phrase that the United States should be a "Christian Sparta." Michael P. Zukert provides a clue to this attitude in his analysis of Locke and the role of religion in providing a dominant understanding of the state. Given the founder's oft-noted concern about ungoverned masses, Locke's conclusion that "the greatest part cannot know,...they must believe" in the concepts underlying the social contract surely appealed to rationalists like Adams. See Zukert's "Locke and the Problem of Civil Religion", in Robert H. Horwitz (ed.), The Moral Foundations of the American Republic (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986), pp. 181-

203, and in the same volume, Robert H. Horwitz, "John Locke and the Preservation of Liberty: A Perennial Problem of Civic Education", pp. 136-164..

17. Robert N. Bellah, "Civil Religion in America", American Political Science Review 62, 1-21, cited in Richard V. Pierard and Robert D. Linder, Civil Religion and the Presidency (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1988), p. 20. See also Will Herberg, "Religion and Culture in Present-Day America," in Philip Ehrensaft and Amitai Etzioni (eds.), Anatomies of America: Sociological Perspectives (London: Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 262, who comments on the evolution of an American "civic religion," comparing it (as is so typical of intellectuals of this period; see below) with the Roman Empire's civic religion. Perhaps Bellah and Herberg were drawing from Benjamin Franklin's term, "publick religion." In any case, it seems clear that the process of civic religion creating derives from the practical imperative to create an ecumenical collective out of social groups which had been on matters of belief almost literally at arms with one another. See Martin E. Marty, "The Changing Role of Religion in American Society", in Dona Baron (ed.), The National Purpose Reconsidered (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), p. 30.

18. I am particularly informed on this transition by Walter Berns, "Religion and the Founding Principle", in Robert Horowitz (ed.), The Moral Foundations of the American Republic, pp. 204-229.

19. Emerson, Complete Works, Riverside Ed. (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1883-88), VII, 267, cited in Edward MaNall Burns, The American Idea of Mission (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1957), p. 92.

20. Emerson, quoted in David Donald, "Toward a Reconsideration of Abolitionists", Lincoln Reconsidered (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), p. 32.

21. James Brewer Stewart, Holy Warriors, pp. 77-78.

22. See James Brewer Stewart, Holy Warriors, pp. 90-91.

23. See David Donald, "Toward a Reconsideration of Abolitionists", pp. 26-36. See also James Brewer Stewart, Holy Warriors, pp. 34-41, which discusses Donald and his critics, and pp. 78-79 on the Abolitionist movement's supporters' background.

24. See Stavely, Puritan Legacies, pp. 206-219, which discusses both the secularized Transcendentalist-progressive outlook on the role of education as a

replacement for religion, as well as Protestant revivalism's interest in spiritualized materialist progress.

25. James Brewer Stewart, Holy Warriors, p. 80.

26. I am reliant on the discussion of Unitarianism and Transcendentalism in relation to the Civil War in Gary Wills, Lincoln at Gettysburg (New York: Touchstone, 1992), pp. 85-148.

27. Samuel J. May, cited in James Brewer Stewert, Holy Warriors, p. 153. Daniel Webster, on the other hand, denounced such arguments as "extravagant", and in his crypto-presbyterian way, avowed that it was a "Christian duty" to obey established governmental laws. See Burns, The American Idea of Mission, p. 115.

28. David Donald's essay, "An Excess of Democracy," in Lincoln Reconsidered 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1961) leads me to suggest that the popular religious identity was used to fill the gap of common identity and civic duty that the Founders--who had the Roman republic in mind--expected franchised citizens to feel toward the government. Instead of Washington's "duty, honor, country," as enshrined at West Point, the Civil War established "God, morality, chosen nation."

29. These excerpted passages are drawn from Gary Wills, Lincoln at Gettysburg (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), pp. 186-188. Wills implies much the same point I am drawing in his chapter on Lincoln, "Lincoln's Black Theology," in Garry Wills, Under God: Religion and American Politics (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990).

30. See James McNall Burns, American Ideal of Mission, pp. 92-93. I need hardly contrast this with Jefferson's famous comment about the necessity of revolutions every generation, or even the far more prosaic observations Hamilton or Madison made of this "ark" within whose words the national "covenant" was hidden.

31. See Walter Rauschenbusch, "A Theology for the Social Gospel", in Matheson, pp. 264-271. See also Josiah Strong, The Next Great Awakening (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1902), pp. 156-175, from which the quoted phrases are taken.

32. This summarizes a much longer discussion given by Theodore T. Munger, "The New Theology", from The Freedom of Faith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and

Co., 1883), excerpted in Robert R. Mathisen (ed.), The Role of Religion in American Life (Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), pp. 251-258. See also Martin E. Marty, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: Dial Press, 1970), pp. 188-209. Jeffrey K. Hadden and Anson Shupe, Televangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1988), define postmillenialism, as well as other doctrinal terms.

33. A short explanation of this is in Martin E. Marty, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: The Dial Press, 1970), p. 180

34. Josiah Strong, The Next Great Awakening (New York: The Baker and Taylor Company, 1902), p. 177.

35. Richard T. Ely, "Social Aspects of Christianity", Congregationalist Leaflet No. 2 (Boston: W. L. Greene & Co., 1888), p. 7. (in Pamphlets on Religion, UCB BL 25 P 26 v. 16.). Excerpted in Robert R. Mathisen (ed.), The Role of Religion in American Life (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982), pp. 239-250

36. See Martin I. Marty, Righteous Empire, p. 184.

37. It should be noted too that Josiah Strong combined evolution with civic religion in Our Country (1885), and perhaps did more than any other single person to create a justification of American internationalism. America was to become God's right arm in His battle with the world's ignorance and oppression and sin, Strong wrote, and argued that the white man, self-evidently the fittest of the human species, had a burden to extend their dominance over the lesser races of the world and Christianize them. In 1898, after praying, William McKinley self-consciously took on exactly Strong's burden: "There was nothing left for us to do but to take them all and to educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilize and christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow men for whom Christ also died." quote from Mark A. Noll et al (eds.), Eerdman's Handbook to Christianity in America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1983), pp. 292-293.

38. See August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1991), pp. 233-235.

39. August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson, pp. 666-667.

40. John Maynard Keynes, The Economic Consequences of the Peace (1920), cited in Francis Farmer (ed.), The Wilson Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956), p. 248. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr. provides a good overview of the Social Theology movement in "A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900", in John M. Mulder and John F. Wilson (eds.), Religion in American History (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 302-317. By contrast, Robert Pierard and Robert D. Linder argue (surely with Keynes in mind) that "Wilson's religious concerns were moral, not theological in character. He saw the world in synthetic, holistic terms and tended to reduce all issues to well-defined moral categories.", Civil Religion and the Presidency, pp. 150-151. But insofar as (by their own argument) Wilson was the chief cleric of the civil religion, and insofar as one of the primary duties of the cleric traditionally has been to clarify moral issues, I think they are splitting hairs.

41. William Allen White, "Roosevelt, a Force for Righteousness," McClure's, Vol XXVIII (January 1907), p. 393, cited in Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), pp. 213-214.

42. See Stavely, "Charles F. Morse: The Secularized Puritan as Country Editor", chapter nine in Puritan Legacies. Note in particular pp. 256-259.

43. Morris Raphael Cohen, American Thought (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 231.

44. Kenneth K. Bailey, Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. ix.

45. Its popularity would seem to be accounted for in part by that context, as a narrative of survival.

46. Bailey, Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century, p. 24. See also Samuel S. Hill, "A Survey of Southern Religious History", in Samuel S. Hill (ed.), Religion in the Southern States

47. Samuel S. Hill, "A Survey of Southern Religious History", in Samuel S. Hill (ed.), Religion in the Southern States (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1983), p. 411. The cultural changes in the North which the South feared--the tendency to view Sunday as a pleasure-day, of urban utilities such as street-cars, trains, bars, resorts and other businesses to remain open, and other marks of a secularized Sabbath--are discussed in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., "A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900", in John M. Mulder and John F. Wilson (eds.), Religion in American History (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-

Hall, 1978), pp. 307-308. Such issues were a concern to many in the North as well, but the more homogenous character of the postwar South makes it possible to speak of a Southern regional collective attitude.

48. Martin I. Marty, Righteous Empire, p. 184.

49. Of note in this respect is Richard Hofstadter, "William Jennings Bryan: The Democrat as Revivalist," in Hofstadter's American Political Tradition (New York: Vintage Books, 1948), pp. 186-205. A roughly contemporary attitude of Cleveland's "Mugwump" attitude--that is, of his alliance with the mildly progressive reform Republicans--may be found in Paul Haworth, The United States In Our Own Times (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), pp. 166-167.

50. I am indebted for the background of these shifts to Mark A. Noll, et al, Eerdman's Handbook to Christianity in America, pp. 321-342.

51. See Sandeen, "The Origins of Fundamentalism", and Helen Lee Turner and James L. Guth, "The Politics of Armageddon: Dispensationalism among Southern Baptist Ministers", in Ted G. Jelin (ed.), Religion and Political Behavior in the U.S., the latter of which indicates current (and presumably reflects earlier) prevalence of Premillennialism in the South.

52. This distrust of human knowledge in practice can be awesomely comprehensive. An evangelical Georgia state legislator, in voting against library funding, put it thusly: "Read the Bible. It teaches you how to act. Read the hymnbook. It contains the finest poetry ever written. Read the almanac. It shows you how to figure out what the weather will be. There isn't another book that is necessary for anyone to read and therefore I am opposed to all libraries." Quoted in Hadden and Shupe, Teleevangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier, p. 109.

53. cited in Martin I. Marty, Righteous Empire, p. 184.

54. See Mark A. Noll et al, Eerdman's Handbook of Christianity in America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1983), p. 331.

55. Ernest R. Sandeen, "The Origins of Fundamentalism", in Mulder & Wilson, Religion in American History , p. 417.

56. This receives support from Helen Lee Turner and James L. Guth, The Politics of Armageddon: Dispensation among Southern Baptist Ministers, in

Ted G. Gelin (ed.), Religion and Political Behavior in the United States ( ), pp. 187-207; note conclusion, p. 206.

57. Josiah Strong (1913), cited in Martin E. Marty, Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: The Dial Press, 1970), p. 177.

58. Hadden and Shupe, Televangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier, pp. 107-108

59. See Martin E. Marty, p. 187.

60. Walter Weyl, quoted in Edgar Kemler, the Deflation of American Ideals (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967) [1941], p. 9.

61. It is suggestive to note that Bryan, who was Secretary of State at the time, resigned when Wilson sent Germany a harsh note over the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915--even though Billy Sunday described the act as "absolutely hellish." Bryan was sure such notes would lead to war in Europe, which he regarded as contradictory to the United States' destiny as a chosen nation, apart from the world.

62. See Hadden and Shupe, Teleevangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier, pp. 105-106. It is notable that the Klan actually controlled the political structure of some states, such as Indiana, in the early postwar period.

63. Wyn Craig Wade, The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America (New York: Touchstone, 1987), p. 170.

64. Hiram W. Evans, "The Klan's Fight For Americanism," in Richard Hofstadter (ed.), Great Issues in American History Vol. II (New York: Random House, 1958), p. 327.

65. See Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, pp. 285-289.

66. Edgar Kemler, The Deflation of American Ideals (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967), p. 66.

67. As an example of this, see Pat Robinson's interesting attack on Roger Baldwin and the ACLU in Pat Robinson, America's Dates With Destiny (New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986), pp. 185-195. For a liberal viewpoint of the same change, see Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, pp. 314-318; 324-327.

68. Reinhold Niebuhr, Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic, cited in Robert Sklar (ed.), The Plastic Age (New York: George Braziller, 1970), p. 320.

69. See Edwin Lewis, "The Great Tribulation," in A Christian Manifesto (New York: Abingdon Press, 1934), pp. 9-10; 196-204, excerpted in Matheson, The Role of Religion in American Life, pp. 318-324 for a conservative view of the Modernists.

70. Wyn Craig Wade, The Fiery Cross, pp. 239-247; pp. 251-252.

71. Edgar Kemler, The Deflation of American Ideals, p. 149.

72. Edwin Lewis, A Christian Manifesto (1934), excerpted in Mathisen (ed.), The Role of Religion in American Life, p. 319. This compares with Imperial Wizard Hiram Evans' comment: "The Klan does not believe that the fact that it is emotional and instinctive, rather than coldly intellectual, is a weakness. All action comes from emotion, rather than from ratiocination.... [Emotions] can be trusted where the fine-haired reasoning of the denatured intellectuals cannot." -- "The Klan's Fight For Americanism," in Richard Hofstadter (ed.), Great Issues in American History (New York: Vintage, 1958), p. 331.

73. Hadden and Shupe, Televangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier, pp. 46-48.

74. Will Herberg, "Religion and Culture in Present-Day America", in Philip Ehrensaft and Amitai Etzioni (eds.), Anatomies of America: Sociological Perspectives (London: The Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 257.

75. Henry P. Van Dusen, The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), p. 63.

76. Van Dusen, p. 101.

77. Tracy K. Jones, Jr., Our Mission Today: The Beginnings of a New Age (New York: World Outlook Press, 1963), p. 39.

78. Tracey K. Jones, p. 132.

79. Wilson's version of the league was entitled "Covenant," in conscious reference to the Puritan Calvinist "covenant doctrine." See August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson, pp. 533-534.

80. In 1921, Roosevelt organized the Woodrow Wilson Foundation to "perpetuate the fight for liberalism and internationalism." See August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson, pp. 652-653.

81. Matt. 3:7-8.

82. "Invaluable 10%", Time Vol. 56, No. 18 (October 30, 1950), p. 71. See also Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 551-554.

83. "Trend", Time Vol 56, No. 22 (Nov. 27, 1950), p. 54.

84. "Evangelism", Time Vol. 56, No. 20 (November 13, 1950), p. 61.

85. Gilbert, p. 238. It is worth noting, in regard to Bible sales, that this sales jump predates the rise in Holiday Inn and other motel chains by four years, and predates Eisenhower's highway bill by seven. Thus it is impossible to account for it as a reflection of Gideon bibles in motel rooms.

86. John Foster Dulles, "A Righteous Faith", Life (Dec. 28, 1942), cited in Henry P. Van Dusen, The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), p. 51.

87. John Foster Dulles, "The Way of Love and Compassion," April 14, 1952, in The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 209-210; 211.

88. I will not extend my already lengthy sketch of religious movements with the rise and development of conservative Catholics, and their political link to Fundamentalist Protestantism. Instead I refer the reader to David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "The Intellectuals and the Discontented Classes," p. 147, and Seymour Lipset, "The Sources of the `Radical Right'," pp. 350-355, both in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right. I

89. The U.S.S.R. was not entirely left out of divine reckoning. February 24, 1953, on his television show Life is Worth Living, Fulton J. Sheen read a lengthy section from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, substituting the names of several Soviet leaders for the play's characters. "Stalin must one day meet his judgment," Sheen declared. Two weeks later, Stalin died. Corbett Steinberg, TV Facts (New York: Facts on File Inc, 1980), p. 464.

90. Joe E. Barnhart, The Billy Graham Religion (Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1972), p. 34, cited in Michael R. Real, Mass-Mediated Culture (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977), p. 196.

91. Billy Graham, "Whither Bound", America's Hour of Decision (Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1951), pp. 139-141.

92. Harold J. Ockenga, "The Christian Answer to Communism", America's Hour of Decision (Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1951), p. 153.

93. See note 3, Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," in Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1962), p. 12, and Jeffrey K. Hadden and Anson Shupe, Televangelism: Power and Politics of God's Frontier (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1988), p. 52.

94. Irving E. Howard, "Protestant Prophets of Collectivism," in Kenneth W. Ingwalson (ed.), Your Church--Their Target (Arlington, Virginia: Better Books, 1966), p. 37.

95. "Prototype" is indeed the word, at least according to a September 16, 1953 memo from David O. Selznick to Louis B. Mayer regarding Mayer's proposed production Joseph and His Brethren, in Rudy Behlmer (ed), Memo From David O. Selznick (New York: Viking Press, 1972), pp. 416-420.

96. In my comparisons I rely on Janey Place's analysis of Noir characters, "Women in Film Noir", in E. Ann Kaplan (ed.), Women in Film Noir rev. ed. (London: BFI, 1980).

97. Eugene O'Neill, quoted in Eric F. Goldman, The Crucial Decade, p. 43.

98. Robert Ottoson, A Reference Guide to the American Film Noir: 1940-1958 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981) pp. 54-55. He derives this from A. M. Karini, Toward a Definition of the American Film Noir (1941-1949) (New York: Arno, 1976), pp. 43-45.

99. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 40.

100. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 185.

101. A Noir exception is Black Angel (1946), and a Bible film exception is The Story of Ruth (1960). In this case the expression "the exception proves the rule" is valid, as the films virtually invert gender roles and otherwise preserve their

genre's themes--except that the homme fatale, as it were, is attractive either for emotional sensitivity, financial security, or both. It is notable that, in variance with the personal or familial issues at stake with the female protagonist of Gothic or Noir, the Bible female protagonist's conflict is equally epic. In The Story of Ruth, for example, her acceptance or non-acceptance among the Hebrews is decisive in the lineage of King David and Jesus. The prototype of the homme fatale in all his dimensions and perversity is Uncle Charlie in Shadow of a Doubt (1943). Robert Ottoson, in A Reference Guide to the American Film Noir: 1940-1958 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981) pp. 54-55, comments on Gothic novel influence in reference to another Noir exception, Dark Waters (1944). Several Films, such as Gaslight (1944) and Dragonwyck (1946), clearly exhibit a conscious application of Gothic themes in Noir--but note too that these are both period films, in keeping with Gothic's tendency to place the story in a distant past. Hitchcock, in Suspicion (1941), Rebecca (1940) and Notorious (1946) manages to make both male and female antagonists at different points a victim, particularly in the latter two--although in Hitchcock, the influences of genre are less a matter of director following the form than the form allowing full expression of the director's predilections.

102. Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique (New York: Dell, 1964), p. 40

103. I would argue that this family theme is consistent even with films that have no significant female roles in them, such as Night and the City (1950); Harry Fabian is in a fallen society to begin with, but he activates the moribund codes of honor in wrestling by the extent of his amorality. He double-crosses his surrogate father, the wrestler Gregorius, and as a result Gregorius dies. The wrestler's true son emerges, and has Fabian killed.

104. This is more easily seen through contrast. Compare Sephora's relationship to Moses in The Ten Commandments to Bathsheba in David and Bathsheba.

105. There are exceptions in both genres. In Dead Reckoning (1947), Coral Chandler, the Noir sorceress, has no nurturing counterpart. Consequently, the Noir ending in which she dies is particularly bleak, as it suggests the moral code which is imminent in Rip Murdock has no female equivalent, and the social order is fundamentally corrupt. In Sodom and Gomorrah (1961), the Noir sorceress queen, Bera, is only the strongest example of a destructive Noir nature common to Lot's wife Ildith, and Lot's daughters Tamar and Shuah--although the latter two have this imminent destructive nature brought out by homme fatale Astaroth, who is interestingly also the Noir man victim of his femme fatale sister; the true femme fatale trumps homme fatale, we learn from

this film, but at best women simply are destruction held in check, acquiescent to law. No woman embodies a nurturing nature obedient to divine law.

106. Simone De Beauvoir, The Second Sex, p. 131.

107. Place, in Kaplan, p. 50.

108. The one variant from this pattern is Ruth in The Story of Ruth, who develops into an authoritative figure in her own right, much as male heroes do. She perhaps receives special dispensation from this rule as a maternal ancestor of Jesus.

109. One example of this is Mae West's "Eve and the Snake" radio play, which she performed several times in the late Thirties and Forties.

CHAPTER THREE

> "Escaped from the house of bondage, Israel of old did not follow after the ways of the Egyptians. To her was given an express dispensation; to her were given new things under the sun. And we Americans are the peculiar, chosen people, the Israel of our times; we bear the ark of the liberties of the world."
>
> --Herman Melville[1]

In 1951, Cecil B. DeMille met with the Paramount Pictures Corporation executive board to present to them the idea for his next film, The Ten Commandments. In his memoirs, DeMille recalled saying to the board that his audience had been writing to him: "The world needs a reminder, they said, of the Law of God; and it was evident in at least some of the letters that the world's awful experience of totalitarianism, fascist and communist, had made many thoughtful people realize anew that the Law of God is the essential bedrock of human freedom. That, I felt, was worth telling."[2]

DeMille felt that he had a calling to tell moral tales. His father, Henry DeMille, had during the Social Gospel period studied to be an Episcopal minister. His wife persuaded him that he could

reach more people by turning to theater. Cecil DeMille followed his father into the theater, and helped found one of the earliest Hollywood film production companies, the Lasky Feature Play Company, in 1913.[3] As he described it later, he saw film as an opportunity to follow his father's calling to deliver religious messages to the masses: "[W]hen I came along the mantle fell on my shoulders in a new form which was the motion picture, and I was able to reach hundreds of millions [with religious messages].[4]

DeMille was a religious conservative. Like William Jennings Bryant, he saw the coastlines of the United States as enemy territory, where "not people live, only smart alecks."[5] When he previewed a film to test it with audiences, he did so in cities like Denver, Salt Lake City, Omaha, and Kansas City. In Kansas City, when a reporter asked him about critics who called his films corny, he said: "Be proud of corn. Corn is soul, corn is that which makes you cry and laugh. Yes, my pictures have corn and I am proud of it."[6] The Ten Commandments invokes canonic stories of the past as iconic models[7] to redefine and guide the identity and behavior of the United States in the world--and more broadly, of other nations with similar

internal conflicts. DeMille's film re-mediates its social context, rather than passively conveys it, in accordance with the perspective of his political orientation. As with his first Ten Commandments, which intercut a modern story showing what happened to those who did and did not obey the Ten Commandments, DeMille wanted his audience to draw the parallel between the United States' troubles in the world and a failure to adhere to the "corny" heartland values he advocated.

The Ten Commandments, although it was neither first nor last, is the best film to examine the agenda-setting common of the Bible films. It is perhaps the epic culmination of the Bible story films emergent in the post-WWII Cold War context. Unlike many of the films which followed in later years, which were more self-consciously "biblical" in theme, it has a sincerity of execution and a sureness of its convictions that has kept it from seeming as dated as its cohort. Common to the Bible morality films is the conflict between the Chosen People, either of Israel or of Christ, and the Immoral Empire. The conflict in them is usually a matter of the hero perceiving more clearly the dichotomies between good and evil

behavior, and choosing the good. Typically this means the rejection of an assertive female character's attempts to control the male protagonist in favor of an identification with the divine paternal voice. Occasionally, as in Salome (1953) and Samson and Delilah (1949), the seductive, assertive female brings about the downfall of the hero and then repents, turning against her society. If the protagonist is allowed a romantic interest, it is displaced from the assertive woman to a passive woman, who occasionally (as in Demetrius and the Gladiators, 1954) reminds the hero of his proper attachment to the divine Father. This choice is made usually at the cost of abandoning lifestyle, friends, and even life. In Samson and Delilah (1949), Samson must learn not to trust his wife. She (although repentant) and all her relatives are destroyed when Samson commits suicide in penance for his earlier traitorous lack of will by tearing down the enemy temple.

Cecil B. DeMille, the director of The Ten Commandments, initiated both periods of Bible films, in 1923 with the first The Ten Commandments, and in 1949 with Samson and Delilah. When his father, Henry DeMille, turned from his idea of becoming an Episcopal

minister in favor of teaching people through the theater, he became a playwright. He teamed up with David Belasco to produce Broadway shows. Henry DeMille died when Cecil was nine, and Cecil's older brother William began writing plays to support the family. Cecil DeMille grew up around the theaters in which his father and brother's plays were staged by Belasco. Cecil DeMille became an actor and playwright himself. He was not particularly successful in either occupation. In 1913, when DeMille, along with his friends Samuel Goldfish (later Goldwyn) and Jessie Lasky, started the Lasky Feature Play Company, DeMille was put in charge of production,[8] and began, as he saw it, to take up his father's mission of teaching moral beliefs to the world.[9]

Among DeMille's beliefs were right-to-work laws. He was a member of the American Federation of Radio Artists union (AFRA). In 1944 the union assessed a $1.00 fee to help fight a California ballot proposition that would have established open shops in the state. DeMille was for the proposition, and alone among the union members, he refused to pay the fee. The ballot measure was defeated, and after much publicity and several months of arguing,

DeMille's membership was suspended, forcing him off the weekly Lux Hour radio show he hosted. DeMille instigated legal proceedings against AFRA. He lost, and appealed. In the Fall of 1945, DeMille and some like-minded associates established the DeMille Foundation for Political Freedom. A few months later he lost his final appeal when the United States Supreme Court declined to take his case. He had the political affiliation of AFRA's board of directors investigated.[10]

DeMille's career as a filmmaker was financially successful, although critics usually attacked his movies: "The critics say my pictures are full of hokum. Well, what is hokum? It is pure and simple emotion. Christ making the blind girl see, I suppose, is hokum. They say my pictures are spectacles. Was the crucifixion a spectacle? That had a lot of people."[11] In the late 40's, he was convinced that "there was a world conspiracy attacking him through his pictures"[12] and that atheistic Communists were responsible for the negative reviews his films received from the critics. "They are a Communist ring and if you can check the foreign critics I know that's what you'll find. It's a Red band circling the earth, and this is one of the ways they're fighting me." [13] On hearing from an aide that

the New Yorker had ridiculed Samson and Delilah, DeMille shouted at him: "Do you think for a moment that the New Yorker crowd cares whether Samson and Delilah is good or bad! This is a political attack against me, against my beliefs! It has nothing to do with the picture."[14] This personal history was what DeMille brought to his filmmaking when, in 1951, he began the background work for The Ten Commandments.

The Ten Commandments begins with a montage of hundreds of slaves building pyramids in the desert. Over this image of enforced labor, DeMille narrates an epic invocation summarizing the Bible from Genesis to Exodus that establishes the dominant theme which will unify the film's stories, the metaphoric conflict between Light and Darkness.[15] In his summary, DeMille reduces the theme of Genesis to the metaphor of "Good is Light/Evil is Dark." God created a material world out of the darkness, and gave humans dominion over it. "But each sought to do his own will, because he knew not the light of God's law." As a consequence of this lack of spiritual "light," "the conquered were made to serve the conqueror; the weak were made to serve the strong; and freedom was gone from the

world." This is a distortion of the Bible. In Genesis and Exodus, the Israelites are not conquered or defeated, but rather enslaved some generations after moving to the land of Goshen. This journey was by invitation of Pharaoh and his chief minister, Joseph, son of Israel, in a time of famine; but this history of former comradeship is irrelevant to DeMille's story. Many of the miscellaneous laws which follow the Ten Commandments are directly concerned with rules governing treatment of slaves. But DeMille's elisions of the text serve to establish the sense of a golden age destroyed by a spreading disease of darkness. "So did the Egyptians cause the children of Israel to serve with rigor," DeMille continues, paraphrasing Exodus 1:10-15.

But then DeMille introduces Moses, ". . . a man, upon whose mind and heart would be written God's law, and God's commandments. One man, to stand alone against an empire . . . ." Moses is notable in Exodus for his indecisiveness and personal weaknesses. He grows into his role. In contrast, DeMille's Moses has within himself an innate knowledge of God's law; he acts on this knowledge from the beginning of the film, but the range of his sense of justice is

restrained by an improper paternal affiliation with Egypt. This is in accord with some of the more panegyric commentaries on the American character contemporary with DeMille's youth: "The very first pilgrim that set foot upon the rock at Plymouth, stepped forth a living constitution, armed at all points to defend and to perpetuate the liberty to which he had devoted his whole being," H. S. Legare said.[16] "I raised you above my own son because I saw in you a worth, and a greatness above other men," Pharaoh Sethi will say to Moses later in the film. Reflecting, but not knowing "God's light," DeMille's Moses is a hero in search of his identity, bound by his ignorance, unaware of the subversion that surrounds him.

DeMille's alteration of Moses fits into a broader narrative context in which the issues he takes up will be presented. In the narrative prologue which opens the film, we find Rameses I staring into a fire. The camera tracks out to a Long Shot to reveal Rameses sitting in a chair on a raised platform. His principle advisors stand at a lower level, and at their feet is a scribe. Pharaoh is ruddily lit, but the advisors are lit with a bluish light; this color scheme is a recurrent motif, to which we will return. The principal priest

reports that an "evil star" indicates that the Hebrew slaves will revolt, led by a deliverer who has just been born--no reference to gods, I would point out, but natural signs. On hearing of this intelligence report, Pharaoh's commander takes a step forward and says, violently, "then the Hebrews shall die!" "Slaves are wealth, Commander," Pharaoh objects, turning away from the light of the fire and facing the shadows--a not insignificant gesture, as we will see the dichotomy of light and dark reiterated throughout the film. "The more slaves we have, the more bricks we make." "I would still see fewer bricks made, and fewer Hebrews in Goshen," the commander says. "It is our Eastern gate." The Priest, who is in the foreground--furthest from the light--gazing off in the distance, says that since only the newborn (male) children are dangerous, only the newborn need be sacrificed. After a pause, Pharaoh gives the order the Priest suggests: "Every newborn Hebrew manchild shall die. So let it be written; so let it be done." The priest claps his hands and points to the scribe, who writes the order. The commander leaves to carry it out. "So speaks Rameses the first," the priest cries out, gazing toward the heavens.

In this brief scene, DeMille establishes the central preoccupations and limitations of the Egyptian empire. He presents an empire--and the Egyptians in general--as guided by pragmatism, rather than idealism; reason, rather than faith. He presents religion not as a matter of faith in laws established by gods, but rather as a science of divination. Priests are something like spymasters. Instead of establishing the moral goals and reasons for the existence of the state--which is what Moses will do later when he receives the ten commandments--Pharaoh's priests possess instrumental knowledge only, directed to preserve and extend the power of the state as represented by Pharaoh. The Egyptians treat Pharaoh's words as divine--a twisted version of the "Word made Manifest" theme of the prologue to the Book of John--but DeMille frames this as hubris, by linking this scene to the prologue: The room is indoors, and dimly lit. Pharaoh looks at the light from a small brazier, and turns away to look to the shadows as he listens to his priest, and assents to murder. The Pharaoh is a false god, and the movement of the film will be to reveal this truth.

Preservation of Pharaoh's personal power is the means by

which the state's power is conceptualized in this empire. The only moral imperatives the Egyptian state recognize are self-preservation, and the conservation and extension of power. As Pharaoh is the embodiment of power in the state, his every act is a selfish act. Every subject is his slave, and the government is organized to preserve itself in him. The state is organized so that the Pharaoh's selfish interests coincide with the preservation of the power structure through which they are expressed. The Hebrews, as nominal slaves, are at the bottom of this pyramid of slavery. DeMille seems to suggest that any nation which is not guided by the external "light" of god's law must set up artificial deities.

An empire informed by a divinatory yet rational science, ruled by a divine leader whose word is law, and guided by pragmatic self-interest rather than morality--in all of this we have a right-wing allegorical model of the U.S.S.R., informed by Marxism's science of history, ruled by Stalin, and guided by imperialism rather than morality. However, Egypt is a complex mixture of allegories. If the U.S.S.R. is a state thoroughly infected with the Communism "disease," then it follows that this allegory both denotes the U.S.S.R.

and connotes also the future of other nations which do not attack and destroy the disease spreading within. But Egypt is also a patriarchy. The motivation for action in the film derives in each case from the threat of female opposition or subversion of patriarchal rule: Bithiah, Pharaoh's daughter and Sethi's sister, defies her father and saves Moses from death. Nefreteri's efforts to place Moses on the throne motivate Rameses' particular hatred of Moses, and as Rameses' wife, Nefreteri "hardens" Rameses' heart and causes the destruction of Egypt's army at the end of the film. What is the role of this threat to patriarchy for the film's theme?

Michael Rogin[17] and Norman Podhoretz[18], among others, have pointed out that the family served as a model for conceiving of subversion and competing ideals. Podhoretz found in his study of the family in early television "plays"[19] that the father was presented as the possessor of natural authority, the voice of reason. In narratives of reinforcement, the father preserves the family from disruption by reason, advice, and good will against external forces and internal strains and dissent. The mother in this narrative "is not so much by as on the side of her husband. If she asserts her

personality too forcefully, we may be sure that calamity will result. Evil, when it makes one of its rare visits to these plays, is likely to come in the shape of a domineering wife or an overly possessive mother," Podhoretz writes.[20] The domestic conflicts which motivate movies like Mildred Pierce (1945), The Lady From Shanghai (1948), Rebel Without a Cause (1955), The Man Who Knew Too Much (1956) and Ten North Frederick (1958) are also founded on this sense of "natural law."

Michael Rogin examines the world of horrors outside the home as revealed in the movies, stories too threatening to be television series, and, confirming Podhoretz, finds behind them a dangerously assertive matriarchal force. In movies such as My Son John (1952), Kiss Me Deadly (1955), The Thing (1951), and I Married a Communist (1950), the consistent pattern he finds is of families in which the presumed natural order of paternalism has been displaced, or is under threat, by self-assertive women. He argues that these films merge women and matriarchal power with Communism, and "[shift] the locus of anxiety from the American State to the American family, on the one hand, and the Russian state, on the other."[21]

There is a complex history behind this representation of women which I can only briefly mention here. In the majority of representations of women prior to World War II, the prototype woman was "a vessel of the race...a still, deep sexual being...a biological force under a compelling instinct to find a safe place to lay her babies, and before that she is in subconscious search for a man who will give her the babies and help her to find a place to lay them."[22] Before growing into this destiny a girl, because she was not yet a sexual being, "could dictate her needs, act on her whims, and meddle in the business of all concerned,"[23] as Shirley Temple often did in her films. This phase could extend into early adulthood, but then the woman-child became a comic figure, like Katherine Hepburn in Bringing Up Baby (1938), engaged in a subconscious search for the male figure who would help her find her proper orientation. Serious questioning of these roles, as in Hepburn's Sylvia Scarlet (1937), rarely were filmed, and were not popular. In its more sinister incarnation, the active woman--for example, Jean Arthur in Mr.Deeds Goes To Town (1936) and Mr. Smith Goes to Washington (1939), or Greta Garbo in Ninotchka (1939)--nearly

brings about the destruction of the proper social order by maintaining her selfhood as an agent of an organization until she is willing to recognize and yield to the proper paternal figure, and to discover herself in the service of his will rather than her own, and in her identity as part of a couple or as a parent instead of her identity as an individual. In this role, the "natural role" for the adult female, she is self-sacrificing, the maternal figure who, like Barbara Stanwyk in Stella Dallas (1937)[24], acts only to further the interests of others.

During World War II, labor shortages (and perhaps the existence of a predominantly female audience) led to the validation of a new active role for adult women. Women were nurses with duties in They Were Expendable (1945) and So Proudly We Hail (1943); government employees in Government Girl (1943) and The More The Merrier (1943); spies in Flight for Freedom (1943); and factory workers building war weapons in Swing Shift Maisie (1943) and Meet the People (1944). As Stanley Cavell has documented in Pursuits of Happiness, social remediation of appropriate roles for women was the principle theme of screwball comedies both before

and after the war years, reflecting an "inner agenda of [the] culture."[25] What makes these war films different is that the concept of an active woman is less the subject of the narrative than the predicate to the narrative; where these woman take on jobs, they do not so much fight to accomplish this as they yield to the expectations of their society.

Many women appreciated the opportunities the war provided for an active role outside of the home; 95 percent of the woman war workers who originally had planned to quit after victory intended to stay with their jobs.[26] But with the end of the war, industrial leaders and government officials expected the paradigm of womanhood to shift back to the pre-war model, both because returning soldiers would need jobs, which were expected to be scarce. "From a humanitarian point of view, too many women should not stay in the labor force. The home is the basic American unit," the chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers opined.[27] Returning soldiers regarded the changed state of women with suspicion: "Many American war veterans are silently bearing some unexpected rehabilitation difficulties in coming home to what used

to be a pleasantly pliable and even appealingly incompetent little woman and finding a quietly masterful creature recognizing no limitations to her own endurance," a magazine author observed.[28] Social institutions resisted the idea that Rosie the Riveter was an acceptable post-war social role for women.

In contrast to the war years, women in films who attempted to be independent and to choose their own destiny in the postwar years, as was true of Hepburn's characters in Adam's Rib (1948) and The African Queen (1951) became exceptional rather than typical. More commonly, such women were presented as immoral, dangerous, antisocial, and emotionally unbalanced. Particularly in film noirs, the outcome of their attempts to assert control (Double Indemnity [1944]; The Lady From Shanghai; Mildred Pierce; Out of the Past [1947]) usually resulted in disaster for themselves and their loved ones. Often women in films were split into two character types. Janey Place describes the independent type as "the spider woman." Her counterpart Place calls "the nurturing woman;"[29] if the "spider woman" is a sinister interpretation of the war-woman, the "nurturing woman" is a return to the 30's ideal. Place describes the

interaction between the two as follows:

> [In] Out of the Past...one woman (Ann) is firmly rooted in the pastoral environment, static, undemanding and rather dull, while the other (Kathie) is exciting, criminal, very active and sexy. In this film the lack of excitement offered by the safe woman is so clearly contrasted with the sensual, passionate appeal of the other that the detective's destruction is inevitable.[30]

Simone De Beauvoir also speaks of the noir "spider woman" type:

> The woman who makes free use of her attractiveness--adventuress, vamp, *femme fatale*--remains a disquieting type. The image of Circe survives in the bad women of Hollywood films.... In place of the myth of the laborious honeybee or the mother hen is substituted the myth of the devouring female insect; the praying mantis, the spider. No longer is the female she who nurses the little ones, but rather she who eats the male; the egg is no longer a storehouse of abundance, but rather a trap of inert matter in which the spermatozoon is castrated and drowned.[31]

Even films opposed to this trend--Adam's Rib (1948), for example--tend to invoke the threat of personal and social destruction for both men and women before negotiating stable identities. Katharine Hepburn, Rosalind Russell, and a few other actresses occasionally played roles in which they were both nurturers and destroyers. Such ambiguity in women's roles--which suggested that women's interactions with others in society were dependent on more than

submission to biological destiny--were relatively rare in this period.

We see this dichotomy emerge in the first two women to whom The Ten Commandments introduces us. Moses is born, and Moses's mother Yoshobel and his sister Miriam send him off into the Nile to save his life from Rameses I's order to have newborns killed. The princess Bithiah, Rameses I's daughter, is the one who finds the child in the water. But what "type" of woman is she? This is the dramatic problem of this scene. We are shown Bithiah bathing on the banks of the Nile, along with other ladies of the court. The topic of conversation is pragmatic, rather than idealistic: Which is better, money or men? Money, they conclude, for "with money you can get any man." Here we have the voice of the spider woman the doctrine of seductive power, the same doctrine that How to Marry a Millionaire (1953) asserts only to deny in its ending. The doctrine espoused is fundamentally threatening to the paternal order, as these women are suggesting that they should themselves hold power, rather than the men which they will acquire later. This theme is repeated moments later when one of the women warns Bithiah to be

careful of crocodiles. "Bithiah could charm tears from a crocodile," one lady tells another.

But Bithiah's "type" is not so easily ascertained. As Bithiah wades off alone into the reeds, one of the women responds to the comment that men can be had with money by saying, "gold will not fill an empty heart." We cut from a long shot of the group to a medium shot of Bithiah, who looks sad, and then to a medium long shot of the women. Memnet, Bithiah's body-servant, wearing a blue mantle, steps forward and chides the other princesses for talking about men, as Bithiah's husband was recently killed: "You fools--talk about empty hearts before the Pharaoh's daughter! What is in her heart but the memory of a dead husband?" These comments suggest attributes of the nurturing woman. We cut back to Bithiah discovering Baby Moses in his bulrushes basket. She tells Memnet to send away the princesses, and pulls the child from the water. Memnet kneels down (as Bithiah stands up) and plucks at a bit of red fabric in the child's basket, and is alarmed: it is a Hebrew cloth, and thus a Hebrew child, one of those condemned to death by Pharaoh. No matter, Bithiah says, as she picks up the child and wraps it in

Memnet's blue mantle, which she has lain down. "It is a royal robe. I am Pharaoh's daughter. This is my son; he shall be raised in my house, a prince of the two lands." She asserts her authority over Pharaoh's law. We cut to a medium two-shot as Memnet stands, faces Bithiah, and says that she will not see this happen. "You will see it, Memnet . . . and you will serve him as you serve me." Bithiah orders Memnet to "sink the basket into silence," and we cut to a long shot showing Bithiah standing and Memnet kneeling. Memnet sinks the basket. We cut to a medium close-up of her as she hides the Hebrew cloth, and return to the long shot showing her kneeling in front of Bithiah, emphasizing her submission as Bithiah swears her to silence on pain of death.

Bithiah seems at this point to represent more the spider woman than the nurturer. She will become Moses' mother, but because he fulfills her needs, not the other way around; and she will do so in defiance of paternal authority. The motifs of light and darkness repeated again, here signified by red and blue. Memnet wears blue, and she speaks for Pharaoh. Moses symbolically passes from the proper paternal affiliation (his sister Miriam, watching

from the reeds, wears a red cap) to the improper paternal affiliation by changing from red to blue the cloth with which he's wrapped.

We see here as well DeMille's typical strategy in constructing scenes. DeMille's father was a playwright who worked with the theater impresario David Belasco, and DeMille grew up in the theater. He constructs his scenes by using the language of stage settings and stage blockings. The camera serves for him primarily as something like the equivalent of the raked stage: He uses it occasionally to emphasize power relations by his choice of angles. Occasionally he will isolate a key detail with a close-up, such as in his shot of Memnet hiding the Hebrew cloth. More commonly, he uses the camera as a recording device rather than a storytelling device. Thus the rebellious Memnet stands up and faces Bithiah, and the defeated Memnet kneels. The camera serves to emphasize the language of the scene blocking rather than to add anything of its own. The motifs of red and blue (and, occasionally, gold and black) for light and darkness appear throughout the film's mise-en-scene. Egyptian characters sometimes are seen wearing red, but this is done in the context of their roles of authority (thus they are false

lights) or, in the case of Nefreteri later in the film, in the context of emphasizing a movement from innocence to evil. Red and blue, in interaction with the blocking, serve to underline the thematic implications of conflicts.

In comparing these two opening scenes, there is certainly a more sympathetic motivation for Bithiah's actions than those of her father. Bithiah seems to be acting in the interest of "light." The blue mantle she wears is a reminder for us that this is incorrect. This scene is in daylight, where the other is in shadows, and the priest in particular in bluish shadows. But the underlying link of colors suggests this is less of a qualitative contrast than it seems. Bithiah expresses no concern for all the other Hebrew children killed. It is this particular child's good fortune that Bithiah, possessed of power and position, has an empty heart. The child, by her father Rameses I's orders, should be killed, but to Bithiah the orders have no relevance if no one knows that they have been defied. Memnet, "daughter and granddaughter of slaves," as she tells us, is morally offended by the idea of being ruled by a slave, and is absolutely adherent to the paternal law. Bithiah, by contrast, is

pragmatic and selfish: She has an empty heart, and as she has the power and opportunity to acquire a child, she does so. The security of the state is irrelevant to her, as are the rules of her father.

We cut ahead some decades later. Bithiah's brother Sethi is now Pharaoh, and has (we are told later) adopted Bithiah's son. In Exodus, Moses is a very timorous, uncertain leader, completely lacking in self-confidence. God, not Moses, is the hero of the story. DeMille's Moses on the other hand is a seasoned leader, inherently endowed with command. We see him arriving in triumph from a successful war, shot from a low angle riding in a chariot, acknowledging the cheers of the people on the street. Above, Nefreteri gazes down at him and tells Memnet of her love for Moses, as Memnet (wearing blue again) looks on darkly. Moses is a particular kind of heroic figure. At the end of the last century, C. W. Upham described George Washington as follows:

> In his stature and conformation he is a noble specimen of a man. In the various exercises of muscular power, on foot or in the saddle, he excels all competitors. His admirable physical traits are in perfect accordance with the properties of his mind and heart; and over all, crowning all, is a beautiful, and in one so young, a strange dignity of manners, and of mein,--a calm seriousness, a sublime self-control, which at once

> compels the veneration, attracts the confidence, and secures the favor of all who behold him. That youth is the Leader whom Heaven is preparing to conduct America through her approaching trial.[32]

Upham's comments of the divine national hero could have been taken as a character description of Moses.

Prior to Nefreteri's scene is one of more significance. From Moses in his chariot, we cut high above to Rameses (the second), Sethi's son, watching Moses. Behind Rameses is the Pharaoh Sethi, being dressed for the arrival ceremony, in which Moses will present the tribute of Egypt's newly conquered territory. Rameses turns from the window to join his father in a medium two-shot.

> Sethi: He proclaims his coming from afar, does he not, my son. Rameses: Such favor with the people can be dangerous, great Sethi. Sethi: To whom, Rameses? To me, or to you?
> Rameses: It would not be the first time that fame turned a Prince against a Pharaoh.
> Sethi: Or envy brother against his brother.
> Rameses: Envy is for the weak.
> Sethi: And beauty is for the strong, eh? That is what you have in mind."
> Rameses: If you mean Nefreteri, yes, my father.
> Sethi: Is it that the princess is beautiful that attracts you, Rameses, or the fact that she must marry the man I choose to follow me to the throne?
> Rameses: I am the son of your body; who else could be your heir?
> Sethi: [closeup] The man best able to rule Egypt will

follow me. I owe that to my fathers, not to my sons.
Rameses: [closeup] I shall follow you.
Sethi: [two-shot] Shall you? I sent Moses to destroy a city; he returns in triumph. I sent you to build a city. [pause; Sethi turns and looks at Rameses] Where is it?
Rameses: It will arise when I have put fear into the stiff-necked Hebrew slaves who build it. But this I know, my father: [Rameses lifts the crown of Egypt from a pillow held by a slave and hands it to Sethi] No pretended brother will ever have your crown--or Nefreteri.
Sethi: Indeed. Whomever I choose shall have my crown--and Nefreteri. [takes crown from Rameses and hands back to slave]

In this scene we see the issues of the previous two scenes reiterated and linked. The Egyptian standard of behavior is determined by the Moral Accounting metaphor, in which deeds have value, and may be stored or expended.[33] Rameses and Moses are both personal servants of Pharaoh. Rameses assumes that Moses' service is guided by self-interest. If he seems to be trying to gain the favor of the people--who do not matter--then it must be because Moses desires to overthrow Pharaoh's power in favor of his own. Sethi evaluates both his natural and adopted sons' competence, assuming that each are motivated by the desire to be the next pharaoh. The standard presented is that the most selfish son, the one who will brook no opposition to the performance of his will, should be

Pharaoh. "I owe that to my fathers," Sethi says. The one law that Pharaohs have is the preservation of the institution which they rule. The irony of this scene, which DeMille emphasizes by Rameses's unknowingly apt reference to Moses as his "pretended brother," and by the staging business of having Sethi take his crown from Rameses and hand it to a slave, is that the concealed injustice of this empire is about to be made manifest by the revelation that Moses is a slave, and the institution is about to crumble. It is an adroit foreshadowing, a bit of dramatic irony typical of classical drama.

The throne room scene which follows is one of those visual spectacles which mark epic films. Massive wooden doors open, like a theater curtain drawn back, and Moses strides onto the scene, and walks toward the throne. He is announced with drums and trumpets, and dancing women toss flower-petals in his path as hundreds of courtiers cheer the recitation of his exploits. At his command, exotically-clad women enter bearing the tribute of Ethiopia, the country he has conquered. The king and princess of Ethiopia enter as well. Rameses, with his keen sense of the proprieties of servitude, attempts to exert his superior status over Moses by telling Moses,

"command [the Ethiopian rulers] to kneel before Pharaoh." "Command what you have conquered, my brother," Moses replies, walking down the steps from Rameses and Pharaoh's level to the level of the Ethiopians--a foreshadowing of his future identity with the oppressed. "I bring the Ethiopian king and his sister in friendship, as an ally to guard our southern gates." Where Rameses would have made Ethiopia a slave nation, Moses has made Ethiopia an ally who acknowledges the leadership of Egypt. Sethi says, "my son has dealt wisely with you, Ethiopia. Welcome, as a friend." By acting so considerately after defeating Ethiopia, Sethi realizes, Moses has made the Southern border safer than it would have been if it consisted of an oppressed Ethiopia. He is pleased.

The Ethiopian princess serves as a catalyst for bringing up the issue again of who will succeed Sethi. We cut to a medium shot of the very attractive Princess, clad in one of DeMille's trademark bare-midriff outfits: "Great King, I will ask but one favor of your friendship: [she removes necklace with stone] this green stone from our mountains, that I may give it to your prince of Egypt; for he is kind, as well as wise." We cut from her to a two-shot of Nefreteri

and Sethi. The implied suggestion is that were Sethi inclined to cement further Ethiopia's loyalty by a royal marriage between her and her conqueror, she would certainly be willing. Nefreteri glares at the Ethiopian as Sethi remarks sardonically that "it is pleasing to the gods to see a man honored by his enemies." "And such a beautiful enemy," Nefreteri adds jealously; she has her own royal wedding plans. Goaded by her comment, Rameses suggests that Moses be sent to Goshen, to take over from him construction of Sethi's necropolis. Nefreteri objects--Rameses is just trying to separate Sethi from Moses. "Or you, my dear," he replies. "I think our roosters would crow more quietly on another roof." Sethi orders both Moses and Rameses to Goshen. Moses will take over from Rameses the task of building the necropolis. Rameses is given the task to discover the identity of the "deliverer," the rumor of whose advent he blames for his own inability to build the necropolis. If found, the deliverer should be brought back in chains. "So let it be written," Rameses says, invoking the familiar pattern of making manifest the spoken will of Pharaoh, "so let it be done."

Moses exhibits his variance from the Egyptian Moral

Accounting rule of selfishness or sycophancy further when he is alone with Nefreteri, prior to his departure. As they stand together, embracing, Nefreteri tells Moses that he must succeed, for then Sethi will deny him nothing, including the throne of Egypt. "I will build the city for the love of Sethi, not for the throne of Egypt," Moses replies irritably, stepping away from Nefreteri. He is motivated not by the desire for power, but by God's law, written "in his mind and heart." He must honor his Egyptian adoptive father with duty and obedience, as he will soon step away from Nefreteri to honor his Egyptian mother Bithiah. This is so completely out of Nefreteri's comprehension that she sees his words as childishly silly, and laughs. "But I am Egypt," she says, and kisses Moses. Predicated in this is that even if he is so silly as to not want the throne, but merely her, one cannot be had without the other. Like Bithiah's princesses bathing in the Nile, she knows that love must follow power.

But Nefreteri's laugh implies more than mere amusement at Moses. We cut to Bithiah and Memnet observing the kiss. They walk into the frame, and Moses leaves Nefreteri to greet her. "The

conqueror already conquered? . . . marry her if you can, my son," Bithiah says, "but never fall in love with her." Why? Rameses and Sethi will speak more directly to the point later, but the implication is clear already from what we know. She is the spider-woman type. If Moses, by loving Nefreteri more than she loves him, becomes her servant, then hers will be the selfish will that governs Egypt. The desire to rule is more ambitious than Bithiah's desire to defy her childlessness (in accordance with the progressive decline implied by the disease metaphor), and underlies the suspicion which Bithiah, and later Sethi and Rameses, express regarding Nefreteri's behavior.

Egypt is a patriarchy, and as we have seen in Podhoretz, Rogin, and Place, the spider woman type is driven to displace patriarchy with a matriarchy, in which she will rule. The myth of woman, Simone De Beauvoir says, is that

> ...woman is not fully integrated into the world of men; as the other, she is opposed to them.... Woman is the siren whose song lures sailors upon the rocks; she is Circe, who changes her lovers into beasts, the undine who draws fishermen into the depths of pools. The man captivated by her charms no longer has will-power, enterprise, future; he is no longer a citizen, but mere flesh enslaved to its desires, cut off from the community, bound to the moment.... The perverse sorceress arrays passion against duty, the present

> moment against all time to come; she detains the traveler far from home, she pours him the drink of forgetfulness.[34]

Woman "is related to nature; she incarnates it," De Beauvoir says.[35] "Man aspires to make Spirit triumph over Life, action over passivity; his consciousness keeps nature at a distance, his will shapes her," and thus the threat of female allure is to lose Spirit, to become again a child, to be "again beset with life, nature, and passivity."[36] Nature is expected to be passive, the object of male activity rather than itself an active agent.[37] An active nature can only be destructive, or at best mindlessly creative.[38] In accordance with this metaphoric myth, an active, self-willed woman therefore is not reasonable, but rather irrational; "unconquered Nature, counter to all goodness."[39] She is an anarchic force that tears down rather than builds. DeMille was no exception to his times; if anything, he was more willing than most to see the assertive woman as a force of evil: "Feminine allure is a ruthless tool that has changed the course of civilizations," he once said; he introduced himself to the actress Claudette Colbert by saying, "to me, you are the wickedest woman in the world," and asked her to play Nero's wife Poppaea in his film

Sign of the Cross (1932).[40] For DeMille, in an Egypt where a woman rules, history ends.

Combining Podhoretz's, Rogin's, Place's and my own observations of such narratives, this threat to the appropriate paternal order of the family seems to function as a metaphor domain through which another form of subversion, Communism, may be better understood. This metaphor, SOCIETY IS A FAMILY, constructed with the aid of the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor, may be mapped as follows:[41]

Metaphor	Application
1. Father figure/paternal authority (reason; action; mind; MAN IS SPIRIT)	1. U.S. government/industry leaders (leaders)
2. Mother/woman (passion; passivity; body; WOMAN IS NATURE)	2. Collective organizations of the "led"
3. Female authority (usually non-procreative sexuality associated with a desire to replace paternal with maternal authority)	3. Collective leadership as opposed to hierarchical leadership (in this case, Communism)
4. Sexual seduction	4. Ideological seduction
5. Self-denial	5. Traditional virtue (in this case, pre-New-Deal social policy
6. License	6. Non-traditional social policy (in this case, New Deal policy)
7. Children	7. Citizens

In the relevant social contexts of this period, the characteristics of woman as a type are mapped onto the theoretical goals of Communism. Just as Circe turns men into beasts, and replaces spiritual goals with physical desires, so Communism is seen as a mysterious loss of selfhood in a collective mass. To become Communist is to return to the womb, to be one with the mother. "Biology is out of control in such movies as Them!, The Thing, and Invasion of the Body Snatchers," Rogin says. "Promiscuous, undifferentiated, vegetable reproduction threatens family bonds."[42] In Them! (1954), nests of giant female collectivist ants establish themselves outside of Los Angeles. "Ants are `chronic aggressors, [who] make slave laborers out of their captives,'" Rogin quotes one of Them!'s scientists as saying. "'Unless the queens are destroyed,' he warns, `man as the dominant species on this planet will probably be destroyed.'"[43] If Communism is a seductive force, and if this seduction produces destruction, then this state of patriarchical control which we are shown in The Ten Commandments must be seen to be unstable: Egypt will survive so long as it has a strong leader resistant to female seduction. Otherwise it must continue to

deteriorate and finally collapse under female influence.

DeMille takes us next from Nefreteri and the intrigues of Pharaoh's palace to the Hebrew slaves in Goshen. Joshua, a stone-cutter, and Lilia, a water-bearer. Joshua--in contrast to Pharaoh and Rameses' inactivity--Pharaoh in particular is almost always pictured sitting--swings down his rope to take a drink of water; DeMille is making reference here to the Douglas Fairbanks hero-type, a reference still current through the persistence of the Fairbanks physical hero in pirate films. His active physicality is meant to contrast with Dathan, the Hebrew chief overseer.[44] Dathan, whom Lilia defines as being able to "look through stone," wants Lilia for himself. He is like Rameses, crafty and verbal, not open and physical; both he and Rameses frequently are shown seated. By contrast, Moses (and Joshua) always are either standing or moving. Joshua and Lilia's love is not intermingled with power agendas. Dathan, on the other hand, has completely adopted the Egyptian code. It is he to whom Rameses delegates the task of identifying the deliverer.

Up to this point in the film, Moses has behaved outwardly in

accordance with the Egyptian code, in part because the servitude to the will of Pharaoh which the code requires coincides with the law of God written in his mind: He must honor his father. That others ascribe selfishness to Moses' actions rather than selflessness has been because his obedience has been coincident to the question of succession. Those who know better--Sethi, when his suspicions about such puzzling selflessness are not inflamed by Rameses; Bithiah; Nefreteri--find his eccentric nature endearing, even though they do not understand it. Thus, from the Egyptian point of view, what follows is a tragic tale of the hero undone by peculiar weaknesses of his nature.

Visually and psychologically, Moses's horizons open in Goshen. Even in his triumph at the beginning of the film, he was pictured as a figure enclosed by walls. He is under the open sky in Goshen, surrounded by thousands of slaves pulling massive stones at his orders. He immediately is confronted with contradictions between the Law written in him and Pharaoh's law as practiced upon the Hebrews. An old woman--who just happens to be Yoshobel, Moses' true mother--catches her garment under a giant stone being pulled

into place by press gangs. The Egyptian taskmasters refuse to stop the stone to save the life of an old slave woman. Joshua, true to type, swings down on his rope from the area where he has been stone-cutting, knocks the lead Egyptian overseer into the path of the stone as well, and thus forces the overseers in charge of individual press-gangs to stop the stone's progress. Striking an Egyptian means death for Joshua. Yoshobel tells Lilia that she must go to Prince Moses and appeal for mercy. Moses comes to investigate the incident, and is moved to pity by the sight of the old, frail woman caught under the stone, remarking that she should not be put to labor at all. "They use the old ones to do the work of greasing the stones, my prince," the master builder Baka explains. "If they fall down, it is no loss." Moses is appalled at what is in effect a policy of murder: "Are you a master builder, or a master butcher?"

Moses' question suggests more than it says, as the answers to it reveal. Moses is questioning not just the morality of this specific policy, but the more general attitude regarding the Hebrews as instruments to be used rather than as people. Communism regards conventional morality as "a product...of the economic conditions of

society obtaining at the time." A universal human morality exists, but it can only be fully understood in the context of a classless society.[45] The Right interpreted this as having no morality at all except as was emergent from instrumental goals, a natural corollary to a godless state.[46] Moses's question, then, from a Right-wing point of view, serves a similar function to the eldest son's questions about Passover practices will serve later on in the film: as an exemplar of the difference between the morality of God and the morality of the state.

In its service as a plot device, Moses's question sets him on the path to discovering himself, and to discover the nature of Egyptian society. We cut away from what has been a two-shot of Moses and Baka to a medium shot encompassing representatives of each class of Egyptian society, as the question is answered down the line of command. Baka says, "if we stopped the stones for every grease woman who falls, the city will not be built." The overseer says that the slaves must be driven, or they will not work. Both excuses justify harsh treatment of the Hebrews in order to complete the task Sethi has assigned them. Joshua--who has nothing to lose-

-says "if their work lags, it is because they are not fed!" This goes to the heart of Moses' concern to complete the city, and he is intrigued. Rameses has delegated his task of finding the Redeemer to Dathan, his "rat." In obedience to the Pharaonic formula, "so let it be written; so let it be done," he directs his will downward and does not interest himself in the concerns of those who carry out his will. Moses, because he has written within him commandments to consider the effect of his will upon his neighbor (and perhaps anachronistically, John 16:12-13, to love one's neighbor as oneself) again, as with Ethiopia, seeks to see from the other person's perspective.

Moses begins asking questions to understand Joshua. The camera moves in to a medium close-up to emphasize the more personal nature of these questions. Moses asks Joshua to explain why he struck the overseer, knowing that it meant his death. To save the old woman, Joshua replies. "Why? What is she to you?" Moses asks. By the Egyptian Moral Accounting standard, there must be a strong ulterior motive for such a personal sacrifice. "An old woman," Joshua replies. This is an answer that makes no sense to

Egyptian society, but which Moses recognizes as intrinsic to himself. The overseer, who has no interest in this exchange, interrupts: "Kill him." Moses responds, irrelevantly, "the man has courage," and continues asking questions. "You do not speak like a slave," he says. "God made men. Men made slaves," Joshua replies. "Which God?" Moses asks. "The god of Abraham, the Almighty God," Joshua tells him, and explains that the Deliverer will come to prove their god is almighty. Baka breaks in: "Lord Prince, the man speaks treason!" We cut away to the slightly more distant medium shot; Moses has been called back to his worldly concerns. "It is not treason to want freedom. Release him," he orders, to the amazement of his Egyptian subordinates. He is not behaving as a proper Egyptian.

To drive this point home further, we cut from the static Moses shot to a slightly askew frame as Rameses drives his chariot through the crowd of Hebrew slaves, accompanied by screaming. Slave problems, Rameses asks Moses. "Nothing that can't be cured by a day of rest and a ration of grain," Moses replies, noting that one would do as much for a horse, and sends Joshua to raid the Egyptian

priest's temple graineries. This is a practical solution to his labor problem, but it is also the conclusion to what has been in essence a discussion over the morality of the status quo. Moses sides with the Hebrew slaves, as he literally "sided" with Ethiopia, and violates both Egyptian law (by releasing Joshua) and Egyptian religion (by stealing the gods' grain for the Hebrew slaves). Moses sets himself against the status quo, because it violates the morality written in his soul.

Rameses is not interested in morality, however, but rather evidence of disloyalty to Sethi which he can use to gain his own ends. We cut to Sethi and Nefreteri (wearing blue), playing "Jackals and Hounds," as a priest complains about Moses' actions. Nefreteri accidentally reveals that she has been losing to Sethi on purpose to keep him happy and to give her words of support for Moses a bit more emphasis. Sethi does not seem to have been fooled. He advises her to beware, as "crowns might be lost by smiles and dimples." As both Nefreteri and the priest press harder for and against Moses, Sethi grows angry, and breaks the head off of the Jackal game piece he is holding as he insists that he will choose his own successor. The

game-piece head slides down the hallway to the feet of the approaching Rameses. He picks it up, approaches the game table, and tosses the fragment into Nefreteri's lap. "you're losing your head, my sweet;" a marvelously nuanced line in combination with DeMille's stage business, implying that Nefreteri is a jackal herself, that she is going too far in her advocacy of Moses, and--picking up on the double meaning of Sethi's warning to her--that if she is involved in treason, her own head might be lost.

Sethi, picking up the game metaphor himself, asks how successful Rameses has been in chasing down the "jackal that would free the slaves." "They do not need a deliverer now," Rameses replies. "They have Moses." "Is that a riddle," Nefreteri says with a sneering tone. "He gives them the priests' grain, and gives them one day in seven to rest." Rameses pauses for effect: "They call it the day of Moses." Sethi, who has been looking away, turns his head around; this is the sort of divine rule-making that he recognizes as an infringement on his status. The priest, seeing this, adds, "this man makes himself a god." Nefreteri ineffectually counters, "I prefer him as a man." Rameses says to her, "you would prefer him as

Pharaoh," reminding Sethi that she has already chosen her sides. Rameses then presents his evidence of Moses' selfish agenda. Moses has already secured the allegiance of Ethiopia. Now he has become a demagogue among the Hebrew slaves. "Do you imply that he would raise the slaves against me? I have been his father," Sethi says. "Ambition knows no father," the priest says. We cut to a two-shot of Nefreteri and Sethi as she tries to counter these accusations by saying, "Moses could no more betray you than I could, Sethi." Sethi's face takes on an even more worried expression; we have just been reminded of her untrustworthiness. "He can tell me that himself when he arrives [for Sethi's jubilee]," Sethi says. Rameses delivers his final bit of evidence: Moses is not coming, as he is--and Rameses pauses again for effect--"pressed by other matters." Sethi is convinced. "Other matters!" he rings a gong and stands. "My escort! I will ride with you, my son (and for the first time Sethi looks directly into Rameses' eyes), to see what rears itself in Goshen, treason or my city." The priest and Sethi exit.

Nefreteri and Rameses exchange a few parting words before the scene concludes, serving both to underscore the crippling effect

the Egyptian society of selfishness has on human relations, and to further define Nefreteri's intentions. Rameses upbraids her for siding so completely with Moses. "Remember, my sweet, you must be wife to the next pharaoh. You will be all mine, like my dog or my horse or my hawk, only I will love you more--and trust you less. You will never do the things to me you would have done to Moses." This underscores the implication of Bithiah's warning to Moses not to love Nefreteri; either one commands, or one serves. There is no alternative in the Egyptian conception. Nefreteri's response to this is to rise up from her couch and kiss Rameses. He responds to her, and as they release, she smiles and laughs at his weakness; he will serve her, the laugh implies. Angered, Rameses pushes Nefreteri down on the couch. We cut to a medium closeup of his face. "I know you, my sweet. You're a sharp-clawed, treacherous little peacock." We cut to a reaction medium closeup of Nefreteri, who scowls, and cut back to Rameses. "But you are food for the gods. I will have all of you." We cut back to Nefreteri. "None of me! Did you think my kiss was a promise of what you will have? No, my pompous one. It was to let you know of what you will never have. I could never love

you." "Does that matter," Rameses responds. "You will be my wife. You will come to me whenever I call you. I will enjoy that very much. Whether you will enjoy it or not is your own affair. But I think you will." Rameses turns and leaves.

We cut to Nefreteri, and the camera slowly tracks in as she wipes her mouth. As it is typically used in film and television, a track or zoom indicates strong emotion, either shock or fear. Nefreteri fears him, as his success means a life of servitude. She fears him because he will force her into passivity. By the same token, Rameses fears her, for he knows that she will try to seduce him to her ends, as he believes she has been beguiling Sethi, and will seduce Moses in turn should he come to power. As people, they are sympathetic; we respond to the actors. As character types, each is monstrous: Rameses is the personification of materialism, a naturalized spirit, no longer ruled by the patriarchic laws of reason written in Moses' heart. He is a devolving man--but still human. Nefreteri is the spider woman, active Nature, the force that destroys individuality. She is a destroyer--but she sincerely loves Moses, and sincerely wishes to do him good. Neither camera or

script plays favorites with either Rameses or Nefreteri. The words and attitudes each express about the other, we know, are both true. One of the film's virtues is that its antagonist characters are not intrinsically bad, but rather products of an evil strategy for living. To live in the light of God's law is to contain the destructive power of Nature, DeMille is saying. This scene presents two very human victims trapped in the darkness of their system, doomed to be the scapegoats for their culture's sins.

Moses, by contrast, in a sense is not human. He is the Word of Spirit made flesh. Because he cannot help but express the commandments of God written on his soul, he cannot do wrong. He is always fearless, because he is completely selfless. Rameses and Nefreteri mistake this as weakness, when it is in fact the mark of his monstrousness. If they are monsters of Nature, Moses is the monster of Spirit. He lives for ideas and for others, not for himself. Thus, when we cut from Nefreteri to Rameses and Sethi arriving at Moses' surveying station in the necropolis, Moses at first is oblivious to the succession of questions Sethi asks him after the stone oblesk he is setting up--which everyone but Moses is afraid

will shatter, and which of course does not--falls into place. Moses only gradually realizes that the questions add up to an accusation of treason. We cut from the establishing shot in which Moses realizes what is going on, to a medium shot in which Rameses is placing weights on a scale, signifying the arguments against Moses. "A city is made of bricks, Pharaoh. The strong make many, the weak few." Moses picks up a brick and sets it on the scale's other balancing pan, tilting the scale to his side. "The dead make none. So much for accusations. Now judge the result." Moses pulls back a blue curtain to reveal in daylight a portion of the nearly finished necropolis. Sethi persists, trying to fathom why Moses would engage in such risky, unEgyptian behavior.

> Sethi: With so many slaves, you could build an army.
> Moses: But I have built a city.
> Sethi: Are the slaves loyal to Sethi's glory, or to you, Moses?
> Moses: The slaves are loyal only to their god. And I serve only you. [Moses pulls aside a blue curtain to reveal below a giant stone statue being pulled by press-gangs] Let your own image proclaim my loyalty for a thousand years.

"Supurb," Sethi exclaims, and then turns to Rameses. "And this you call treason. Who would take a throne by force that he has earned by

deeds?" Sethi has found his answer. As the scale reminds us, this is the sort of deed-compiling which, in the Moral Accounting thinking of Egypt, deserves reward. Moses is more competent then Rameses; he piles up more and better deeds than Rameses. The empire of Egypt is a monument to the will of those who have ruled it, a material institution rather than a spiritual ideal. The visible manifestation of this will is the necropolis each Pharaoh creates. For this necropolis and those of the past to be preserved--thus preserving in stone the name of the Pharaohs who willed them into being--a strong leader must succeed to the throne. For Sethi, Moses proves his right to rule by his ability to bend labor and materials to his will. He decides on the spot that Moses shall be his heir, and that Rameses shall be dishonored by leaving his name unmentioned on any of the monuments--a punishment against which Moses ironically cannot help but protest, much to Rameses' irritation.

DeMille's script has Baka, the master builder come over and ask Rameses at this point, as Moses and Sethi depart, "Will you lose a throne because Moses builds a city?" It is a rather pointless question, and the actor, Vincent Price, does not really seem to know

himself what possible motivation he might have for saying such a thing. It serves as an excuse however for allowing Rameses to make his odd prophecy:

> Rameses: The city that he builds will bear my name. The woman that he loves shall bear my child. So it shall be written. So it shall be done.

This is what Kenneth Burke refers to as a "magic formula," a phrase which establishes a pattern of connections for the audience.[47] Words, the phrase says, shall be transformed into deeds. The relevant context of this for an audience concerned about communism is the books of Marxist theory, the "science of history" which predicts the end of religion and the end of capitalism.

There are two versions of history that are in the process of being willed into existence. Moses, we know, has his will written and his history predetermined by God; he is chosen to be the divine ark of democracy in history. Rameses, to whom the Pharaonic phrase of making human will manifest has devolved--note that in the court scene in which Sethi sends Rameses and Moses to Goshen, it is Rameses, not the priest, who utters the phrase--is the film's champion of the human will, and of human power to determine

history. Where Moses is the unconscious agent of the historical process predetermined by God, Rameses sees himself as the actor who consciously wills history into being. Charlton Heston is the personification of Anglo-America. Yul Brynner, with his Asian features, fresh from playing the King of Siam in The King and I, is the personification of the Alien Soviet, invoking precisely the equation of aliens and Communism which were current at the time. Moses is a Washington, a Lincoln, guided by a divine destiny; Rameses is a Lenin, a Stalin; he believes in the historical destiny created by human will.

History begins to cast tools in Rameses' path, which he will be quick to take up. We cut from Rameses to a ruddy reflection of Nefreteri, seen in her bronze mirror, wearing a red dress--colors of light, DeMille's signal that, for the moment, she is in conformation with proper female destiny--, and zoom out as she happily selects a gauzy wrap for her imminent wedding night with Moses. Memnet, wearing grey and blue, enters from a shadowy blue-lit room. Nefreteri moves from the ruddy surroundings of her room to be framed, with Memnet, in the blue entryway. "You will never wear it.

I bring you a cloth more revealing," she says, carrying the scrap of Levite cloth in which Moses was wrapped as a baby in his bulrushes basket. Memnet reveals Moses' identity, and when Nefreteri still says that she will marry Moses, says she will go to Rameses. DeMille's camera zooms in on the Levite cloth which falls to the floor as, offscreen, Nefreteri pushes Memnet off the balcony of her room. Nefreteri takes action herself, breaks the divine laws her society never taught her, and moves from the world of light into the shadows.

This would be the end of the secret if Nefreteri either understood Moses better, or if she had no desire for ascendancy herself. But for one reason or the other, or, most plausibly, both, she lets slip to him that she killed Memnet, and why:

> Moses: [outside door] Nefreteri? Have you closed your door to make a beggar of a prince?
> Nefreteri: [opening door] You are no beggar, my love, you are a conqueror, and I am your captive for life.

Each continues to pledge servitude to the other. This is an allusion for the film audience's benefit to Nefreteri's intention, of which Rameses and Bithiah have made reference, to rule through Moses. By placing Nefreteri's actions in this context, DeMille is trying to

undercut any sense that Nefreteri has killed Memnet simply to protect Moses, even though the red dress and warm-color room in which we find her suggests that her emotions are genuine. When a slave arrives with the news of Memnet's death, Nefreteri sends the newsbringer away abruptly, which disturbs Moses.

> Moses: Can one so rich in love be so poor in pity? She was a faithful servant. What kind of woman holds me captive?
> Nefreteri: One who loves you and will not lose you. One who will be your wife. Nothing in the world can change that--nothing. Not Rameses' princely plots, or Memnet's evil lies.

Here we have, as with Rameses, the assertion of the right of the selfish human will to determine history regardless of moral concerns. Moses persists in following the path of riddling answers to his questions, until Nefreteri finally tells him of his true identity, including his true mother's name. Presumably she thinks he will want to keep this information forgotten, and that she will have a secret that she can always hold over him as a threat, if necessary. Ironically, however, she has made a beggar of a prince by giving him this information. Moses leaves her to question his Egyptian mother Bithiah.

Bithiah, who knows Moses better, perhaps, or has no desire to hold more than a parent's power over Moses, or again, most plausibly, both, tries to tell Moses nothing. "It's a wicked lie. Memnet will pay for spreading lies." "Why did you say Memnet," Moses says. "Who else," Bithiah replies desperately, facing the camera with her back to Moses. "She nursed Rameses. She'll pay." Moses is not fooled. He assures her of his continued filial loyalty, "wherever I'm led, or whatever I must do," and departs to find Yoshobel. Bithiah rushes to Yoshobel first, in the hope of hiding Moses' true mother. In a room with red-lit walls, Yoshobel agrees to be hidden, in order to preserve Moses' position, but cannot say for sure if she can deny her son. Moses arrives soon after, and asks Yoshobel if indeed he is her son. Attempting to obey Bithiah's wish, Yoshobel replies conditionally:

> Yoshobel: If you believe that men and women are cattle, to be driven under the lash, if you can bow before images of stone and golden images of beasts, you are not my son. My son would be a slave, hands gnarled and broken from the brick pits. But in his heart would burn the spirit of the living God.

This defines again to Moses (and more importantly, to the film's audience) the potential consequences of her response. However,

Moses is not driven by a will to power, but rather a will to justice. He asks Yoshobel again, and she breaks down and acknowledges that she is his mother. His brother Aaron and sister Miriam introduce themselves. "I am your brother Moses," Moses says.

Bithiah makes one final attempt to divert Moses from his from what she sees as his tragic fate: She points out that nothing is yet decided.

> Bithiah: No, no! [to Aaron and Miriam] Get ready to leave! [to Moses] They are going away, Moses. The secret's going with them. No one ever need know of the shame I've brought upon you.
> Moses: Shame? What change is there in me? Egyptian or Hebrew, I am still Moses.

Moses, in other words, is no product of a class, no product of History. The implicit argument DeMille's script makes is that Moses is a Spirit, Reason and Law given material form by God. Written in his mind is no sense of distinctions between races or classes. If Moses is not prepared to conceal this change in status, then human society (but not humans) means nothing to him. His identity is too spiritual to protect himself against the material social outcome that must follow in Egyptian society. Bithiah despairs at this point, and Yoshobel is astonished:

> Yoshobel: A moment ago you were her son, the strength of Egypt. Now you are my son, a slave of Egypt. You find no shame in this?
> Moses: If there is no shame in me, how can I feel shame to the woman who bore me? [to Aaron and Miriam] Or the race that bred me?
> Yoshobel: O God of my fathers!
> Bithiah: What will you do?
> Moses: [matches his swaddling cloth scrap with Yoshobel's robe] Here is the binding tie. And here I will stay, to find the meaning of what I am: why a Hebrew, or any man, must be a slave.

Yoshobel, by giving an annunciation speech, interprets this insane selflessness as a clear mark of divine intervention--as Bithiah, despairing, perhaps does as well. It is worth noting however that Bithiah in her language describes what is happening to Moses as a female seduction, a triumph of anarchy over order, whereas Yoshobel attributes Moses' choice as the mark of the divine patriarchy reasserting justice:

> Bithiah: Moses. Has she more to offer you than I? Will the life she gave you be more useful in the black pits of slavery? Cannot justice and truth be served better on a throne, where all men may benefit from your goodness and strength?
> Moses: I do not know what power shapes my way, but my feet are set upon a road I must follow. Forgive me, Bithiah.
> Yoshobel: God of our fathers, who has appointed an end to our bondage! Blessed am I among all mothers in the land,

for mine eyes have beheld my deliverer!

The narrator returns, indicating that we have completed one part of the story and are entering another. As Bithiah's response shows, Moses has completed his "Egyptian" tragic destiny of discovering his true identity. But as a Biblical epic hero, Moses now needs to discover what this identity means, and what is to be done. "And he went out among his brethren and looked at their burdens," the narrator declaims. We see Moses working by one of the brick-making pits, watching as the Hebrew workers are whipped and driven. He watches as Baka, being carried on a litter, selects the water-girl Lilia (whom he remarked when she came to Moses for mercy) to be a house-slave. "He does not thirst for water," one of the workers notes. Dathan, for his own purposes, tries to dissuade Baka, but to no avail, and they leave. An old man stands up to complain of this, and is promptly killed, dying in Moses' arms, his prayer to "see the deliverer before I die" ironically answered, although he does not realize it. "What deliverer could break the power of Pharaoh?" Moses asks himself. All of this seems to come as quite a shock to Moses. Nefreteri comes along at just this

moment, also borne on a litter, and mockingly selects Moses to be an oar-man for her Nile barge--a pattern of repetition matching Baka's actions to signal to us once again that we should be suspicious of her intentions.

On her barge, a setting DeMille presumably chose because it is proverbially linked with the archetypal seductress Cleopatra, Nefreteri presents Moses with a pragmatic resolution to the various problems his new identity poses:

> Nefreteri: If you want to help your people, come back to the palace.
> Moses: And hide the truth from Sethi? That I am Hebrew, and a slave?
> Nefreteri: The truth would break his dear old heart, and send Bithiah into exile or death. Think of us, and stop hearing the cries of your people.
> Moses: Their god does not hear their cry.
> Nefreteri: Will Rameses hear it, if he is Pharaoh? No. He would grind them into the clay they mould, and double their labors. What about me? Think of me as his wife. Do you want to see me in Rameses' arms?
> Moses: No.
> Nefreteri: Then come back with me. [passionately] Oh, Moses, the gods have fashioned you for greatness. The splendor of your name will last beyond the pyramids. As Pharaoh, you can free your people, worship whatever gods you please, so long as I can worship you!

This is not exactly honest, and not entirely unselfish, but it is an answer to the problem; who but Pharaoh could break the power of

Pharaoh? Moses agrees. On this barge, DeMille surely means to make reference to Cleopatra's similar pattern of distorting her lovers' goals to fit her own ends. But first there is a particular injustice Moses must resolve that cannot wait: He must "make a call on the master-builder."

We cut to Baka's house in the evening. Dathan has brought Lilia, who is being adorned for Baka. Joshua has come too. He starts a fire (producing a small light in the darkness that quickly is put out), and releases Lilia, but is himself captured. Baka has Joshua bound between posts, and then sends the rest of his household out after Lilia. He then prepares to whip Joshua to death. Moses however arrives and kills Baka. "Why does a prince of Egypt kill Pharaoh's master-builder?" asks Joshua. "I am Hebrew," Moses replies. "The God of Abraham has heard our cries. You are the chosen one!" Joshua exclaims. We cut from a medium shot of them to a medium closeup of Dathan, listening at Baka's gate, as we hear Joshua's voice: "He has brought you to us . . . . The finger of God points to you." We cut to the next day: Rameses is in the courtyard, inquiring about Baka's murder. Baka's servants tell him that Joshua

must have done it. Dathan arrives. "Joshua didn't kill Baka," he says. "Now speaks the rat that will be my ears," Rameses says. "Too many ears tie a rat's tongue," Dathan replies. After a bit more riddling and negotiating, Dathan tells Rameses that the deliverer killed Baka, and that deliverer is Moses; Moses is Hebrew. In return, Dathan is given the mirror image of what Rameses gains: All of the power within his grasp, the governorship of Goshen; and Lilia, to be his concubine. As we are to judge Nefreteri by Baka's behavior, which is a less refined version of her own, so we are to judge Rameses by his servant, Dathan, whose cynicism is a match for his master's.

The climax of this Egyptian tragedy occurs the next day when, amid the DeMille spectacle of Sethi's court, Rameses announces that he has found the deliverer, and has Moses brought in, chained. "He is a Hebrew," Rameses says. "Speak, my <u>son</u>," Sethi says, drawing himself up to his full height, ignoring Rameses next to him and staring at Moses. "I am the son of Amran and Yoshobel, Hebrew slaves," Moses replies. We cut to a medium-far shot of Sethi, who slumps, and then exiles Bithiah. He tells Moses to come forward, and, like Bithiah before him, tries to give Moses an option of escape.

We cut to a closeup as, speaking quietly, Sethi says, "I do not care who you are, or what you are, or what they might say about you. But I want to hear from your own lips that you are not a traitor, that you would not lead these people in revolt against me. Tell me, Moses. I will believe you." We cut to a closeup of Moses. Moses, who cannot bear false witness, says, "I am not this deliverer you fear--it would take more than a man to do this, it would take a god. But if I could, I would."

This admission of Moses' seems to Sethi to be a perverse will toward self-destruction. He recounts, as to himself, his own feelings and beliefs about Moses. He loves him; he has elevated him above his own son, because he saw in Moses "a worth, and a greatness above other men." "No son could love you more than I," Moses responds; this is not a rebellion against patriarchy. Sethi raises his voice slightly in confused anguish. "Then <u>why</u> are you forcing me to destroy you? What <u>evil</u> has done this to you?" "The evil that men should turn their brothers into beasts of burden . . . . only because they are of another race, another creed. If there is a god, he did not mean this to be so." In other words, Sethi's rule is in

defiance to the divine patriarchy. Moses steps forward. "What I have done, I was compelled to do;" the classic line of the tragic hero. "So be it. What I do now, I am compelled to do," Sethi says. The difference is that Moses' destiny, like the Calvinist Puritan's, is preordained. Sethi acts to preserve the destiny he has written for himself. We cut to a far shot. Pharaoh begins to speak the words in public that seal Moses' fate. Sethi announces Rameses is his heir. Sethi turns to Rameses, and gives him advice for when he is Pharaoh:

> Sethi: Harden yourself against subordinates. Put no faith in a brother; have no friend [looks at Moses]; trust no woman [looks at sister Bithiah]. [Steps forward. In a loud voice] I protected the helpless. I nourished the orphan. But he who ate my bread, and called me father, would raise rebellion against me.

We cut to a two-shot of Rameses and Sethi. "What manner of death do you decree for him?" asks Rameses. Sethi looks shocked and surprised, as if the thought of Moses' death had not really occurred to him until now. "I cannot speak it. Let it be as you will."

Later, Rameses and Nefreteri visit Moses alone in his cell. "I defeated you in life; you shall not defeat me by your death," Rameses says. "The dead are not scorched in the desert of desire. They do not suffer with the thirst of passion, or stagger blindly toward some

mirage of lost love." Rameses will allow Moses to live. He turns to Nefreteri. "Dead, you alone would possess him. From where I send him, there is no returning. And you will never know if he finds forgetfulness in another woman's arms." Rameses, in other words, wants to torture both of them. He allows them a last embrace. We cut to the parallel narrative of Dathan, the new governor of Goshen, in Baka's house, with Lilia. Dathan tells Lilia that, if she is nice to him, he might spare Joshua's life. This general victory of oppression over Justice seems complete the next day, when Moses is taken out into the "desert kingdom" Rameses grants him, along with his binding-pole to use as a staff, and a one-day ration of food and water. Having discovered his identity, and having discovered that a god is needed to deliver the Hebrew slaves, Moses seems to have been compelled by his own virtues to suffer and die without purpose.

The narration begins again, marking a third phase of the story, accompanying a montage sequence of Moses staggering along, "driven through the crucible of the desert, where holy men and prophets are cleansed and purged for God's great purpose, until at last, . . . the metal is ready for the maker's hand." Dead to his old life, Moses is

to be reborn. He falls asleep at an oasis, and is awakened by Amalekhites bullying the daughters of the Sheikh Jethro, whose well this is. Moses beats up the Amalekhites[48], to the general enthrallment of Jethro's daughters.

The youngest daughters--who DeMille shows have been talking about men, deliberately echoing Bithiah's attendants when Moses was drawn from the Nile--are led by Sephora, the oldest daughter, who is the model of the nurturing woman. Where Bithiah had her attendants sent away so as to keep Moses a secret from her father, Sephora leaves her younger sisters with Moses and goes to inform her father of his presence. This repetition of pattern serves to underline the contrast of behavior between the "infected" Egyptians, whose power will collapse, and the healthy bedouins, whose power will increase.

We cut to Jethro's tent. "He who has no name surely guided your steps" to this oasis, Jethro says to Moses. "You Bedouins know the God of Abraham," Moses asks, surprised. "Abraham is the father of many nations. We are the children of Ishmael; we are the obedient of God." Jethro then asks Moses to remain with them. Moses

protests. He knows nothing of shepherding, and he is an escaped slave, whom it is death to harbor. "Not among us," Jethro responds. In his society, people are judged by their wisdom, and shepherding may be learned. Moses agrees to stay, and as we see later, marries his eldest daughter and becomes in effect Jethro's heir-apparent. This is a repeat of the Horatio Alger Ragged Dick type of narrative which DeMille quite possibly grew up reading, and implies a sort of Calvinist/Social-Darwinian point of view: In any moral culture, those of merit rise to the top by virtue of their innate superiority.

As Jethro notes, his are a people obedient to God. This contrasts with Egypt, where there are "gods," but only Pharaoh seems to count. The structural repetition of Moses being taken in by a ruler who adopts the outcast [this time adult] Moses, and offers his daughter in marriage, invites us to compare the features of the two systems. Egypt is an empire, concerned with extending dominion over others. Jethro, Sheikh of Midiam, is one of the "Sheikhs of Sinai," we find out later, but they seem to be friendly rather than competitive. Jethro is a sheikh, yet we see only his daughters. Either the title is misleading, or it underscores the

independence of Jethro's people, as they do not pay court. Egypt demands tribute, and enslaves people to work for them. The Sheikhs of Sinai seem to enslave no one, and to do their own work. Egypt builds monuments and fights wars; the sheikhs raise sheep and engage in peaceful commerce with caravans. And perhaps the antonym with the most resonance is: Pharaoh's Egypt is urban; Jethro's Midiam is the rural. The antonym of corrupt city:pure country informs all the comparisons between these two systems. This would seem to contrast with the much more rural U.S.S.R. However, if the target for this narrative is the United States, then what DeMille implies is a diachronic comparison between core rural American values and their corruption in a modern feminized urban culture. Following modern urban values leads to becoming Egypt; returning to traditional rural values preserves the divinely-ordained patriarchical social order.

This movement to an isolated land invokes the isolationist metaphor City on a Hill, of which the Exodus narrative itself is constitutive: We have an unexploited land, a Desert very much like the desert we see in Westerns, waiting to be transformed. The

Philistines, who would be Indians in the Western, here are Amelekhites.[49] And we have a parallel chosen people, the people of Ishmael, "the obedient of God," as Jethro says. Midiam is not described in Exodus, so here we have an extrapolation on DeMille's part of what a properly-oriented patriarchy should be like, to contrast with Egypt, of the United States prior to becoming powerful. This was DeMille's original idea when he made his first The Ten Commandments in 1923:

> A `western' with Israelites instead of cowboys! Pioneers trekking westward was Hollywood's richest plot vein...[S]heepherders plaguing cattlemen, Indians plaguing new settlements, bad white men plaguing good white men, the hard life vs. determined heroine fresh from big city, the countryside vs. `the dirty railroaders'.... If Brigham Young went West, DeMille reasoned, why not Moses? The people of Israel yearned for a land of hope too.[50]

DeMille's 1923 narrative contrasted the biblical events with a modern story about two brothers: one a sober, moral traditionalist, the other a materialist who flouts all ten commandments. Egypt's fate in that film prefigured the fate of the materialist brother. In this film, the audience has no intermediaries. The modern narrative is the audience.

Moses feels at home in Midiam. While they are herding sheep, as a clouded-over Mount Sinai rumbles forebodingly in the distance with the presence of God, Sephora broaches the possibility to Moses of his staying on. She tells him that she knows that he is an outcast Egyptian prince. "This is not the scepter of a prince, but the staff of a wanderer," Moses replies, staff in hand. "Then rest from wandering," Sephora says. "My father has many flocks, and no son to tend them. There would be peace of spirit for you, Moses, in our tents beneath the holy mountain." "You have strong faith in this god, Sephora. But for me there is no peace of spirit until I hear the word of God from God Himself." But for this laudable--if, on the face of it, insane--ambition, Moses' selfless judgments and actions seem to be more appreciated as expressions of wisdom, rather than signs of weakness. At the shearing festival which follows this scene with Sephora, not just Jethro, but all the sheikhs of Midiam choose Moses to be their agent in selling their wool. Moses sells all of their wool to one caravan leader, who purchases the wool at a higher rate than the Sheikhs have received previously. The sheikhs are pleased, and so is the caravan leader, who says of Moses: "His words are truth;

his trading is just." This repeats Moses' fair dealing with Ethiopia. But in this case, Moses has no need to justify his decision to fit a code of masters and slaves, victors and losers.

Sephora is, to use Janey Place's words for the type, "static, undemanding and rather dull," the nurturing woman contrast to "exciting, criminal, very active and sexy" spider woman Nefreteri.[51] Similarly, Midiam with its tents and sheep is the moral frontier to the colorful urban corruption in Egypt's Memphis. Jethro has given Moses the pick of his daughters to be a wife. Sephora is so much the passive nurturer that she refuses to seek Moses in any active way at all. She refuses to compete with her sisters for Moses. In Midiam, this is the correct behavior for a woman. Moses, who excuses himself by saying that his heart is still a "prisoner of the past," leaves Jethro's tent and finds Sephora outside. We cut to a two-shot of them together "Whom did you choose," she asks. "No one," Moses replies. "The woman of Egypt must have been beautiful," Sephora says.

> Moses: Yes . . . as a jewel.
> Sephora: A jewel has brilliant fire, but it gives no warmth. Our hands are not so soft as the women of Egypt, but they can serve. Our bodies are not so white,

> but they are strong. Our lips are not perfumed, but they speak the truth. Love is not an art to us; it is life to us. We are not dressed in gold and fine linen; strength and honor are our clothing. [Moses turns to look at Sephora; we cut to a CU of her] Our tents are not the columned halls of Egypt, but our children play happily before them. We can offer you little, but we offer all we have.
> Moses:[two-shot] I have not little, Sephora, I have nothing.
> Sephora: Nothing from some is like gold from others.

These are anti-materialist values. The strength and honor of which Sephora speaks are not to be seen as a matter of shows of material strength or of visible trappings of honor. Jethro has power, but he lives simply. Because Moses by nature is one of the Chosen of God, power and wealth inevitably follow. Wealth arrives to the Protestant Capitalist not as a virtue in and of itself, but as a material signifier of inner wealth. Wealth is retained over time not from rational behavior, but from spiritual superiority. This of course is antithetical to the Egyptian understanding of these terms, as we have seen from Bithiah's confusion as Moses elected to stay with Yoshobel, and in Nefreteri's confusion of Moses's motivations for serving Sethi. Sethi and Bithiah alone among the Egyptians we have seen regard the signs of spiritual strength and honor with favor, but their society does not give them a way of acknowledging

this. Even Sethi is compelled to act within the beliefs and the ideals of the system in which he rules.[52] This is pressed home as we cut next to Sethi's deathbed scene. Compelled to expel Moses, on his deathbed he yet thinks of him, the son of his spirit, even if, as Rameses has frequently reminded us, Rameses is the son of his body--the son of Nature.

Even as Sethi dies, so Moses' material existence is about to be taken over by the spiritual world. Joshua arrives, having escaped to search for Moses. "I am not the deliverer," Moses tells him--and then immediately sees on Mount Sinai a flaming bush that is not consumed by the flame, an object in defiance of Nature--an eternal light. "I would see this wonder," Moses says, and climbs the slope of the forbidden mountain.

Confronted with the bush, bathed in ruddy light, Moses listens to the inhumanly deep and resonant voice of God as He orders Moses to deliver the Hebrews. "Who am I, Lord, that you should send me?" Moses asks. "How can I lead these people out of bondage?" This is one of the few remaining elements of Exodus' humble, fallible Moses. Moses the stutterer who needs his brother Aaron to be his voice is

not discussed. God does not need to get angry at this Moses and order him to stop making excuses and get going, as is the case in Exodus.[53] DeMille has transformed Moses' remnant protest into another sign of his odd selflessness. DeMille's Moses is a Parsifal figure, a holy fool driven to carry out acts by his nature and destiny that he does not understand. "I will teach you," God tells Moses. He descends, hair turned white from his experience of enlightenment, the true patriarch-on-earth.

Joshua assumes that freeing the people requires war. "I'll lead men to the armory to get swords," Joshua says. "No," Moses orders. "It is not by swords that he will free his people; it is by the staff of a shepherd." This is a reference to Moses' actual status. But it is also a reference to the Medieval exegetical reading of Moses, in which he is a metaphorical prefiguring of Jesus freeing humanity from bondage both by his sacrifice and by his example. Moses has a prophetic certainty now which guides his actions and choices.

Moses is now redefined, from a tragic hero who seeks and discovers his hidden identity and suffers his fate, to a romance hero having discovered himself and preparing to accomplish an

Apotheosis. DeMille now cuts from here to an intermission title-card, concluding this third sequence.

The fourth and final sequence of the film opens in the throne room of Egypt, as the romance ritual of confrontation unfolds. In a resonant but less imposing voice than God's, a priest announces Ambassadors and their tribute offerings to the Pharaoh Rameses, his Queen, Nefreteri, and their son. Offerings come from all corners of the Ancient World, emphasizing the imperial power of Egypt. As persons, Nefreteri and Rameses have been made to seem cruel, but also pathetic. Now, however, they assume the role of the holdfast tyrant.[54] Like Moses, their actions are ruled by the narrative structure in which they have become enmeshed. If the first half of the film has been Moses' tragedy, the second half is theirs, a point which the film stresses far more than is typical in the treatment of romance villains. Because we know the social constraints under which Egyptian rulers live, Nefreteri and Rameses continue to excite our pity even as they function in the romance structure as figures of evil. But furthermore, if they are living in a system suffering from "infection" of a false ideology, and the film is an allegory of the

future for such "infected" nations, then we are seeing the future of the United States in Egypt's tragedy. Rameses will become the unwitting dupe of Nefreteri, and Nefreteri will succeed in her effort to control the fate of Egypt through her husband, and see everything destroyed.

Moses arrives amid this ritual display of Egypt's power to demand the Hebrew slaves' release. "Who are you to make their lives bitter in bondage? Men should be ruled by law, not by the will of other men." Moses tosses his staff to the ground, where it turns into a snake. Rameses says that this is a "cheap conjurer's trick," and motions two priests to toss their staffs on the ground too.[55] Their staffs turn into snakes as well, but Moses' snake-staff eats them. Snakes are usually a phallic signifier, and in this scene it is easy to see that the Egyptian patriarchy is weak, and that Moses' new allegiance is to the true source of patriarchic power.

Rameses' son is afraid of this display, but Nefreteri comforts him; "nothing of <u>his</u> will harm you, my son." She sees this as the continuation of a battle of will between Rameses and Moses, as Rameses himself seems to think. "You gave me this staff to rule

over scorpions and serpents. But God gave it the power to rule over kings. Hear his words and obey," Moses orders. Rameses smiles at this. He has given us his opinion that transformations are a cheap conjuring trick. His scientist-priests also have instrumental control over elementary forces. In the second scene following this one, which initiates the series of plagues, he discounts Moses' threat to turn the Nile into blood, saying "priests invented gods to create fear in men." Conjuring tricks are priests' tools. But Rameses uses priests as tools. He controls people; this is real power. Rameses is a materialist, seeing the world only in terms of human power relations, not in terms of a divine Law. As Prince of Egypt, Moses gave similar orders in Pharaoh's name. He has exchanged his patriarchical affiliation, but Rameses assumes that Moses' god is a mystification, and that Moses truly speaks for himself. His response to Moses' metaphysical threat is to demand an impossibility, which will discredit him with those he would lead: He tells Moses to use his staff to help the Hebrews make bricks without straw, without diminishing the tally of bricks due. If the staff will not provide straw, then the slaves will have to glean

straw at night. He is the ruler of history, not Moses. "So let it be written; so let it be done."

Nefreteri has a different kind of confusion about Moses' intent. If Rameses thinks Moses has come to continue the struggle for power, Nefreteri--who knows that Moses is too foolish to want power--is convinced that Moses has come for her. At night, she orders Moses to be brought to her barge. Her soldiers arrive at Goshen in time to save Moses from an irritated crowd of Hebrews, who have had their anger whipped up both by Pharaoh's order, and by Dathan, again a shadow of Rameses; if anyone is to lead the Hebrews, he reminds them, he, Dathan, is, not Moses. On her barge, surrounded by silk curtains and pillows, with the blue night visible through draperies, Nefreteri hopes to repeat her earlier success when she found Moses in the mud-pits with the slaves, and convinced him to shape up and keep quiet about his Hebrew heritage for Bithiah's sake, and for hers. She finds this time that Moses is no longer susceptible to female seduction. "The Moses who loved you is another man," Moses says. "No he is not. You believe you've changed, but you haven't," she says, trying to will him to fit her purposes. "Neferteri,

I have stood in the burning light of God's own presence," Moses says, trying to convince her, invoking his allegiance to spiritual light and patriarchal Law. "It was not he who saved you just now," Nefreteri says; she, like Rameses, does not believe in gods or spirits, but in human agency alone.

"Oh, Moses, Moses," Neferteri continues, "why of all men did I fall in love with the prince of fools? Why must you deny me, and yourself?" "Because I am bound to a god, and to a people, and to a shepherd girl," Moses says. This mention of Sephora provides a material foe for Nefreteri, one that makes sense. She pulls away from Moses, and recites an inventory of her attributes--in effect, the inverse of Sephora's; Nefreteri's implied argument is that they are two physically attractive people, and she is more seductive than any desert temptress, therefore they should be together. Were this a film noir narrative such as the ones Place discusses in her Spider woman model, Moses would be drawn into Nefreteri's plans in spite of himself. But Moses is not the film noir drifter; he is a pilgrim. "There is a beauty beyond the senses, Nefreteri," he responds. "A beauty like the quiet of green valleys and still waters; a beauty of

the spirit that you cannot understand." The somewhat anachronistic reference is to Psalm 23, the theme of which is submission to and trust in the divine patriarch; God as a super-Jethro, in the context of this film.

When this appeal fails, Nefreteri falls back on the power of her position. Moses can either come to her and succeed in his task or fail; "who else can soften Pharaoh's heart--or (with an edge in her voice) harden it?" She expects some kind of emotional response to this double-edged promise, and so she is shocked by Moses' response: "Yes...yes, you may be the lovely dust through which God may work his purpose." Moses leaves. This way of describing Nefreteri's actions turns her into a spectator of her own behavior. "Lovely dust," a phrase which underlines Moses' detachment from the physical and material world, should indeed also startle a character whose motivations are so consistently carnal. How can a *femme fatale* function when sexuality is irrelevant?.

When she fails to control Moses directly, Nefreteri tries to control him through Rameses. In contrast to Moses, Rameses is completely the film noir male. He is a ruler, yet he is adrift

spiritually. He fears and distrusts Nefreteri, yet he cannot help but lose his will in the face of her presence. "I am Egypt," Nefreteri told Moses, and Rameses is a victim of the combined seduction Nefreteri represents, of material power and sensuality. The Ten Commandments is a colorful film, but for Rameses in this second half it is a noir world:

> The dominant world view expressed in film noir is paranoid, claustrophobic, hopeless, doomed, predetermined by the past, without clear moral or personal identity. Man has been explicitly uprooted from those values, beliefs and endeavours that offer him meaning and stability, and in the almost exclusively urban landscape of film noir (in pointed contrast to the pastoral, idealised, remembered past) he is struggling for a foothold in a maze of right and wrong. He has no reference points, no moral base from which to confidently operate. Any previous framework is cut lose and morality becomes relative, both externally (the world) and internally (the character and his relations to his work, his friends, his sexuality). Values, like identities, are constantly shifting and must be redefined at every turn. Nothing--especially woman--is stable, nothing is dependable.[56]

Moses' destiny is out of his hands, and so is Rameses'. Rameses' fate is that he lives in a society which does not allow him to realize this. In the disasters which follow, Rameses is not being punished in this so much as Rameses the agent of Egypt, agent of matriarchy.

Before the last plague, Rameses yields to his advisors' pleas and agrees to let the slaves go. DeMille cuts to a medium two-shot of Rameses on the throne, as Nefreteri approaches.

> Nefreteri: Does the world bow to an empty throne? [Nefreteri steps forward slowly, like she is stalking, places a hand on the back of the throne and leans forward].
>
> Rameses: [turns away from N., tugs blue cloak around himself more. Hoarsely:] Empty?
>
> Nefreteri: [slowly moves behind throne] Does the Pharaoh harden his heart against his son? If you let the Hebrews go, who will build <u>his</u> cities? You told Moses to make bricks without straw. Now he tells <u>you</u> to make cities without bricks. [laughs mockingly] Who is the slave, and who is the pharaoh? [Closeup Rameses: anger] Do you hear laughter, Rameses? Yes. The laughter of kings, [Return to medium two-shot, track out slowly to long shot] in Babylon, in Canaan, in Troy, as <u>Egypt</u> surrenders to the god of <u>slaves</u>.
>
> Rameses: [shifts on throne; voice is cold, hard-edged] Bring the Hebrew in.

Rameses refuses to let the Hebrews go. As he says this, the camera cuts to a closeup of Nefreteri, watching from the stairs above. The passive, impotent film noir male, spiritually adrift, is unable to resist the active force of nature that the noir woman represents. Nefreteri stalks Rameses, and then, literally and figuratively the power behind the throne, dictates his policies to him. Nature fills the vacuum which follows when the patriarchal spirit is weak.

Moses tells Rameses that another plague will come, and Rameses says that, on the contrary, the next plague will fall on the Hebrews. Moses warns Rameses that what he orders done to the Hebrews will be done to the Egyptians. Heedlessly, Rameses decrees that all first-born Hebrew children shall be killed. Nefreteri goes to Moses' camp and sends Sephorah and Moses' children away. Moses then arrives.

> Moses: What do you want, Nefreteri?
> Nefreteri: You, Moses. Everything about us is coming to an end. You will destroy Egypt or Egypt will destroy you.

This seems hyperbolic unless we keep in mind that this is an allegory of messianic systems, and that the beliefs of each system are being tested against each other. We know from what we have seen of Egypt that: 1) It conquers other countries; 2) It is always on guard from invasion (thus the constant concern about various frontiers); 3) Its power is military, not spiritual; as we will see, Egypt's army is destroyed chasing after the Hebrews. 4) It has hegemony over countries it does not directly rule; Egypt expands its influence at the beginning of the film by establishing Ethiopia as a satellite state, and it receives submission from nations around the

world. All of these are characteristics which could also be attributed to the Soviet Union.

In American civic mythology at the end of the last century, Moses was the spiritual forefather of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, as Israel was the precursor chosen nation to the United States:

> Moses led the first emancipation movement, liberating three million slaves.
>
> Moses organized this horde of bondmen into the world's first republic, the United States of Israel, with local self-government, citizen soldiery, popular and compulsive education, elective judiciary, primary, and appellate courts, courts of the last resort, and most of the various advantages of which modern republics boast.
>
> Moses legislated...a government of laws and not of men, where rulers as well as the people were alike amenable to law.
>
> Moses made every citizen a land-holder, with inalienable rights; introduced Homestead Exemption; canceled debts after six years; gave every weary toiler a weekly rest;...and ordained a system of legislation more humane than any the world has ever known.[57]

At the end of the film, Moses says: "Go! Proclaim Liberty throughout all the lands, and all the inhabitants thereof," about which more will be said later. If, as Melville says in the quote with which I began essay, the United States is the Israel of the modern age, then Moses indeed is the spirit of the founding fathers. To the extent that the

audience sees themselves in Rameses, the Noir Man, or Nefreteri, the Noir woman, DeMille wants to convert them. The Ten Commandments is a revival film for that old-time civic religion in a time of spiritual malaise.

The final plague which kills the first-born children of Egypt (except for those marked with the red stain of lambs blood) echoes the false patriarch's "plague" on the Hebrews. This last plague is brought about because Nefreteri wants to prove to Moses that he cannot overcome Rameses' will without her assistance. The earlier plagues we are shown--the blood-red Nile, and the rain of burning hailstones, were the two recurrent symbols for god's light in the film. The cloud of death is different. It is massive and black, and drifts down in tendrils like condensing particulate matter. Visually, it is a fallout cloud. It is the result of the exchange of curses that, in Moses' case, was an automatic response to Egyptian aggression, consonant with the usual American claims of the time regarding when the United States would launch a nuclear attack.

As their son lies dying, Nefreteri and Rameses begin accusing each other of treachery.

> Nefreteri: Your own curse is on him!
> Rameses: I would not let his people go because your serpent's tongue hardened my heart. You only thought to keep Moses here. You cared nothing about my throne--or my son.
> Nefreteri: I asked Moses for his life!
> Rameses: The shadow of death is on his face.
> Nefreteri: No! He will not die.

The true betrayal is that their beliefs failed them. Nefreteri cannot believe that her power over Moses is gone, just as Rameses cannot believe that Moses possesses an immaterial power. Each is caught up in his/her own loss of power, because that is the only personal value their system allows them. Even when each realizes they have been defeated, they are unwilling to believe that there is a force beyond Moses the individual opposing them. "You have conquered, Moses," Rameses says, when he calls Moses to release his people.

> Rameses: The foot of a slave is on the neck of Egypt. You were saved from the Nile to be a curse on me. Your shadow fell between me and my father, between me and my fame, (looks down at floor) between me and my queen. Your shadow now fills all things with death. Go out from among us, you and your people. I set you free.
> Moses: It is not by your word nor my hand that we are free, Pharaoh. The power of God has freed us.
> Rameses: Enough of your words! Take what spoils you will from Egypt (tears off jewelled Pharaoh necklace and flings at Moses) but go!
> Moses: (walking away) Tomorrow we go forth a free nation, where every man shall reap what he has sown,

and bow no knee except in prayer . . .

The camera takes Rameses point of view as Moses walks away, and returns to the establishing shot position to show Nefreteri bringing her dead son down the stairs. DeMille deliberately directs our sympathy to Rameses and Nefreteri, expressed in accordance with his myth of natural male and female identity. Shocked by catastrophe, Rameses expresses his spiritual desolation eloquently in words and action, and Nefreteri wordlessly carries the extension of her physical being whose death was caused by her previous actions. As audience members, we cannot help but react to the depth of their suffering which DeMille demands that we acknowledge. They are not unsympathetic as people, he means for us to see, but rather believers in an evil faith.

DeMille's epic purpose is to provide an image of what the results of such beliefs are, in order that his audience might be saved from a like fate; this is what happens to materialist Noir Man, and to active, sexual Noir Woman. Nefreteri and Rameses themselves are so closely tied to the system which empowers them that they cannot separate themselves from it, even when they no longer believe in it.

Rameses must act like a pharaoh. Nefreteri must achieve her will through manipulating others. They must suffer destruction, because, as each says about themselves separately, they are Egypt. For individual humans to claim for themselves identity with the state to abrogate humanity. Moses, "the deliverer," is in this position too, of course, except that he is under no illusions that he is willing events to happen, and both he and Sephorah are aware that he can no longer be human when he becomes the deliverer. The law written on his soul rules his behavior, and the law he speaks is not necessarily his will; a point he tries and fails to impress on Nefreteri when she asks him to spare his son's life.

When Nefreteri and Rameses both fail to exert their will over Moses, they turn on each other. We cut from wide-open scenes in the sunlight of thousands of Hebrews leaving, to the shadow-filled palace in the city. Nefreteri looks for Rameses. She finds him praying to the Egyptian god Sokha to bring his son back to life, trying vainly to compete with Moses on this new field of competition. She "hardens his heart" again with words. "He can't hear you. He's a stone statue with the head of a bird." "He will hear me," Rameses

replies; "I am Egypt." "Egypt! You are nothing. You let Moses kill my son." She begins to taunt him. "What have you done to [Moses] for killing my son," she says. "You are not a god; you are not even a man." She informs him that Moses spurned her. "All you wanted, he would not take. Do you hear laughter, Pharaoh? Not the laughter of kings, but of slaves!" Rameses must respond to such multiple insults to his honor,[58] as that is his function. He is fully aware that he is being manipulated, but he must act. When Nefreteri brings him his sword, saying "bring it back stained with [Moses'] blood," Rameses replies, "I will--to mingle with your own." Once he has acted on her taunts, he would then be free to punish her; Nefreteri can only win a pyrrhic victory over Moses. But Rameses has no illusions that he can win. "Better to die in battle with a god than live in shame," he says.

The Hebrew slaves, by contrast, are in a romance narrative, and in it the redeemer has come. The narrator tells us that it is "a day such as the world has never seen," in which "a nation arose, and freedom was born into the world." But they must choose between the true and false prophets. Even a nation in possession of the paternal Law is in constant danger if it has within it people who are

infected with Egyptian maternalism. We have seen Dathan as Rameses' overt agent among the Hebrew slaves. Now, he becomes Rameses' covert agent. Expelled with the rest of the Hebrew slaves because Joshua has marked his door with lambs' blood to save Lilia, a first-born child, Dathan's first action on arriving at the assembly area, where the new Hebrew egalitarianism deprives him of his litter, is to go over to an Egyptian soldier to send a message to Rameses that he, Dathan, will bring the slaves back after a little suffering in the desert. When Rameses pursues the Hebrews, and the Egyptian chariots come into sight, Dathan shouts, "blame Moses for this! Deliver him up to Pharaoh!" Moses temporarily resolves the people's confusion about who to follow by delivering a miracle.

In spite of a whirlwind of fire, and in spite of the opening of the sea and closing it again on the Egyptian chariots, Dathan still retains his identification with Egypt. True to the feminine myth of irrationality, Dathan does not reason, but rather believes--the infected are permanently blind to the true order of the world--and others also must be infected, as Dathan still has power to mislead others. After the miracle, we next cut to the Hebrews camped by the

holy mountain (radiating fire and light), waiting for Moses to return. "Could anyone live on that fiery summit 40 days and nights?" Dathan asks the crowd. Sephora reminds the people that Moses went up to receive the law from God. A dissenter dashes from the crowd in chains, shouts for others to have faith--and is beaten to the ground by Dathan's men. Bithiah--outcast of Egypt, and in her role as Moses' self-sacrificing mother the one redeemed Egyptian--quite reasonably suggests that "would a god who's done such wonders let him die now?" To no avail. Dathan convinces the people to make him leader, and begins his rule by an act of collectivization: All gold must be gathered in a common pile, in order to make a golden calf, a god of Egypt. With such a god before them, Egypt will allow the Hebrews to return, and become slaves again for food. Allowing free speech is dangerous, the film suggests, as even chosen people are easily misled.

DeMille contrasts the moment of highest spirituality with the moment of highest sensuality as the climax to his epic of patriarchy. Moses is on the mountain, and the people are in the valley. I began this essay by using the mountain to illustrate the function of

metaphor. "Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord? And who shall stand in his holy place?" MORAL IS UP/IMMORAL IS DOWN tells us that only those who struggle against yielding passively to a natural world that at all times pulls us downward. In the literal and metaphorical valley, the Hebrews yield entirely to nature. Afraid of starving, they are transformed by the Circean noir memory of Egyptian matriarchy into beasts, sharing all things in common.

> The Woman-Mother has a face of shadows: she is the chaos whence all have come and whither all must one day return; she is Nothingness.... In the deeps of the sea it is night, the reverse of this fecundity, which threatens to swallow him up. He aspires to the sky, to the light, to the sunny summits, to the pure and crystalline frigidity of the blue sky; and under his feet there is a moist, warm, and darkling gulf ready to draw him down; in many a legend do we see the hero lost forever as he falls back into the maternal shadows--cave, abyss, hell.[59]

We have been shown such an inundation already, when the sea parted for the Hebrews and closed again on top of the Egyptian chariots. The paternal force of God spread apart the seas to allow the birth of Israel from the Egyptian womb, and allowed Egypt to devour her children in the depths. Now, as the fireball of God burns the Law into stone above, the Hebrews, no longer citizens but mere flesh enslaved to desires, as De Beauvoir says, involve themselves in a

giant communal orgy, forgetting reason altogether.

Moses and Joshua, who has been waiting halfway up the slope, return to camp to find Dathan and his brother, abetted by Moses' brother Aaron, about to sacrifice Lilia to an Egyptian golden calf-god. Tolerance can no longer be practiced. Moses stands on a pinnacle high above the valley, and in a resonant voice that echoes tells the people to choose up sides: Do they wish to live by the law of God, or continue in their habits of passion? We cut to the valley floor to see Dathan and his men, and others who prefer Egypt. Moses then judges, speaking slowly: "Blasphemers! Idolaters!... Those of you who will not live by the law (Moses raises the stone tablets with the Law) shall die by the law!" Moses flings down the newly inscribed tablets of the law at Dathan and his followers, and the ground opens up beneath them. Just as the sea devoured Pharaoh's chariots, so the ground devours the idolaters.

DeMille and his screenwriters[60] chose to re-edit portions of the Bible to create this scene. Dathan as a character is, as noted above, largely an invention. Moses does throw the tablets, but no earthquake occurs; that incident is borrowed from Numbers 16.

Moses instead asks God not to incinerate everyone. Moses' brother Aaron and his sons, and Moses' sister Miriam seem to be the leading troublemakers (Exodus 32; Leviticus 10; Numbers 12). Korah, Dathan, and Abiram of Numbers 16 are notable however for their egalitarian claim that "all the congregation are holy, every one of them; why then do you [Moses and Aaron] exalt yourselves above the assembly of the Lord?"[61] Presumably this appeal for a classless society caught DeMille's eye as the emblem of the enemy. The earthquake allows for one more spectacular effect, but it also serves as a culmination for a theme of traitors in the midst of the nation, and allows them properly to be sunk in the darkness of the earth, thus completing the opposition of light/dark, and spirit/matter.

DeMille skips over the rest of Israel's 40-year wandering to Moses' death on the edge of the promised land. After exposition in which Joshua is made Moses' successor, Moses walks up a mountainside into the light, turns, and says "Go--proclaim liberty throughout all the lands, unto all the inhabitants thereof." This is a call to the American Mission to the world. As Adlai Stevenson

stated it in the 1952 presidential campaign, "God has set for us an awesome mission: Nothing less than the leadership of the free world."[62] We then cut to a shot with the tablets of the Ten Commandments frame right, and in frame left the words "So it was written/So it shall be done". This is indeed an apostolic succession, but now from this tableau of the past, as DeMille styles it, to us, the audience. It shall be our duty, DeMille implies, to avoid seduction and continue to make manifest the Word of the Father. The phrase of course is taken from the Liberty bell[63], with the addition of plural lands instead of Land, signifying that the mission is no longer to be contained within just one land, but rather to convert all lands.[64] Milton wrote Paradise Lost to be "doctrinal and exemplary to the nation," and so apparently did DeMille intend The Ten Commandments to function for the United States.

The Ten Commandments is notable for its reinvocation of the traditional City on a Hill myth as the appropriate model for the United States to follow. This invocation uses the new post-war metaphor mappings of Communism is feminine seduction and Communism is a disease, and particularly emphasizes the more

deeply entrenched cultural identity of law with the father. It presents ideological conflict therefore as gender conflict, and in its identities represents Communism as an attempt to overthrow not just an economic system, but divine law and the natural order. It establishes through Dathan the idea that all dissent is the product of infection by the "disease," and that the only way to handle dissent is to "purge" the social body of its diseased elements. Only then can the chosen society go on to fulfil its proper destiny in the world. Not to do so is to become like Egypt: a society in which the remnants of the natural paternal order operate unjustly; a society doomed to collapse in accordance with the Law--not of history, but of the divine patriarchy. It reiterates the messianic theme that Reinhart Neibuhr noted has been the core of American identity for centuries, in order to affirm that there is nothing inherently wrong with the United States. The problem rather is with false Prophet/patriarchs, and those passive Americans who forego their duties as citizens by their acquiescence to such leadership. DeMille's film is meant to be a beacon light to draw his nation out of the night and back to the path of tradition.

ENDNOTES

1. Herman Melville, White Jacket (New York: Library Classics of the United States, 1983), p. 506; conclusion of chapter 36.

2. Cecil B. DeMille, The Autobiography of Cecil B. DeMille, Donald Hayne (ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1959), p. 411.

3. This is a summary of Phil A. Koury, Yes Mr. DeMille (New York: Van Rees Press, 1959), pp. 63-78.

4. Koury, p. 49.

5. Phil A. Koury, Yes. Mr. DeMille (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959), p. 126.

6. Koury, p. 126.

7. What I have in mind here is what Marx Wartofsky describes in "Perception, Representation and Action," in Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding (Boston: D. Reidel, 1979), pp. 188-210.

8. This is a summary of Phil A. Koury, Yes Mr. DeMille (New York: Van Rees Press, 1959), pp. 63-78.

9. Koury, p. 49.

10. Koury, pp. 291-297.

11. DeMille, in Koury, p. 287.

12. Koury, p. 288.

13. Koury, p. 289.

14. Koury, p. 288.

15. It is interesting to note, in accordance with the film's theme and DeMille's narration, that DeMille's father "used to read every night to us boys a chapter of the Old Testament, a chapter of the New Testament, and a chapter of history." From an interview in 1951, quoted in Phil A. Koury, Yes, Mr. DeMille (New York: Putnam & Sons, 1959), p. 49

16. Hugh Swinton Legare, "The American Constitution No Experiment," in Carrington (ed.), p. 120.

17. Rogin, op cit.

18. Norman Podhoretz, "Our Changing Ideals, As Seen On TV," Commentary Vol. 16, No. 6 (Dec. 1953)

19. Podhoretz does not cite the programs he quotes from, although as a type they could be said to have solidified a few years later in the "Nelson" family, and in "Father Knows Best"--a title which, it seems, says it all.

20. Podhoretz, p. 536.

21. Rogin, p. 259.

22. Margaret Laurence, The School of Femininity, quoted in Marjorie Rosen, Popcorn Venus: Women, Movies, and the American Dream (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, 1973), p. 182.

23. Rosen, p. 183.

24. My understanding of this maternal sacrifice role is taken from the debate about Stella Dallas, a summary of which can be found in Patrice Petro and Carol Flinn, "Dialogue", Cinema Journal Vol. 25, No.1 (Fall 1985), pp. 50-54.

25. Stanley Cavell, Pursuits of Happiness (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981), p. 17.

26. Rosen, p. 202.

27. quoted in Rosen, p. 203.

28. Anne Leighton, "The American Matron and the Lilies," Harper's Magazine

(December, 1946), cited in Rosen, p. 204.

29. Janey Place, "Women in Film Noir," in E. Anne Kaplan, Women in Film Noir (1978?), pp 35-82.

30. Place, p. 50.

31. Simone De Beauvoir, The Second Sex (New York: Knopf, 1957), p. 191.

32. Charles Wentworth Upham, "Washington's Training," in Carrington, p. 121.

33. George Lakoff, Jane Espenson, Adele Goldberg and Alan Schwartz, Master Metaphor List (unpublished draft, Berkeley Cognitive Linguistics Group, 1991), p. 188.

34. Simone De Beauvoir, The Second Sex (New York: Knopf, 1957), p. 165.

35. De Beauvoir, p. 248.

36. De Beauvoir, p. 162.

37. De Beauvoir, p. 157

38. De Beauvoir, p. 147.

39. De Beauvoir, p. 197.

40. Both quotes from Koury, p. 202.

41. see George Lakoff and Mark Turner, More than Cool Reason, pp. 204-213 for an extended discussion of the GREAT CHAIN and its functions. Society is a Family is deeply embedded in the culture. Freud's "primal horde" does not exist as a biologically fixed narrative, but something like it does seem to exist in language. An example of this commonly found in speech is the use of the term "domestic" when discussing political or social actions taking place in the United States. Aristotle, in Politica, makes just this sort of linkage in his man-as-helmsman ship metaphor, which he uses to justify both the subjugation of women and slaves as natural objects to the male subject. Although he allows that political states are qualitatively different, the general Chain of Being is the same. That his "ship of state" metaphor is still familiar to us is another instance

of the cultural conservativism of metaphors.

42. Rogin, p. 264.

43. Rogin, p. 264.

44. Why "Dathan"? Numbers 16:1 lists him as one of Korah's brothers, the leader of a Levite rebellion against the Aaronite priesthood. The punishment inflicted on them--the ground opening up--is transposed to the tribes of Israel in general. Perhaps DeMille or his scriptwriters simply liked the name.
Why Edward G. Robinson? If Egypt is mapped to Communism, then Robinson presumably is at the least a "fellow traveller." As it happens, he had been so identified in the anti-communist press: "Some of the celebrities are clearly pro-Communist....[O]thers, however, appear merely to have been caught in the Communist swirl. Among those persistently found in Communist fronts are Edward G. Robinson...." "Enemy Within the Gates," Newsweek, June 2, 1947, p. 29.
In addition, Robinson, although played against type occasionally, was one of Hollywood's gangster prototypes, as his use in Key Largo (1948) illustrates. Gangsters defy law, act selfishly, and--in short--in other ways share characteristics of the Female. White Heat (1949) in particular links the idea of female subversion to the gangster genre, and in a less obvious way we see it linked here as well. The seductive mother in this case however is Egypt.

45. Friedrich Engels, "On Morality" (Anti-Dühring), The Marx-Engels Reader (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1978), p 726.

46. To be sure, as seen in Stalin's purges, Mao's cultural revolution, and Pol Pot's attempt to purge Cambodia of any non-proletarian culture and classes by destroying them, the difference between repudiating class morality and all morality at times has become exceedingly fine.

47. See Kenneth Burke, "Anthony in Behalf of the Play," The Philosophy of Literary Form revised edition (New York: Vintage Books, 1957), pp.279-280.

48. DeMille or his screenwriter chose Amalekhites as antagonists presumably because, after leaving Egypt, God decrees that Israel is to "utterly blot [the Amalekhites] out," Exodus 17:14, for somewhat vague reasons.

49. A novel apparently partially inspired by the film (and certainly published to take advantage of it) is even more explicit about the mapping. In Paul Ilton and

MacLennan Roberts, Moses and the Ten Commandments (New York: Dell, 1956), p. 145, the "Amelekites" are described as "desert-dwellers . . . with only two thoughts in their unwashed, louse-infested heads--stealing other people's sheep, and other people's daughters." Replace sheep with cattle, and you have the attributes ascribed to Indians in a number of films. In The Searchers (1956) for example, the film begins with Indians stealing two daughters and stealing cattle. Another novel inspired by the film--presumably because he loathed the certainty with which DeMille's Moses dealt with his divided identities--is Howard Fast's Moses, Prince of Egypt (New York: Crown, 1958), which sees the "natives" around Egypt in quite a different light. Excellent for many features, it does not, alas, mention Amalekhites.

50. Koury, p. 88.

51. Place, p. 50.

52. It is worth noting that all the spiritual elements of Egyptian religion are concealed almost completely in the film. We hear of gods; we see emblems occasionally of Anubus, and other Egyptian deities; but their significance is not discussed. Rameses, Nefreteri, and Sethi, the principle figures we see of Egyptian society regard what little religion we see as superstition.

53. The timorous deliverer motif, derived from Exodus, is a common motif in Old English religious poems and prose; these provide a good example of how Moses in Exodus typically has been read. See, to name two prominent examples, the character of Augustine as presented in Bede, History of the English Church and People; the Andreas, or St. Andrew's Voyage to Mermedonia.

54. I use here Joseph Campbell's term from Hero With a Thousand Faces for the antagonist of the hero myth.

55. Interestingly, in Paul Ilton and MacLennan Robert's novelized expansion of the film, Moses and the Ten Commandments (New York: Dell, 1956), pp.195-196, using the Egyptian snakes on Moses was the Grand Vizier's idea. No one believes in the "magic" of staffs turning into snakes. As administrators of the "divine will", Pharaohs and priests play the tricks; they do not believe in them. See, for example, Ramses and Nezamuth, Queen of Egypt, pp. 263-264. The Egyptian leadership is cynical about gods.

56. Place, p. 41.

57. Carrington, pp. 29-30.

58. And indeed this is another defeat for him, if we recall his promise to Nefreteri that she would never command him. "You will never do to me the things you would have done to Moses," he said, in their confrontation after he presented his evidence of conspiracy to Sethi.

59. De Beauvoir, p. 147.

60. DeMille, in passing, absolutely tyrannized his screenwriters. The director perceived himself as, rather like Moses, imbued with divine authority. There is small doubt that his films reflect DeMille, utterly. See Koury, Yes, Mr. DeMille--the title itself is suggestive--pp. 229-242

61. Numbers 16:3

62. Adlai Stevenson, Major Campaign Speeches, 1952 (New York: Random House, 1953), p. 262, cited in Edward McNall Burns, p. 349.

63. The phrase is quite properly associated with Moses, but not on entry into Canaan. It is drawn rather from the festival of Jubilee, to be held fifty years after arrival in Canaan. The Liberty Bell is the reference the film audience was more likely intended to understand. See Leviticus chapter 25. (The phrase is a fragment of verse 10.)

64. See Henry B. Carrington, Beacon Lights of Patriotism (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 [1894]), p. 14, for a tidy summary of the phrase's significance. Indeed, Carrington's book contains a retelling of the U.S. as successor to Israel as the chosen nation that DeMille himself may well have read.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Story of Ruth (1960) is one of the last of the Bible epics. It is unusual among them in that its story underplays the punishment of the Alien society in favor of an introspective study about the morality of the Chosen society. As in all Bible epics, the question to be decided in The Story of Ruth is not only the fate of the protagonist, but also the rebirth of Society. As they are epic films, the protagonist undergoes a cathartic purge of identity and society, and a probation and transformation that leads, not only to his or her reincorporation within the correct society, but also to her or his assumption as the agent of linkage between the human and divine worlds.[1] Almost alone among the Bible epics, however, The Story of Ruth does not end with a spectacle of catastrophe for the Alien, and purging of the Chosen society. It is the moral state of the Chosen society that is the film's focus. In this sense it is a bridge to the concerns of the Roman Empire films.

It was not terribly successful, but then few Bible epics of the Sixties were. Only the ironic tragedy Barabbas (1962) was even a critical success, which is significant: The moral certainties that characterized the Old Testament epics, the McCarthy era sense of a Holy War against an invading alien race and an alien belief system, were fading. The certainty of Moses became relegated to the new John Birch Society, and other new Right-wing groups that organized in response to a "moral decay" they saw in the country, and even in the Republican party. Films like Barabbas and Lawrence of Arabia (1962), and the

Roman Empire films like Spartacus (1960) and Fall of the Roman Empire (1964) replaced the certainty of the Chosen Hero with a hero uncertain not only of his chosen status, but of the morality of his actions.[2] The Story of Ruth had this uncertainty, but as a romance genre story it ends on a note of affirmation and reconciliation.

The United States was changing in response to internal and external contradictions to the ideology of the Cold War. Internally, the aftermath of Brown vs. Board of Education and the Civil Rights movement focussed public attention on the hypocrisy of racism in the "land of the free." The postwar emphasis on images, in Life and Look magazines, and television, made the brutalities of racism painfully obvious domestically. These images also became the subject of concern as part of the ideological battle of the Cold War. "Go back to the U.S.A. where you enjoy the lynchings of Negroes and the massacres of Indians," a sign greeted Vice President Richard Nixon on his South American trip of 1958.

Richard Nixon's "friendship" tour of South America, which he was in danger of not surviving,[3] exposed a gap between the United States' image of itself and the image other nations held, even "friendly" nations. Nixon's trip, along with 40 major anti-American riots around the world in 1958, helped make the people of the United States aware of the Third World, and of the possibility of other points of view besides those of the Soviet Union and the United States. Intellectual journals had discussed this problem in the early 50's, but by the late 50's and early 60's it was a general public issue. "Neutralism is immoral," John

Foster Dulles had said of the Third World Nonaligned movement. But as the best-selling novel The Ugly American (1958) suggested, and the Anti-American riots in "our" bloc confirmed, perhaps the United States did not understand what was behind neutralism. In Lawrence of Arabia, Lawrence desperately wants to create an "Arabia for the Arabs," yet manages just barely to make an independent "protectorate" state. In the process, he earns the mistrust and fear of his empire, the Arabs for whom he fought, and himself. In Man of La Mancha (1966), a softer version of this tale, the fool Don Quixote fights for Dulcinea and justice, denying to the end the necessity for him to understand what he is fighting and the reality of whom he is fighting for. Unlike Lawrence's Arabia, Quixote's "Dulcinea" transforms herself into his vision of her. This was far closer to the United States' image of itself in the early 60's, and its fears and dreams, than Moses comforted by an angry God.

The Story of Ruth is particularly interesting in that it existed as a screenplay during the McCarthy years. The earlier screenplay exhibited all of the typical features of the Bible epic, but the story had evolved to reflect these social changes by the time it was filmed in 1960. It began as a screenplay called The Song of Ruth owned by Charles K. Feldman Group productions, which was probably being written in 1951, 1952, and 1953; the available records are sketchy. Feldman was a talent agent and, in the post-war years, a producer; among his productions are Red River (1948); The Glass Menagerie (1950); and A Streetcar Named Desire (1951). These successes probably led to Feldman's establishment of his own production company. Herbert Kline

wrote a treatment based on the Book of Ruth. Frank and Doris Hursley, Noel Langley, and Maxwell Anderson all worked on early versions of the script, and Frank Slaughter seems to have been the final writer to whom Feldman assigned the script.[4] The author among these that is particularly notable is Maxwell Anderson, who was a famous playwright. His Barefoot in Athens (1951), an anti-McCarthy play about Socrates's persecution (which I will discuss later) had won the Pulitzer prize--though little of this sentiment seems to have remained in the novelized version of the script. Frank Slaughter was a paperback novelist. While the Feldman Group attempted to obtain financing for their production, Charles Feldman suggested that Slaughter novelize the screenplay. Slaughter completed his novelization late in 1953, and the book was published in 1954.

The film did not go into production. The novel was moderately successful, as it was issued in one hardback and at least two paperback printings. Feldman's production company went out of business in 1958, Feldman returning to his previous occupation as an independent producer and talent agent. Apparently Feldman sold the rights to the script to Twentieth Century-Fox, for whom he had produced The Seven Year Itch (1955), Fox's highest-grossing film of that year. I have no direct evidence for this, but plot similarities--among them that Ruth is a priestess who participated in child immolations; that the Moabite head priest, named Hedak, is interested in her; that Ruth sees Boaz act cruelly at their first meeting at the Jordan River; that Ruth's "nearer kinsman" of the Bible text is named Tob; that Ruth is suspected of

being a spy; that Boaz suspects Ruth's conversion from Moab and its gods to Israel and its god might be false, and also must sit in judgment of her--all strongly indicate that The Song of Ruth was the basis for The Story of Ruth. None of these elements is in the Book of Ruth, and indeed some--such as Ruth's suspect status in Israel--directly contradict the Biblical source. In the same year as The Story of Ruth, Feldman produced North to Alaska for Twentieth Century-Fox. Feldman may have chosen North to Alaska over Ruth as it was the only film the studio made with one of Hollywood's top twenty most popular stars, John Wayne. North to Alaska turned out to be the studio's most profitable film of the year.[5]

Twentieth Century-Fox was in desperate financial shape, and needed a blockbuster. As a cost-saving measure they did not hire any "name" star for the film, but behind the camera they obtained the services of the best creative talent they could obtain. Although Feldman (wisely, as it turned out) chose to make the film with the "star" drawing power, the Studio executives expected The Story of Ruth to be the film that would rescue the company.[6] Producer Samuel Engel engaged Henry Koster to direct. Koster was a very experienced director who had done many films with religious themes. He had directed the first CinemaScope film, The Robe (1953), which had been the studio's highest-grossing post-war film. Engel hired Norman Corwin to write up the screenplay. The modifications Corwin made to the script were so extensive that apparently it was not required to credit the earlier writers. Corwin had been an enormously innovative radio dramatist, and it is for his radio work that he is best known

today. His first film script, Lust for Life (1956), had been a critical and financial hit. Koster was a competent illustrator of scripts, and in some scenes an inspired director, but did not exercise the decisive control over image and theme that would qualify him as an "auteur" director. Significantly, Andrew Sarris cites Koster's films in the directorial index of The American Cinema (1968), but does not list him on his alphabetical list of directors. Corwin is probably the major creative agent of the finished film.

The shift in focus between Slaughter's Song and Corwin's Story is from the conflict between nations and their leaders, with its concomitant concern about spies, to Ruth herself, and her role in a conflict of gods. The Song of Ruth begins with a border confrontation between Hedak, the Moabite warrior-priest who is the book's principal antagonist, and Boaz, the leader of the Israelite army. Ruth, an adult woman who is Hedak's confidante and the object of his amorous intentions, is simply an observer of the leaders' conflict--a bystander to "her" story. The book quickly establishes the existence of a "cold war" between Israel and Moab. Boaz is at the border chasing after his wife, who has taken a Moabite lover and fled. Hedak killed the wife and lover because he wanted no Israelite spies in Moab.[7] Elimelech and his family are traveling to Moab because the people of Israel are too poor to buy their metal products. Hedak would be inclined to kill them too, but they are able to make superior metal swords. This talent makes them valuable, and they are allowed to pass.

The Story of Ruth shows a prologue statement: "Across the centuries, many legends have grown around the Biblical story of Ruth. All of them begin in

the ancient land of Judah." The film dissolves to a shot of an old man looking at a walled city. Koster cuts from the city, to a closeup of the old man, returns to the city. Koster then cuts to a shot of the Jordan River from the Moab side, as the old man speaks of Jordan. It is dominated by an image of Chemosh, a stone idol with a flame in its belly. Koster then cuts to shots of Moab, cutting from soldiers on horseback to inserts of Chemosh.

> Yonder is a city whose name will one day be known in the far places of the earth: Bethlehem of Judah. Generations have yet to pass before its star shall rise in the east. Much shall happen in these lands, and be told. For nearby, across the Jordan in the land of Moab, lives the people who of old have hated the god of Israel and who serve a god of stone: Chemosh, thirsty for the blood of the young and the innocent.

Chemosh is the leviathan, the monster of the romance genre whose power blights the world. Bethlehem is a city which will, one day, be known. But first it must be released from the spell cast by Chemosh in Moab; that is what this sequence implies, a foreshadowing of the romance mission that the narrative will bring into clearer focus. It is the reason for Ruth's life to become the legend of Ruth.

As part of this romance structure, the romance hero or heroine either has a mysterious birth, or, as with Moses, undergoes a process of a symbolic death and rebirth. Koster shows an old man leading a young girl through streets. They enter a room where a man in rich clothing, turned away from the camera, sits at a small table with food. "Yes? Are you giving her to be raised in the service of our god," the priest asks in a bored, monotonous voice. "If you pay something," the old man replies hesitantly. "Only if there is want," the priest

replies. The old man says that his crops have failed, they have had sickness, and he needs money to feed his family. The priest examines the girl, questioning the old man about her health. "Of all my daughters, she is the strongest and the prettiest," he says sadly. The priest purchases her for the temple of Chemosh, and the man takes the money and runs from the room, waving nervously at his daughter to stay as she starts to follow. "What is your name," the priest asks in his bored voice. Koster tracks the camera in to a close-up. "Ruth," the girl says, and Koster cuts to the credits.

After the credits, Story returns to Ruth, who is among the other "handmaidens" of Chemosh seated in regimented order on cushions. A tall woman clothed in a black silk mantle, the handmaiden's rectoress, sternly orders Ruth to recite a prayer to Chemosh. She does so, unsmiling; these are not children, but something like soldiers. Koster dissolves to the rectoress as she presents the handmaids to Hedak, the high priest of Chemosh, in order to have one selected for "the greatest honor that can befall a daughter of Chemosh." He selects Ruth. As she is being led away, Hedak's assistant notices a rash on her arm, and berates the rectoress for presenting them with a blemished child. Hedak takes his second choice, as Ruth protests that the mark is fading. "The high priest has chosen her to be sacrificed, and that's the end of it," the rectoress snaps irritatedly, revealing for the first time the nature of the honor Ruth is to be denied. Like Moses, she has a miraculous deliverance.

Unlike Moses, however, Ruth seems to have been delivered from one state of bondage to another. Koster zooms in on Ruth, and dissolves to her as a

grown woman, with Hedak's voice-over. "This day you pass from a life of learning about your god," he says, as Koster cuts out to show Hedak lecturing Ruth and the other handmaidens, "to a life of serving him. Your first duty will attach to our yearly ceremony of sacrifice. In this year of Chemosh, the child is Tamar. Among you shall be shared the honor of preparing her for immolation. Obey your rectoress in all things."[8]

After this introduction of Ruth's indoctrination, Corwin turns to the source of dramatic conflict. It is in this area that the political differences between Song and Story are most striking. Ruth accompanies the rectoress to a goldsmithy, run by expatriate Israelite Elimelech and his sons Mahlon and Chilion. They have been commissioned to make a crown for the child to be sacrificed. Song had established Elimelech and his sons as metalsmiths, and their principal activity had been making swords. Moab and Israel were enemies, and part of Song's theme had been to equate patriotism with morality. By providing weapons for their nation's enemy, Mahlon, without intending to do so, was a traitor to his nation, arming Moab to destroy his own people. Song also made Mahlon a pacifist, whose beliefs were used by Moab as part of their plan of conquest. Ruth and Mahlon had met on the border in Song, and simply continued their acquaintance in Moab. In Story, Corwin eliminates the treason theme and displaces the national conflict until later by making Elimelech and his sons goldsmiths. He emphasizes the conflict of beliefs rather than nations by making Mahlon and Ruth's meeting as incidental to a symbol of religion. Koster retained the sense of different nations however by having all of the

Moabite characters speak with a Germanic or Slavic accent, while all the Israelites speak Standard American English. Thus, while Corwin's script redirects the focus from an allegorical Cold War to Ruth, Koster retained the Cold War context.

At the goldsmithy, the rectoress finds Mahlon and Chilion's crown for the child to be immolated unsatisfactory. "This gross piece to be worn on the altar of Chemosh! It looks heavy and dead," she says, striking it with her cane. "It needs glitter. It must be seen at the farthest reaches of the assemblage.... The crown for this child must be radiant, as though for the head of a queen." She points to another crown. "Look! Look how graceful this is, and how earthbound the other!" Mahlon steps into the frame. "But that, your beneficence, I designed for a bride," he says. "It is for feasting and joy. It celebrates life, whilst the other is to be worn in death." Koster cuts to a closeup of Ruth, who looks puzzled at this odd idea. "Say no more!" the rectoress says sharply, and Koster returns to her. "What is sacrificed to Chemosh is endowed with eternal life." The priestess orders Tamar, the child to be immolated, to recite the meaning of death for Chemosh--a restatement of her words. Mahlon says that he will make a crown as she requests. "You disapprove of sacrifice?" she asks him. "Of human sacrifice." Koster cuts to Ruth again, who looks puzzled. The rectoress orders some of the handmaidens to take Tamar outside. "I never heard of such sentiments as yours," the rectoress says. "How do you come by them?" Mahlon tells her that they believe in a merciful god, one who is invisible. The handmaidens laugh, though the rectoress does not. She orders Ruth to "deal

with this person in the matter. Have him bring the crown to you." Ruth repeats the rectoress's orders that the crown be "radiant," not "earthbound." The rectoress administers dogma, and so does not laugh at Mahlon's invisible god. Ruth, Corwin implies, is as much a prisoner of dogma as is Tamar, an automaton, rather than a person.

Corwin concludes the scene at the smithy with a brief family argument about the danger of Judeans questioning Moabite rituals in Moab. Chilion says that Mahlon should not question Moabite rituals--"don't spoil things for the rest of us--"he tells his brother. Their mother Naomi adds that they are Judeans in Moab, and to be cautious accordingly. "But mother, don't even think of us as Judeans, Mahlon protests. "Look at Orpah. Orpah is--didn't we marry, aren't we accepted?" "That is your happiness," Naomi replies a little testily, suggesting that was not something of which she approved. It is in the context of this implied second-generation cultural conflict with immigrant parents that Naomi finishes the family discussion. "You did speak foolishly, Mahlon," his mother says, looking back at him, "but I'm glad of it." He, unlike Chilion, is certain of his identity. This psychological realism in the script is something Corwin in particular brought to his interpretation.

From the smithy, Koster cuts to Ruth and her charge, Tamar. "O Chemosh, thou art the force of light," Tamar says in close-up, and pauses. Koster cuts to Ruth. "To our enemies give evil, plague, famine, and misery," she says. Koster returns to Tamar, who repeats Ruth's words. The implication of this second scene of repeating is that this is what the life of a handmaiden of

Chemosh consists of: Repeating sentences, without thought or feeling. Koster returns to Ruth. "To our king grant heath, strength, and enduring years of life," Ruth says. Koster cuts away to a full shot as Tamar repeats Ruth's words, with prompting, to be interrupted by a servant informing Ruth that Mahlon has arrived. The contrast between the open conflict among the family in the smithy and the passionless repetition of words in the Temple of Chemosh underscores the difference between Judean and Moabite society--and its intended Cold War references.

The contrast between society's implication is that the people in such a nation as Chemosh are not inherently diabolic, as were the Amelekhites in The Ten Commandments; or ideologically committed, as was Rameses, or as were the Philistines in Samson and Delilah, or--in a near contemporary Bible film--the Sodomites in Sodom and Gomorrah (1962). They are potential converts, if they are told of alternative ways of living. When Ruth strikes her servant Kira for dropping one of Mahlon's sacrifice regalia objects, Mahlon begins to do just this. He look on in disdain, and Ruth asks, "do you disapprove of disciplining slaves, as you do of sacrificing to the gods?" Ruth requires that he answer. "It is not wise to be lax with servants. It only encourages disobedience. One must be strong with them. You disagree?" "I never confuse gentleness with weakness, my lady," Mahlon replies. He adds that his god's laws prohibit striking slaves, and that an abused slave can even sue his master. Ruth and the other handmaids find this amusing. Ruth asks Mahlon how he knows his god exists, if it is invisible. Mahlon replies with questions.

> Mahlon: Suppose you wish to pray but you are not near an image of Chemosh?
> Ruth: Then I go to him.
> Mahlon: Well, suppose a soldier of Moab is wounded on a field of battle and cannot get to an image of Chemosh to pray for his life?
> Ruth: Then he thinks of Chemosh.
> Mahlon: But the Chemosh he is thinking of is invisible at the time he thinks of him.

Ruth is taken aback. Mahlon has posed a problem for which she has no rote answer. He continues:

> Mahlon: In my work, gracious lady, I have sometimes repaired your god. Isn't it hard to believe that a god who cracks and crumbles and can be repaired by a mere artisan like myself can be the same god who makes the birds sing and the sun rise and set? How can a god whose own head gets broken mend the broken heads of his soldiers?

Koster has used shot/reverse shot close-ups of this interchange. When Ruth cannot respond, Koster cuts out to a medium long two-shot as Ruth rises, and walks toward the camera with her back to Mahlon, hiding her concern from his eyes and the other handmaidens who sit and watch, but not the audience's. "Tell me more about your Jehovah of the many names" she says, and turns again to face him. Mahlon tells her to send for him any evening, alone. "You will grow old waiting, artisan," she replies. He leaves, and one of the other handmaidens says, "an impudent merchant." To ask questions of things unquestioned is not right, they have been taught.

Conversions can go both ways. Corwin changes the location to Mahlon's home in Story, where Ruth's servant will call to take Mahlon back to the temple. Corwin used the scene to characterize Chilion as a materialist convert to Moab. Mahlon tells of his temple visit, and of the laughter of the

handmaidens, which Naomi finds surprising. "I have been told it is always very grim," she says. "Not always," Chilion replies. "The festivals of fertility are far from grim--eh, Orpah?" In Song, Slaughter had Orpah serve as Ruth's messenger. Both were handmaidens of the temple, and Ruth was part of Ashtar's fertility sacrifice ceremony. Chilion met Orpah at this ceremony, and Ruth and Mahlon met for the second time.[9] Corwin eliminated the fertility ceremony itself--he moves the human sacrifice to a later point, and freights it with greater significance--but he kept the reference.

If Chilion is Moab's convert, Ruth will be Israel's. But as a priestess of Moab, even though as a romance figure she will rise again, this initial movement from innocence to knowledge must be tragic, a movement from innocence to experience.[10] In a series of garden meetings--reminiscent of Romeo and Juliet's covert meeting in her garden, with the difference that one "house" is better than another--Ruth becomes sexually and spiritually awakened. Ruth's servant Kira arrives and leads Mahlon to the temple garden. This is one of the more lavish sets of the film, designed on the general pattern of an ancient walled palace with a central courtyard. Its decorated walls seem based on the Ishtar Gate in Babylon, although its huge central reflecting pool with fountains at the edge seems more reminiscent of modern rather than ancient palaces. Ruth awaits him, sitting on a stone bench surrounded by greenery. This phase in the garden corresponds to what Northrop Frye calls the "green world" of comedy, a place that is temporarily outside of the normal social order. Like Romeo and Juliet, the very palace of the dominant society may

become transformed by night into another world where metamorphosis occurs. But unlike comedy, the immediate result of this transformation is not an access for Ruth to greater freedom, but rather a restriction, through her growing awareness of her bondage, of her apparent freedom.

Ruth tells Mahlon that she has requested his presence for one reason: To tell her more of his ridiculous god. "Why do you look at me like that," she asks Mahlon after he has looked silently at her. "Because you are so beautiful." Koster has his actress react with confusion and shyness; clearly she has not thought of herself in such terms. "Don't you know that you are?" Mahlon says. "I have never thought about it." "No one has ever told you? No man has ever looked at you as I do?" Mahlon asks. Ruth does not think so. "Isn't it pleasant, even for a priestess, to be told that she is beautiful? Especially when it's true," Mahlon says, and that she has inner beauty as well, that he is older than she and "the years teach."

Ruth finds this shift from talking of gods to talking of her frightening (as well she should) and leaves. As Simone de Beauvoir notes, "eroticism implies a claim of the instant against time, of the individual against the group; it affirms separation against communication; it is rebellion against all regulation; it contains a principle hostile to society."[11] She has been the fleshly embodiment of her society's gods, so completely a creature of her society as to have no separate identity from it. In the garden, Mahlon begins awakening her to herself, initiating her transformation from a vessel of her society's identity to an agent in her own right. It is something that he does to her--this is a film of the

50's--but she has him brought to her garden; she makes him the agent as well as the object of her desire.

Corwin changes the scene to Ruth and Tamar alone. Koster cuts to a close-up of Ruth and Tamar as Ruth places her sacrificial crown on her head, then cuts to an over-the-shoulder shot of Ruth, looking at herself and Tamar in the reflection of a bronze mirror. "You are so young. You could be so beautiful one day." This incorporates both ideas Mahlon said to her. She inhabits his role as the older perceiver of youth and beauty, seeing herself in Tamar through his gaze. Koster uses the mirror in its habitual function as the visual medium of introspection--albeit, as Corwin has written it, mediated through Mahlon's consciousness. Koster, by combining Mahlon's words with the mirror image, implies that Mahlon is the bronze through which she sees the girl and herself.

"What's wrong," Tamar asks, as Ruth stares into the bronze, and Ruth awakens from her reverie and reassures her; nothing is wrong. Ruth is happy for her. Koster undercuts this assurance by another cut to Ruth looking at Tamar in the mirror, her face troubled. The adorned object of the god suddenly has become the child under the shadow of death. She sends Tamar away, telling her to take off her regalia. Her servant Kira has been watching. "What's wrong with telling the child she is beautiful?" Nothing, Kira replies. Ruth apologizes for striking her, another of Mahlon's ideas. The servant thanks her for her apology, but looks confused.

The next sequence is a trip by Moab's king and the head priest to the stone quarry where prisoners carve the Chemosh idols. Ruth watches as the

prisoners turn a giant stone idol so that the king may see the back of it. The platform collapses, crushing some prisoners. "I have seen enough," the king says in a bored voice. He turns to leave, but pauses by Ruth. The king asks her name, and when she will complete her "purification." In the Spring, she tells him. "It will please me to welcome you to the royal household." She thanks him, pleased. Koster cuts then to the garden at night, where Ruth relates these events to Mahlon. "You disapprove," she says when she finishes, looking at him. "I wish I'd never let you come." Why, Mahlon asks. "Because you disturb and confuse me. I've been raised to serve Chemosh. He's my god--my only god. And he's been good to me."

Mahlon asks Ruth what evidence she has of Chemosh's favor. Ruth tells him the story of the blemish that appeared on her arm when she had been chosen for sacrifice, which disappeared after another was chosen. "Perhaps it was a higher god than Chemosh who spared you," Mahlon replies. "Besides, I thought being chosen for sacrifice was a coveted honor, yet you speak of being spared from it." Mahlon reveals to her with this observation that she has had all along an identity separate from the divinity to whom she is dedicated. "You've confused me so that I cannot think," Ruth says, and turns away. Mahlon follows her, and they embrace. "Oh, Mahlon, this is all wrong. I was at peace until I met you." Kira offscreen calls a warning; someone is coming. Mahlon tells her that he will come again whether she sends for him or not. "No! If Kira's not watching out for you they will find you and kill you! You must go now!" Mahlon hands her

a gold tablet necklace on which is written the ten commandments. She takes it and runs off.

In the next scene, Ruth is in her room, looking at the tablets in her bed and the new ideas they represent. Tamar comes in. "I had a dream," she says. "A golden bird came through my window. He had a silver beak that stabbed me here," she says, touching her chest, "and blood ran out!" This is a harmonic complement to Ruth's new doubts over whether she and Tamar are fulfilled by her god, or destroyed by her god. Ruth tells her that other gods must be sending her bad dreams, but that she should not worry; Chemosh will protect her. She cannot relieve her own doubt so easily, however, and turns to her own guardians for reassurance.

Koster cuts to her arrival at the chief priest Hedak's office. The rectoress is there as well. She enters, and confesses to him that she is "deep in sin." "I doubted the ceremony of sacrifice." Koster cuts to a close-up of the priest, who turns to look at her in concern. Koster cuts to a two-shot of the rectoress and Ruth. "You have seen many sacrifices since you were old enough to understand," the rectoress says dispassionately. "You have never doubted them before. What has happened, Ruth?" She tells them that she has met a man who has told her that no god could be pleased to accept the sacrifice of a child. "I could not meet his questioning," she adds. Koster cuts to a close-up of the priest again, who looks concerned; this is a failure of training on her part, and of the social order that is supposed to prevent questioners. Koster cuts

back to the two-shot of the rectoress and Ruth. "Who is the man," the rectoress asks. "Mahlon, the Judean artisan."

In romance narratives, positive and negative images of the parents are typical. The good parent figures enable the hero/heroine's development. The bad parent figures inhibit development. Frye comments that Spenser's Archimago and Duessa are characteristic of the type, possessed of magic that has the power to blight and mislead.[12] What is a personal identity quandary for Ruth is a question of social order for Hedak; she should not have an identity at all. Koster cuts to a close-up of Ruth. "He's a gentle, a kind man, and that makes my burden greater," she says, speaking with an emotion she is not supposed to have. Koster returns to Hedak, who steps forward, and Koster cuts to an over-the-shoulder shot of Ruth, shot about a foot above her eye-level as he steps into her close-up. Koster moves out slightly to accommodate Hedak, whose presence pushes her into a corner of the frame. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Hedak is a massive figure with a shaved head, who bears a passing resemblance to Nikita Khrushchev. "You have given heed to one of our old enemies," he tells her sternly. "You are naive, daughter, you have much to learn." Koster cuts to an oblique reverse-shot angle as Hedak smiles at her, staring unblinkingly. "Ruth, do you not know in your inward heart that the sacrifice of the virgin child is wholesome?" Koster returns to the over-the-shoulder close-up of Ruth, nearly crowded out of the close-up by Hedak's head and shoulders as she replies, "yes." "That it brings fertility to the land?" "Yes," she sobs. "Do you not know that this sacrifice purges our land of sins and

sustains us against our enemies?" "Yes," she says. "Yes, I know all of this in my inward heart, but--" Koster cuts to the oblique reverse angle as Hedak raises his voice, smile replaced by scowl. "The ways of Chemosh are not to be questioned!" Koster returns to the over-the-shoulder shot of Ruth, who shuts her eyes, bows her head and says disconsolately, "yes, my lord."[13]

After this punishment, Hedak and the rectoress offer a reward. Hedak has just denied her right to a spiritual identity, and so he now consoles her with the prospect of an exalted physical identity. He takes her chin and lifts it to look in her eyes. He says softly, "you have found favor in the king's eyes. In the spring you will be a priestess of high station. You may even become one of the king's consorts." She may, in other words, become the vessel of the masculine active force of Chemosh on earth; through her children, perhaps, the earthly power of Chemosh will be preserved. This is the false magic that they offer her. Koster cuts to a close-up of the rectoress, who smiles at her. "Do you still have misgivings, Ruth?" Koster cuts back to the over-the-shoulder close-up of Ruth. "No, my lady." "You are going to be stronger for your experience," Hedak tells her, then raises his voice again. "Remember, you have the exalted honor and duty of leading the child Tamar to the altar tomorrow. Be at peace with yourself." Ruth bows, backing out of the frame, and Koster cuts to a full shot of all three as she exits.

The next scene is the sacrifice. Koster cuts to two horn-blowers on a prominence, then to Hedak and the rectoress in long shot by the Chemosh idol. They look to screen left, and Koster cuts to a full shot of the king, facing screen

right. He raises his scepter, and Koster returns to the long shot of Hedak and the rectoress. Hedak spreads his arms and says, "let the child Tamar be brought forth." As horns play, Tamar, followed by Ruth and two other handmaidens, comes out of a temple door. Koster shows a close-up of Ruth's face, expressionless, as she follows Tamar. Koster cuts to a medium shot of Mahlon and Chilion, at the edge of the procession's path, watching her. As Tamar and the handmaidens approach, all bow except Mahlon. Chilion hits Mahlon's arm, and he too bows. The procession arrives in front of the altar, and Tamar recites her prayer. Koster intercuts medium shots of the ceremony with close-ups of Ruth, speeding up the intercuts until in a medium close-up Hedak raises the sacrificial knife--a gold hilt with a silver blade, as in Tamar's dream--over Tamar's body. Behind Hedak is the fire in Chemosh's belly. Koster cuts back to Ruth, who screams "no!" Her personal feelings overcome her social conditioning.

Koster cuts to Hedak's reaction of shock at this shattering of ritual possession by an individual with personal history, then back to Ruth. "No," she sobs. Koster cuts to a medium long shot as Ruth flees the altar, and to a close-up of Mahlon, who seems at first shocked, then pleased. Koster cuts to the king, then to a long shot of Ruth running down the steps, and a medium-close tracking shot as she runs through the crowd. Koster cuts back to a close-up of Mahlon, who is concerned. He starts after her, but Chilion holds him back. "They'll kill you," he whispers. Koster cuts back to the tracking shot of Ruth, running through the crowd, then to the king, as the noise of the crowd rises

above the sound of the ceremonial horns. Koster cuts to the medium close-up of Hedak, who looks over to the king. Koster cuts to a medium shot of the king, who signals to Hedak, and Koster returns to Hedak as he raises the knife. Koster cuts to Mahlon to show his reaction as the knife plunges down. Mahlon keeps his eyes closed, but Chilion looks calmly at the altar; as with other scenes, Koster suggests that he finds Moabite ritual less objectionable than his brother.

What follows are the consequences. Slaughter and Corwin both use the sacrifice spectacle in their respective screenplays, but Corwin uses it to dramatize Ruth's conflict of gods. Slaughter follows the sacrifice with a false peace conference, designed to achieve a propaganda victory and prepare Moab for war. It is the peace conference in Song, not the sacrifice, that is the plot catalyst. In Story, Soldiers come for Mahlon, Chilion and Elimelech at their home. They are imprisoned. Koster cuts to a sequence of close-ups. "It is my doing," Mahlon says. "I had no right to do this to you." Koster cuts to Elimelech. "No," he replies. "The sin is on my head." Koster cuts to a reaction shot of Chilion, who is surprised, then returns to track with Elimelech as he sits down on the floor. "I am punished for leaving our people of Bethlehem in time of trouble. I was rich, but denied the poor. I had bread, but denied the hungry. I had substance, but took it with me." Here is another tragedy, suddenly revealed, the tragedy of Elimelech.

In Story, God punishes Elimelech because he violated his duty to the people; he left Judah during a famine instead of assisting the poor. In Song,

however, Elimelech dies early, and Ruth and Mahlon are married for some years. Mahlon, not Elimelech is the object of this tragic cycle, and the tragic movement from innocence to experience is not Ruth's tragedy at all, but Mahlon's--again, displacing the center of the story from Ruth to another character. It is the making of swords for Moab and the false peace conference that are Mahlon's sins in Song.

Corwin eliminated Song's peace conference in order to keep the center of the story on Ruth, while implying that Mahlon and Chilion's deaths are not a result of Ruth's actions, but rather the culmination of an only partly seen tragedy of Elimelech. Chilion's death is also an expression of justice in Corwin's narrative because Chilion, like Elimelech, ignores God's law. Elimelech recognizes this flaw in himself in this scene, but Chilion cannot. Koster cuts to Chilion, who looks disgusted. He shakes his head. "Let's not cast lots for blame. We're past that now." Elimelech looks up at Chilion, distracted from his thoughts by the new tragic realization that Chilion does not even understand what he has said. Koster dissolves from this to the arrival of soldiers again. They come down the steps and, in a brief struggle, kill Chilion and Elimelech. They take Mahlon, struggling, to face Hedak.

Hedak questions Mahlon in a temple courtyard. Ruth, in custody of the rectoress, is there to watch. Mahlon and Ruth exchange glances, as Ruth's own scene of tragic recognition takes place.

> Hedak: Prisoner, did you have secret meetings with a daughter of the temple?
> Mahlon: yes.

Hedak: Did you speak to her of an invisible power?
Mahlon: Yes.
Hedak: To what end?
Mahlon: That she might learn of a god for whom the killing of innocent people is an abomination!
Hedak: The killing of what innocent people?
Mahlon: Tamar--and all children slain on the altar of Chemosh! And the killing of my father and brother for even less purpose!
Hedak: Artisan of Judah. You and your family came to Moab when there was a famine in your land. We gave you shelter and sustenance, and you repaid us by attempting to corrupt a priestess.
Mahlon: I have done injury neither to your land nor to a daughter of Moab. I repent nothing of my love for her, nor for having told her of a god of justice!

I would note in this that Hedak condemns Mahlon for Ruth's actions; Mahlon does not act, but rather is the seductive vessel of Ruth's spiritual transformation. Hedak tells Mahlon that death is too easy for him, and sentences him to the quarries (the same ones Ruth visited with the king) for the rest of his life.

After dealing with Mahlon, Hedak punishes Ruth. In an interior room of the temple, with other handmaids looking through a doorway, Hedak tears Ruth's priestess emblem from her dress, ripping the dress itself. The rectoress turns Ruth so that her back is to Hedak, and Hedak cuts off Ruth's hair with a razor. Koster dissolves to show Ruth alone in a cell, for the first time in a plain white garment rather than in her thin, apparently silk, priestess's robes. They have stripped her of her identity, her uniform, in the hope that its absence will create a longing to recover it again. The door to the cell opens, and the rectoress enters. "I hope your isolation has cleansed you of the blasphemies of the Judeans. And has it not, Ruth?" she adds, looking down and blinking rapidly as Ruth sits silently, head bowed. "Have not six months been long

enough to purge your thoughts? Surely you would not want more time by yourself." "No my lady, I should not," Ruth finally responds, looking up slightly. This is hardly the plea for forgiveness and reinstatement the rectoress might wish. "Good," she replies nonetheless.

The rectoress is prepared to accept this small concession, because she has no choice. Her implied suggestion that she is judging her repentance is her last delusion. "I bring you happy news. Chemosh has smiled on you. Thanks to the gracious intercession of the king, your privileges have been restored. Tonight you will leave this room. Tomorrow you will begin the month of ultimate purification before you enter the king's household." Ruth had kept her head bowed, but at the news that "Chemosh has smiled on you," Ruth straightens up and looks back at the rectoress. If the king himself believed in Chemosh, the last thing he would do would be to honor the woman who had profaned a ceremony that was to ensure bountiful crops for the nation, however attractive she might look. How can a woman who violated the ritual of sacrifice be a possible mother of the defender of Chemosh? Ruth knows this, and so does the rectoress. They look at each other with this knowledge that Ruth now sees through the rectoress. "You are to call on me (pause) for the services of my office," the rectoress says with restrained anger, and turns and leaves the room, nearly knocking over Ruth's servant, who carries a tray of food.

This is a very different narrative structure from The Song of Ruth. Song's central narrative conflict is between Moab and Israel, not belief systems. The central focus in Song is not which god Ruth believes in, but rather which side,

Moab or Israel, will conquer, and which leader, Hedak or Boaz, will survive. At the beginning of Song, Hedak kills Boaz's adulterous wife before he can catch her to have her judged by the Law. Boaz makes a number of misogynistic comments. As he is about to leave with his family for Moab, Mahlon tells his friend Boaz, "You are leader of Israel, capable of siring other leaders for the future. If you let--what has happened--turn you against all women, you will produce no sons and your line will die."[14] Ruth's significance in Slaughter's narrative is thus less for herself than as the potential agent of Boaz's progeneration; she is his vessel, not a historical agent in her own right. Boaz, not Ruth, is the hero. What is at issue is not whether Ruth will be her own agent, but whose vessel she will be, Boaz or Hedak's.

In Song, the catalyst for Mahlon and Chilion's death is not Ruth's actions, but rather the imprisonment of Boaz, Judah's military leader, whom Hedak has lured to Moab through Mahlon's message to him of an illusory peace conference. Hedak poisons Moab's king, in order to become regent himself, and to inflame his people for war by blaming the king's death on Boaz. Ruth, Chilion and Orpah try to free Boaz, and succeed after Mahlon on his own comes to their assistance. Mahlon, not Elimelech, acknowledges his sin in making swords for Moab and luring Boaz to a peace conference to resolve a conflict he now acknowledges must be achieved by war. He expiates his treason against god and state with his own and his brother's death so that Boaz may escape to Israel and prepare for war. Slaughter's narrative suggests that loyalty to God and to one's nation are the same thing.[15] In contrast, Corwin specifically has

Mahlon state that he has not been disloyal to Moab, but rather loyal to his god. It is Hedak who equates the morality of his god with the state; in Corwin's Moab, it is not the people who are evil, but rather the spell under which they have been cast.

Corwin's Ruth, whose doubts about which god to believe in have been resolved by her king's disbelief in Chemosh, now tries to free Mahlon. At the end of her month of purification she goes to his mother Naomi. Ruth is dressed in a plain robe and shawl, more plain than her servant's; the clothing is a visible signifier of her changed status. Naomi does not see the clothing, however, but the priestess, come to do more harm. She does not speak to Ruth but to her servant, telling her and Ruth to go away. Ruth "Please believe me," Ruth pleads, "I had no thought of betraying Mahlon. I have come to help.... If I were not fearful for your son's life, do you think I would come stealing here? If I did not care for him, would I carry these tablets with me?" Ruth shows Naomi the tablets with the ten commandments inscribed. Naomi looks at them. "Yes. I watched him make them with love and devotion. Now you carry those in one hand. In the other you carried a knife for the killing of a child. Both are stained with blood." "Could you put aside your bitterness long enough to restore your son to you?" Ruth asks. Naomi does not believe Ruth can do anything. But Ruth explains her plan to Naomi, and begs on her knees: "Don't refuse us, mother of Mahlon! It is the only hope. And it must be tonight, for tomorrow I prepare to join the king's household." Naomi is finally convinced of Ruth's

sincerity, and agrees to wait in caves outside the city, prepared to flee with Mahlon.

Ruth waits at the prison quarry wall as one of the guards the has bribed pays off the guard at the gate, and then enters the prison to locate Mahlon. The guard finds him, and leads him up out of the pit. Near the top, Mahlon dislodges a rock, drawing the attention of the other guards. Mahlon and the bribed guard set up a barrier of burning oil to keep the other guards away, but an unseen guard stabs Mahlon in the back just as he reaches out for Ruth's hand. Ruth's hirelings carry Mahlon over the wall to her cart, and Ruth escapes to the cave where Naomi waits. Ruth tells the dying Mahlon to live so that they can marry. He calls to his mother and Orpah to take him outside of the cave, to be married in the light. "I have nothing to bring to you, Mahlon," Ruth tells him as the sun rises. "You are all the dowry, the ornament, the gift, a man could ask," he replies. He marries her with his last breath, and dies.

Mahlon's death completes Ruth's movement from being to transcendence. This is an interesting point to note, as it is in Western literature typically the dying female whose death is the occasion of a transference to the hero of ideology or faith. The love that the male hero has for the woman allows what she represents to become translated from its imminent state in the woman to an active state in the man; As early as Boethius, philosophy was personified as a woman, whose insights became available in the life of the man who follows her. In The Story of Ruth, Mahlon is the incarnation in a sexual form of a spiritual ideal whose spirituality released by death infuses Ruth's actions. The

dawn of Mahlon's death scene is not, therefore, his dawn, but her dawn: his movement outside of history, as the messenger in the night, the agent of internal change; her movement out of the hidden places of night, of caves, of shadows, into the illuminated world of change and history. He, by selecting her as the object of his transference, ratifies her as the agent of change; through him, she sees herself.[16]

Ruth must first acknowledge her despair before her annunciation to a new identity may be completed. As Hedak and the rectoress send soldiers to track down Ruth and Mahlon to Judea, where they assume they have fled, Ruth's hirelings finish closing off the entrance of the cave they have left, where Mahlon is buried. Orpah goes to bring water, leaving Naomi and Ruth alone. Koster cuts between them in medium close-ups. "He taught me to care about living things, but he never told me of the pain of caring," Ruth says. "Pain on entering the world, anguish on leaving it," Naomi replies, looking off into the desert with half-closed eyes. "Yet the interval between is worth it all." This catalyzes Ruth's feelings into language. "How can you say that in such an hour? Look around you in this hard wilderness, and what do you see but mourning women? Where is Mahlon's invisible god of mercy? Where are his blessings?"

This is a cry of innocence outraged. A Moabite would see Mahlon's death as the fulfillment of the law, not the absence of all law. Naomi's eyes widen. She looks at Ruth, as though newly seeing her. She stands, and the camera tracks with her as she walks to a three-quarter medium close-up two-

shot with Ruth, joining together their images, but showing more of Naomi's face. "You were one of them. You gave my son joy, and you sent him away with peace in his soul. I am grateful, my lady." Koster cuts to a reverse angle to show Ruth's reaction as Naomi bows to her. "Could you find it in your heart to call me Ruth?" "Yes," Naomi replies, "I will call you Ruth, and I will remember you with tenderness and love." Tragedy ends in isolation of the hero, while romance moves beyond that to the reincorporation of the hero into the social order. Mahlon's recognition of Ruth, which died with him, are reborn in Naomi's words; with them, Ruth is reborn into her new identity.[17] Her task will be a heroic maternal task, to bring into being a society which manifests the blessings of the invisible god.

The first of these tasks for this mission is with her mother-in-law. Orpah asks, "where now, mother? Where shall we go?" "There's only one place I can go," Naomi responds. "Back to Bethlehem." Orpah says that she will come with her. "Why should you come with me? You are pretty and young, and many a good man of Moab would wish to marry you. And your mother and father who love you even as I will want you by them to comfort their old age." Orpah has a place in Moab, and by right should remain. Slaughter, in contradiction to the Book of Ruth, promptly has Orpah denounce her mother-in-law to Hedak as the cause of Boaz's escape and takes a new lover; she, unlike Ruth, is a Noir femme fatale. "I cannot go to a strange land and live among strange people," Orpah says in Slaughter's version when confronted with Naomi's desire to return to Judah.[18] Corwin by contrast does not see Moab as all bad, even if it is

the Fallen society. As in the Book of Ruth, Naomi sends her back to her people, with a blessing. Corwin adds the moral and psychological motivation that she has living parents.

Ruth, by contrast, has been abandoned by her family, and no longer has a country. She first asks her slave Kira if she still has kindred in Ammon, a neighboring territory. She does, and so Ruth frees her to return to her family. After these two patterns of returns to family, Corwin has established the logic of Ruth's next decision. Naomi asks Ruth where she will go. "With you," Ruth replies. Naomi objects. "With me, to Bethlehem? It is a long and hazardous journey. And who knows, you may even be pursued. And then, a Moabitess in Bethlehem might not be welcome. You must go back with Orpah, my daughter," Naomi concludes. But Orpah, as Corwin has suggested with Chilion's comments and behavior, believes in the Moabite gods. Ruth also does not have parents to whom, in accordance with the Fifth Commandment, she owes honor, except for her mother-in-law. She affirms therefore both her new identity and her god with her response: "Entreat me not to leave you or to keep from following you; for where you go, I will go, and where you lodge I will lodge; your people shall be my people; and your god, my god."

If The Story of Ruth were a three-hour epic, this would be the place of the intermission. As with Moses in The Ten Commandments, Ruth has been separated from the Fallen world. Her identity as Carrier of the Law is established. What remains is to determine how she is to use this identity. The film itself in effect "pauses" the narrative by showing a montage of Ruth and

Naomi travelling across the desert, accompanied by a chorus arrangement of Ruth's reply to Naomi. It is a ritualistic third annunciation in narrative voice of Ruth's changed status. As Frye has noted, "a threefold structure is repeated in many features of romance."[19] This interlude is interrupted on the soundtrack by the horn associated with ritual events in Moab. Koster cuts to a shot of the cavalry soldiers Hedak and the rectoress have sent after Ruth, galloping in pursuit. As one more sign of Ruth's chosen status, providentially Ruth and Naomi happen to be passing a stone outcropping in the midst of the flat desert. The curve of the outcropping conceals them from the riders, who pass by them on the road to Israel.

Ruth and Naomi cross the Jordan and arrive at a waterhole on the border. This is the place where Slaughter's The Song of Ruth begins, near "the tumbling waters of the Jordan River ahead and the springs of Ain-et-Tabeah that formed a fertile oasis of the "Place of Refuge" or "Meeting Place" on the border between Moab and Israel."[20] In Song, a Moabite patrol has killed three people by the spring. In Corwin's The Story of Ruth, a shepherd and his sheep lie dead around the spring. Ruth and Naomi join a group of others looking on the scene, including what seem to be the shepherd's parents, looking down at their son. As they react to this, a horn blows on the soundtrack, but different from those which have accompanied Moabite soldiers or rituals. It is a shofar, the ram's horn instrument used in Jewish religious rituals--in particular to announce the arrival of Yom Kippur, the day of atonement, when God is to decide who is to live and who to die in the coming year. Shot from Ruth and

Naomi's point of view, Boaz and a couple of Judean soldiers ride up. Boaz dismounts, and wordlessly looks at the shepherd then comforts the parents. From another direction, two more soldiers ride up, dragging a man behind them by a rope around his neck. They throw him on his knees in front of Boaz, in a medium long shot. Koster cuts to a shot of Ruth and Naomi's reaction to this brutal treatment, and then returns to Boaz. "We caught him by the wadi," one of the soldiers tells Boaz. "Two others escaped." Koster cuts back to Ruth and Naomi as the captured man, in Moabite uniform, speaks to Boaz. "We were hunting, I tell you! Just hunting!" Naomi seems disturbed at this, and looks over to see what Ruth's reaction to this treatment of the Moabite will be. Her expression of concern is unchanged. She is reserving judgment.

Koster cuts back to Boaz. "Unbind him. He can hardly breath," Boaz orders. His men obey. Koster cuts to a medium shot, obliquely the Moabite's point-of-view of Boaz. "Perhaps you can help us," Boaz says politely. "These sheep. How do you suppose they died?" Koster cuts back to Ruth and Naomi's point-of-view. "Maybe from disease," the Moabite gasps. "I heard that pestilence is spreading." "And the shepherd-boy," Boaz says more sharply, moving aside so that the Moabite can see. "Did he die from the sheep's disease too?" The Moabite looks, and says, a little desperately, "Maybe the sun--the sun!" Boaz replies calmly, "yes, it is hot. You look thirsty." Koster cuts to a shot of the spring, surrounded by dead sheep, and back to Boaz. Boaz looks over to his solder and scolds: "Have you no regard for a thirsty man? Don't you know the teachings of our fathers?" In the background, the watching

Judeans look at each other in confusion, whispering to each other. An old woman nearest to the Moabite in the center of the frame looks indignantly at Boaz.[21] "'If your enemy is hungry, give him meat; if he is thirsty, give him water,'" Boaz recites to his soldier. The soldier quickly passes over his waterskin to the prisoner. "Thank you, master! Thank you!" the Moabite says, standing as he takes the waterskin. Law, not passion for revenge, appears to rule.

Koster tracks in to a medium shot as he starts to drink. Boaz pulls the waterskin from the Moabite's lips. "No, not out of a skin. Fresh, flowing water. Go down there and drink it." The old woman, framed between Boaz and the Moabite, turns to her companion and nods, then turns back to watch, smiling contentedly. "Well, what is it," Boaz asks. "I--I'm not thirsty," the Moabite says. "Go down there and drink!" Boaz says roughly. Koster cuts back to a long shot and pans with Boaz and the Moabite, stopping on a medium shot as Boaz shoves the screaming man's head into the water and holds it down with his foot. Koster cuts back to Ruth and Naomi. Ruth looks over at Naomi, who looks shocked. She closes her eyes. Koster cuts between a medium close-up of Boaz, face distorted in anger, and the Moabite. Boaz releases the Moabite, who slowly rises. Koster cuts to Ruth and Naomi. Naomi opens her eyes, and with a sickened expression, looks over to Ruth to see what her reaction is. Koster returns to the Moabite, then cuts out to a full shot as Boaz pulls the Moabite up and pushes him away from the spring. The camera tracks to follow as the Moabite staggers, turns, and falls on his back and convulses. Boaz turns to face

the camera. "So should it be to all Moabites!" Here is not law, but prejudice toward the alien; like another film character with reference to the McCarthy period, Captain Quinlan of Touch of Evil (1958), Boaz punishes the guilty not by due process, but by "intuition," monstrous even when right. Koster cuts back to Ruth and Naomi as Boaz adds, "and let jackals do the rest." Koster returns to their point-of-view as Boaz rides back the way he came, and then Ruth and Naomi walk into the frame. Naomi look over to Ruth. "Poor welcome for you to Judah," she says, as passing Judeans look at them suspiciously. "We'll go on before they ask us where we come from."

If Judah is not quite the sanctuary of the invisible god and of Law that Ruth expected, Moab is hardly a place to which she can return. Corwin shifts from Boaz's judgment to the Moabite king's throne room, where the two Moabite cavalry commanders are reporting, linking Boaz's judgment with the king's. "Then we have lost her," the king says. "Yes, your majesty," the commanders say, and look fearfully at the king. "Ruth. Favorite of the king, priestess of the temple, not only spurns all Moab, but delivers a judean prisoner from under the noses of my officers." He rises and turns to look at his head priest. "Think, Hedak! It is important for the kingdom that this princess be punished! As for how, I leave that to you." The king looks back at his soldiers. "Now go!" This establishes the plot catalyst that drives the film: Who will judge Ruth, Judah or Moab; and will she be judged under the Law of revenge, or of the invisible god?

Corwin shifts scenes to Bethlehem. Naomi and Ruth walk through the streets with their pack animals. Naomi sees an old friend, Esther. Like Naomi,

she is a widow. She gleans grain from the fields to support herself. Naomi introduces Ruth, who tells Esther when asked that she comes from Moab. Ruth and Naomi turn to go to their old farm. Koster cuts to show Esther in the foreground with other women by the well as Ruth and Naomi move off in the background. "Do you know who that is," she says. "Naomi. And her daughter-in-law, from Moab." The women gasp and look at each other. Koster dissolves to Ruth and Naomi's arrival at Naomi's old home, overgrown with brush. Naomi looks down to the well; it is dry. They enter the house. "This, after your comfort in Moab," Naomi says tiredly. "You have taught me there are other comforts," Ruth says, sitting next to her. Naomi tells Ruth that she has two kinsmen on whom she can call for assistance, Boaz and Tob. But Tob will not help her; "my husband was unkind to him." Boaz will not help either, she thinks. "It pains me to tell you that he was the man at the border." Both, in other words, are influenced by revenge. Ruth tells Naomi that if Esther at the well can survive by gleaning, she can glean for them. Naomi objects to this, but there is no alternative.

Koster cuts to a tracking shot of Ruth gleaning in the fields, just before Boaz arrives. In The Song of Ruth, Slaughter's Boaz (as in the Book of Ruth) is polite to Ruth, and even generous, although some of the other women gleaning are angry. Boaz asks how a Moabitess comes to be in Israel, and when she tells him that she is the widow of a Judean, he says, "you are here by right as the widow of an Israelite, then. Even our strict laws give refuge to a wife of one of our own people." Slaughter's Boaz, who is his hero, is punctilious about both

the letter and the spirit of the Law. Ruth finds Boaz a relief from the "many in Israel who did not obey the teachings of the God they professed to serve."[22] In Corwin's story, Ruth, not Boaz, is the hero. Corwin used this idea to suggest an epic purpose for Ruth: To bring about a rebirth of Israel's own law.

Corwin first shows that the prejudice of Boaz and the people at the well is typical rather than unique. Koster cuts to a tracking shot of the fields. Some of Boaz's harvesters turn around to mock Ruth. "They come fair in Moab," one says. "And from what I hear the come loose," another adds. Esther walks into the frame. "Shut your mouth," Esther says angrily. "I'm sorry I told you." The pickers continue to harass Ruth, until Boaz comes up. He does not know of her, and so he sees only an attractive woman. He greets Ruth courteously, and tells her that she should glean in his field exclusively, as "you improve the look of the crop." He asks if his men have annoyed her, and when she replies "I have managed not to hear them," assures her that he will order them not to bother her. He tells her "the Lord be with you," and prepares to ride off.

One of the widows who has watched this exchange angrily responds to Boaz's farewell to Ruth. "How can the Lord be with a Moabitish heathen? Does she think that we are made of stone like her gods that being among us isn't a mockery?" Ruth ignores the woman, but Boaz dismounts and approaches Ruth again.

> Boaz: You are a Moabitess?
> Ruth: Yes.
> Boaz: What are you doing in Judah?
> Ruth: I am the <u>widow</u> of a Judean.

> Boaz: Do you think that makes you one of us? There is a law here that we shall treat strangers as we do ourselves--even Moabites. It is not my favorite law, but I obey it.
> Ruth: Do you obey all your laws so grudgingly?
> Boaz: Our hospitality is not without limits. Just make sure you worship none of your hot-bellied idols here. We are very short with idolaters.

These are nearly Slaughter's lines of Ruth and Boaz's meeting in his fields, but transformed by anger and contempt.[23] Boaz turns away abruptly, satisfied that he has informed the alien that she will be punished for any of the infringements she no doubt is prepared to commit, and starts to mount his horse. Ruth stops him with her response.

> Ruth: Would you then put my head in a pool of poisoned water?
> Boaz: What do you know of that?
> Ruth: We saw you work justice in the border village.
> Boaz: Who is `we'?
> Ruth: My mother-in-law and I, Naomi, widow of Elimelech. I came with her from across the Jordan.

Boaz reacts at hearing the name of his relative, with (as Naomi suggested) its implied duty, and returns to face Ruth.

> Boaz: On this side of the Jordan we do not coddle murderers of children.
> Ruth: My husband told me that your law requires at least two eyewitnesses to any mortal crime. Where were your witnesses?
> Boaz: I will not be preached to by a Moabitess, especially one whom I suffer to glean in my field.
> Ruth: Suffer no more. I have a widow's right to glean here. I do not need your consent. The only kindness I ask is that you and your hirelings leave me to my work.

Boaz nods at her rejection of any favors from him on the basis of their relation. "So be it," he says harshly, and rides away, leaving Ruth to stare down the angry widows around her. Ruth has implied through her debate that Boaz, not

she, is lawless; Boaz, not she, is a murderer. Her citation of the Law is impeccable, which shames him further, and gives him no outlet for his anger.[24]

Back in Naomi's home, Ruth grinds wheat as Naomi prepares a meal. "I'll never go back to his field," she tells Naomi; she would eat sand first. "I don't understand it," Naomi says, agitated. "The folly, the blindness of hating all the people, as though Moab were a great serpent and every Moabite a serpent's egg!" The are interrupted by a man at the door. He is Boaz's servant, carrying oil, barley, figs and olives, a charitable gift in acknowledgement of kinship. "Please return them," Ruth tells the man. "You do not want it?" the servant says incredulously. "Neither of you?" Ruth apologizes for speaking on Naomi's behalf, but Naomi, after a pause, agrees. "Take it back and thank your master." Naomi looks down, and Koster cuts to the object of her glance: Their two bowls of watery barley soup. She sighs, and smiles at Ruth. Koster cuts to the servant reporting to Boaz, who confirms both refused his charity. "What did the young one say?" "`Please return them'" the servant replies. Boaz squints angrily. "Return them, huh? Well, they'll accept these provisions and more!" He marches angrily inside a building; he cannot allow Ruth's insinuation that his charity is tainted by his disobedience of the Law to stand.

Koster cuts to Ruth and Naomi cleaning up their house. Boaz himself enters, with more food. Boaz addresses himself to Naomi, ignoring Ruth. But their courteous exchange quickly turns to anger.

> Boaz: God be with you, Naomi, and welcome home.
> Naomi: Thank you, Boaz.
> Boaz: Sorry to hear about your family.

Naomi: Am I to take this as some kind of apology?
Boaz: For what?
Naomi: For publicly insulting my daughter Ruth?
Boaz: As the lord lives! You insult me and say I owe you an apology? I don't like an offer of food thrown back in my face!
Naomi: I don't like charity thrown in mine. Who gave you the right to tell Ruth she was not welcome?
Boaz: Well, we Judeans were born and raised into that right! I cannot pretend to welcome anyone from her land.
Naomi: Then don't pretend to welcome me!
Boaz: You're a Judean!
Naomi: So is she!
Boaz: She's a Moabitess! A stranger!

Koster, who has shown Naomi and Boaz in a medium-long two-shot, now cuts to shot/countershot medium close-ups, beginning with Naomi. The cut after Boaz's claim that Ruth is a Moabitess who does not deserve courtesies adds strength to Naomi's response.

Naomi: You choose to forget the law that strangers must we welcomed among us!

Koster cuts to Boaz, now really angry; Ruth and now Naomi have both charged that he is a hypocrite, precisely the burden on his conscience he wanted to be free of.

Boaz: Be that as it may--!

Koster cuts back to Naomi, who lifts her chin and raises her eyebrows; even Boaz itself is admitting that he is disobeying the Law, and his speech is hardly that of a charitable man. Her look at him is one of authoritative expectation. Koster returns to Boaz as he realizes this. He sighs, letting out his breath and relaxing his body. More quietly, after a glance at Ruth, he continues.

Boaz: I didn't mean to shout. This is no way for a man to welcome his kinswoman. I spoke in anger.

Koster cuts back to Naomi, who smiles and nods.

> Naomi: So did I, Boaz. For years I've carried a warm image of you in my heart. I'm disappointed to find you changed.

Koster cuts back to the medium-long two-shot, with Ruth between them. "Well, a man is what he is," Boaz says churlishly, spreading his arms in exculpation, and exits.[25] Naomi follows, shutting the door. "Let him be what he wants to be," Naomi says. "In the meantime, no use leaving this food for the ants."

Boaz in The Song of Ruth has a conversation with Naomi immediately after Boaz's conversation in the field with Ruth. Boaz tells Naomi to send Ruth back to Moab, as Judeans are bound to hate her because of the husbands whom Moabites have killed in border raids. "I have nothing against the Moabite woman, Naomi. I only speak to you as a friend," he says. He adds however that "I cannot trust a Moabite, after what I know of them." Naomi responds that "they say you cannot trust any woman, since your wife betrayed you." At that point, Slaughter's otherwise polite Boaz becomes infuriated--yet still controlled enough that he masters himself without a word of response, and gives Naomi a house to live in, as an expression of his duty to kin. The Law is not the Boaz of Song's problem, but rather women in general as sexual beings, rather than units of the social order within the boundary of law.

Koster cuts to a full shot of Boaz, watching the path to his fields as gleaners pass. Ruth arrives, but turns to go to the adjoining field, which belongs to Tob. This preference to glean in another's field is galling. His obligation to do something for Naomi and Ruth remains, but he has no way of fulfilling this

duty and easing his conscience. he gallops away. Koster cuts to Tob, with his servant Huphim. "Is that Boaz riding up? Yes! Think of the honor, Huphim," Tob says sarcastically, "as though the Holy Ark itself were coming to my door." "Let old wounds be," his servant advises. Boaz tells Tob that Naomi and her Moabite daughter-in-law need help.

> Tob: Then help them!
> Boaz: They won't accept it from me. I had some hard words with the Moabitess, and you are closer kin than I.
> Tob: I may be closer kin, but I am no less a Judean than you. Just because you go up with your border guard is no reason for me to sanction any Moabite you let into our land! I don't like Moabites any more than you.
> Boaz: But we can't let them glean, or beg, or go hungry.
> Tob: I can!
> Boaz: But they're our kinsfolk, Tob! If you won't help them, then let me do it through you. You owe Naomi that much.
> Tob: I owe her nothing!

Tob expands on his dislike of Naomi and starts to tell Boaz what he thinks of Moabites, but Boaz, exasperated, cuts him off. "You can tell her yourself. She's gleaning in your field now." "I will!" Tob says, starting for his horse. "The Law protects gleaners, remember!" Boaz calls after him. "Law or no law," Tob replies angrily.

Corwin's scene establishes that, however prejudiced his speech, Boaz is fundamentally redeemable; he is flawed, but sincere, with a belief in the importance of following the Law. What particularly bothers him about Ruth is that she reveals to him his own lapses of morality. Northrop Frye's comment on the fourth phase of the romance genre is instructive:

> The fourth phase corresponds to the fourth phase of comedy, in which the happier society is more or less visible throughout the

> action.... In romance the central theme of this phase is that of the maintaining of the integrity of the innocent world against the assault of experience.... The social aspect of the same phase is treated in the fifth book of The Faerie Queene, the legend of justice, corresponding to continence in relation to temperance. Here we meet, in the vision of Isis and Osiris, the fourth-phase image of the monster tamed and controlled by the virgin.... The theme of invincible innocence or virginity is associated with similar images in literature from the child leading the beasts of prey in Isaiah to Marina in the brothel in Pericles, and it reappears in later fictions in which an unusually truculent hero is brought to heel by the heroine.[26]

If Boaz is redeemable, Tob is not. "The temperate mid contains its good within itself, continence being its prerequisite, hence it belongs to what we have called the innocent world," Frye comments. "The intemperate mind seeks its good in the external object of the world of experience."[27]

Tob feels no call of the Law on his conscience, and is unburdened by sincerity. He rides out to where Ruth is in the fields, prepared to whip her out of his land. Instead, when he is directed to her, he discovers how attractive she is. Without the burden of conscience, he sees Ruth--like the king of Moab--as a material possession to be acquired. Like the king, the abstractions of belief fall in the presence of the material object. He leaves Ruth in the fields, and comes later in the evening to Ruth and Naomi's house. He chides Naomi for not calling on him earlier for assistance, and pretends not to know who Ruth is. When Naomi tells him that she is his daughter-in-law from Moab, Tob chides her again. "Why, you say that as though it were an apology! Don't you know our sacred teaching that we are to treat strangers as ourselves?" Tob tells her that he will send workmen to repair their house and work their land--all of which

surprises Naomi. "The years of prosperity have mellowed you," she says. "Even a cabbage ripens," he replies. "And you feared he would rebuff you," Ruth says to Naomi after Tob leaves. "Why, he is as warm as Boaz is cold." Naomi however sees through Tob's words, and suspects that Ruth is the real object of this concern for kin. "Maybe one is too cold, and the other too warm."

Although Ruth is no longer bound by Hedak and the rectoress's spell, she is not past the point of needing assistance, as Naomi's comment about Tob suggests. This is even more true of the Judah Corwin and Koster have shown. As Tob's men work on Naomi's house, Koster shows a passing trade caravan. Among the traders are the two Moabite army commanders, their uniforms exchanged for Israeli garb. Their arrival signifies Hedak's last attempt to cast a spell of delusion, this time on Israel itself.

The spies go to the center of town. "Where we come from it's being said that there is an idolatress among you," the commander says. "A Moabite priestess," his lieutenant adds. "There is no Moabite priestess here," a man steps forward and says. "You do not speak like Judeans. Where do you come from?" "From Reuban, near the border of Ammon," the lieutenant says. "Well, what is it that you've heard in Reuban?" "I heard this idolatress came with a Judean woman," the commander says. "The widow of a man named Elimelech," the lieutenant adds. Some women listening complete the link: Ruth must be this woman. Another man walks into the frame. "What business is it of you people in Reuben who comes here?" he says angrily. "No business," the Moabite spies say, and walk off. Koster and Corwin then show a montage of

gossiping women, the intent of which is to invoke the more standard image of women involved in community affairs: An outburst of what Philip Wylie called "Momism," a breakdown of the rational social order through collective interference of women.[28]

When Ruth comes to the community well to draw water, the women surround her, accusing her of worshipping idols. Naomi's well is dry, and Boaz mentioned drought in the fields. Israel is a land suffering blight, and with the spies' rumor as a guide, the women blame her for causing the wells to run dry. Their leader, a widow later identified as Hagar, calls an old man over to "call the vengeance of God upon her." He complies: "If you despise His statutes, and abhor his judgments, you will lose your children; your cattle shall be destroyed!" This language has its context in the Anti-Communist Fundamentalist Christian attacks Harold Ockenga, Billy Hargis and Fred Schwartz had been making for a decade. 1950, Billy Graham had said, was the year in which the cause of American reverses abroad had become painfully clear in news stories "of immorality and crime, subversive activities that threaten to destroy the moral fibre of America faster than the pressure of communism on the outside. A year in which moral deterioration began to worry even national leaders."[29]

As McCarthyism faded, the virulence and intensity of such far-right organizations increased. Early in 1960, the Eisenhower administration had a small scandal when it came out that the Air Force Reserve Training Manual claimed that American churches and the government had been infiltrated by communists.[30] Several military bases held "educational seminars" on the

internal communist threat. In a typical example, a naval air base in Illinois held a seminar for local community leaders in which Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and John Birch Society members spoke against the prevailing "moral decay, political apathy and spiritual bankruptcy" of the nation, caused by "liberals, modernists, John Dewey, Harvard Students, pacifists, naïve ministers," and other agents-provocateurs of American World decline, one of many such "alerts".[31] Koster and Corwin's contradictory invocation of "Momism," in this context, seems rather like a calculated insult directed at such groups employing their own gender prejudices: They were represented by gossiping women exhibiting Freud's "masculinity complex," hommes manqués,[32] or old men whose possession of the phallus is uncertain.

The old man and Hagar are shadow figures of Hedak and the rectoress, spiteful manifestations of their stronger counterparts in Moab. Ruth's words to the ringleader are a judgment on them: "You are a hateful woman, unworthy to speak God's name." The woman takes the old man's staff--hardly a subtle signifier--and strikes Ruth down with it. Before she can do more, however, Boaz steps in and takes the staff away from her. He hands it back to the old man. After chasing off the women, he hands the staff back to the old man. "Don't ever trust this to a woman, Ben Adim," he scolds--a rather interesting statement. The old man persists in cursing Ruth, but stops when Boaz gives him a few coins. "God's blessings on thee!" he exclaims. "And you too," he adds, looking at Ruth. "Poor old madman," Boaz says as he walks away. The John Birch society, which consciously modeled itself on Leninist organization principles, and Billy

Hargis, who begged for donations on his radio show even as broadcast preachers of today do, hardly would have found these complementary references.

This scene serves a plot function as well: Boaz and Ruth each see each other clearly for the first time. Whatever his prejudices, Boaz upholds the Law. Boaz is better able to appreciate Ruth's courage and the justness of her reproaches when they are directed at others. But the implications of what Boaz says--that women should never be trusted with the "staff," that women have no right to the authority of the Law--is a strong suggestion that he still does not understand Ruth. She does not have authority, though she has awakened his own sense of the Law. She is an object of the Law, not an agent. In accordance with this, he fills her waterskin and places it on her donkey. Boaz rescues her, yet in such a way as to show that while he may be changing from Hagar and the Old Man's understanding, he still denies her identity with the Law.

Later, he pays a call on Naomi and Ruth's house to discuss the well incident. Naomi is pleased; Ruth had not told her what happened, and so she goes to bring wine in order to leave them alone to court.

> Boaz: What did Mahlon tell you about us Judeans?
> Ruth: Enough to bring me here.
> Boaz: Did he explain our hatred of Moab?
> Ruth: No. There was no menace in his heart. He hated nothing except cruelty.
> Boaz: Well, there has been a long hard history between our countries: Wars; loathing of each other's gods; some of us lost parents and brothers to Moab; others have lost children, as you

saw on your way to Bethlehem. Does it surprise you that it is in our blood to fear and hate Moabites?
Ruth: And you are content with that?
Boaz: I was.
Ruth: Was?
Boaz: I used to think that hate belonged in our blood.
Ruth: And now?
Boaz: Now I'm not so certain.
Ruth: But others are, though.
Boaz: Only a few: Those who forgot the teachings of our fathers, and those who are as bitter as I was.
Ruth: Like the women at the well.
Boaz: Yes.

This is one of the places where Corwin did not entirely fill the gaps left by his alteration of Slaughter's script. The death of Boaz's wife in Song distracts from Ruth's story. But his emotional reaction at her infidelity also provided a context for Boaz's inability to understand that Ruth was not a subject of the Law, but the carrier of it. This scene redresses this lack, but without the psychological context. Boaz tells her that he will take them to another tribal area of Israel, further away from Moab. But this is not an answer, she replies. Bethlehem is Naomi's home; if they cannot live in Judah, where Naomi is known, it is unlikely that other tribes will be prepared to believe why she came to Judah.

Boaz: Why did you come to Judah? Because you love Naomi, and--?
Ruth: And because I saw a new light in her beliefs, in her god.

This is the language, down to the Puritan metaphor of light, of City on a Hill. Koster cuts from Ruth's face to Boaz's to show his expression of recognition that this is the language of true conversion. He seems convinced. Naomi enters and looks concerned as he tells her to be careful, and smiles contentedly when

Boaz asks her to let him help. She lingers strategically in the doorway, unnoticed.

> Boaz: It is not the first time I offered to help. You accepted only from Tob.
> Ruth: (smiles) he never threatened.
> Boaz: Nor shall I, ever again.
> Ruth: What made you change?
> Boaz: A number of things. Mostly you, seeing myself through your eyes. I think I needed that.

What Mahlon gave to Ruth, the gift of herself, now Ruth gives to Boaz. Ruth cannot leave Judah precisely for this reason; to bring it back to itself is precisely her mission. Where the common pattern of romance is to have a woman in power of the dragon, the king's daughter whom the hero rescues from the dragon and weds, Boaz is, in The Story of Ruth, the imperiled spouse-to-be under the power of the dragon. As Mahlon has awoken Ruth, now Ruth has awoken Boaz from the dragon-spell. "That is the Boaz I remember," Naomi says, looking after him.[33]

Boaz is only part of Judah, however. Just after they re-enter their house, the women of the well come as a body, carrying staffs and pitchforks. The noise draws Naomi and Ruth to the door. "Where are the idols," Hagar the ringleader shouts. "Bring out the idols!" "There are no idols," Naomi says sternly. They make their charge again that Israel's blight is God's punishment; the wells are dry, the cattle are dying, and the children are endangered. "God has shown His anger ever since she came.... We'll all perish unless you rid us of her!" Naomi tells them that they have no right to invade her land, and to go to the tribal judges if they have a complaint. Naomi is fearful, and Ruth goes to Boaz, as he

asked, to ask for his help. At Boaz's house, his servant sends her to the judges' council room. Boaz comforts Ruth. "I know what happened. Shameful! The judges are as disturbed about it as I. Fear nothing."

Boaz returns to the council discussion as the judges are concluding that they need to have a trial of the widow. "By all means," Boaz agrees. "The widow Hagar has shamefully violated one of our most--" The presiding judge interrupts him. "We are not speaking of Hagar, but of Ruth." "Ruth!" Boaz is shocked. "Well, Hagar and her rabble viciously attack two peace-abiding women, and you're going to sit in judgment of Ruth?!" The other judges agree that Hagar and the others are wrong, but point out that Ruth is a Moabitess. "Moabitess, Moabitess! She is no longer a Moabitess," Boaz protests. "And I for one will not consent to judge a woman for fetching water from a public well!" The Peakskill riot and the public pro-McCarthy gatherings of the early fifties were of recent memory. A trial by a council of leaders based on rumors and unsubstantiated accusations would have invoked recent memories of House and Senate investigations of Communism in government and industry. In that context, the following exchange is notable.

> Lead Judge: Do not mock us, Boaz. You younger judges are here only because your fathers gave their blood to uphold our laws. If this woman is innocent, if she is not an idolatress, she will be free. But if she is guilty, it is our duty to see that she is punished according to the Law.

This is the language of hyperpatriotism. It seems to place the lead judge with those who have confused prejudice with law. Boaz insists that he will not judge her, innocent or guilty. "You are going to defy the Law?" a younger judge asks.

"You would put us to scorn, and divide the city?" another says. The younger judge implies Boaz is treasonous himself, as he clearly is not as concerned about Moabite infiltration in Judah as he ought to be--a charge that the film's audience might be expected to link to similar charges made by the new Republicans of the late 40's and early 50's, with their war-cry of "twenty years of treason". "Then judge me," he says angrily, and starts to leave.

The lead judge stops him and makes him an offer that seems straightforward:

> Lead Judge: What if it is true that Ruth has been a priestess in the temple of Chemosh, as is rumored?
> Boaz: (smiles in disbelief) A priestess? The wife of a Judean who renounced idolatry, who of her own free will chose to come among us with her destitute, bereaved mother-in-law? You ask me to believe that this gleaner in our fields was once a priestess of Chemosh?... If it could be proven...then I will be the first to sit in judgment of her.

Boaz swears to this--Ruth could not now, or ever have been, a priestess of the enemy god, not Ruth--then goes out to tell Ruth herself of this absurd rumor. "I was," she says. Koster cuts to an over-the-shoulder close-up reaction shot of Boaz. As Ruth continues to speak, Boaz backs away from the camera, his eyes widening in shock. He tells Ruth that it is not Hagar, but she who is to be judged. It is her turn to back away from him, eyes widening; she will be judged not on what she has done under the Law, and what she believes now, but what she once was. She runs home to Naomi, tells her what happened and then flees to her room.

Ruth, like all Romance characters, is the object of two sets of symbolic or real parents. Hedak and the rectoress are the romance evil magician and witch of Ruth, the devouring parents, in the psychological economy of romance. But these negative figures have positive doubles, the enabling parents. "Romance has a counterpart to the benevolent retreating eiron of comedy in its figure of the `old wise man,' as Jung calls him, like Prospero, Merlin, or the palmer of Spenser's second quest, often a magician who affects the action he watches over," Northrop Frye observes. His feminine counterpart "is often the lady for whose sake or at whose bidding the quest is performed," a figure of moral authority who embodies the values the hero/heroine serves.[34] Naomi becomes revealed in Judah as the enabling mother, but by herself she is only part of the enabling pair. In myth, the enabling figure is a god, and indeed Ruth has, in her arm rash, been the object of direct action by the invisible god. But in romance gods no longer speak directly, but through symbolic intermediaries. This structural pattern explains what happens next.

After Ruth flees to her room, Naomi prays to god--a true prayer, rather than the false ritual prayers of Chemosh.

> Naomi: I am weary, o God. Weary of life, weary of calamity. My husband taken from me, my sons; my daughter--I've blighted her life. Out of love for me she is defamed and humiliated. O lord, I entreat thee: Do what you want with me, but spare her, that her days of grief will not be without ending!

As she falls to the ground and weeps, a shofar horn blows on the soundtrack, just as it did when a rash appeared on Ruth's arm. Naomi rises, as if in response to the horn, looking up, and walks out to the dry well outside. There

she finds an old man. drinking water from the well bucket. It is the same old man that Koster has shown at the beginning of the film, narrating the prologue as Koster shows a long shot of Bethlehem. "Peace be with you," he greets her. "Who are you," Naomi asks. "Jerome," he replies, without further definition of land or tribe. Naomi reacts with awe at this; no one else in the film is similarly detached from a social group. "Are you a holy man," she asks. "We are all holy in the eyes of God," he replies, the evasive, redefining of terms answer that holy men traditionally give. She looks down at the dry well, now miraculously filled with water. "There will be water for many wells." Koster cuts from the medium two-shot of Jerome and Naomi to a shot of the sky, filling with clouds. "Many wells," Jerome repeats. Koster cuts back to a medium two-shot of Jerome and Naomi as Jerome picks up the water bucket and his staff, emblems respectively of maternal and paternal fructifying power, and places the bucket down next to her. "Trouble your heart no more," he tells her. "Be strong through this time. For from the widow of your son will issue children, and children's children, numbering among them a great king and a royal house, and a prophet whom many will worship as the messiah."

This scene is multiply encrusted within the symbolism both of Judaism and Christianity. It evokes the story of Abraham and Sarah, in which the old woman bears a child; the dry well fills again with water, and as always in romance, the barren land becomes reborn. Ruth is the ancestor of King David. In accordance with the Augustinian doctrine that the Old Testament conceals what the New Testament reveals, the water metaphor, in which not just this well,

but "many wells" will be filled, relates to the genealogy that makes Ruth the ancestor of David. Jesus, through Mary, who was of the house of David, is the descendant whom "many will worship as the messiah." One of the better known parables of Jesus is of his meeting a woman in Samaria by a well, and offering her the water of eternal life.[35] In the Augustinian interpretation of the Christian church, the church is the "vessel" of the divine word, the bride of Christ. The scene itself is quite simple, but nonetheless deliberately written for the maximum of evocative effect.

If Norman Corwin is the major creative force of the film, not every director might have been as sympathetic to the material. Henry Koster was perhaps the ideal director for this kind of scene. He enjoyed directing films infused with religion, Bible films in particular.[36] This may be because he believed that, just as Ruth received divine assistance from God, so he himself had received divine assistance. He believed God had directed film producer Samuel Goldwyn to offer him The Bishop's Wife (1947) to direct at a time when he was on suspension, and his career on the verge of ending. Koster was a non-practicing Jew. His wife, Peggy Moran, was a member of a small Protestant cult, the Church of Religious Science. She had her prayer group pray for Koster, and at the hour they were praying, Koster's agent received a call from Samuel Goldwin. Goldwyn had just fired his director for The Bishop's Wife, and thought Koster was the director he needed to fix the film. Koster was impressed enough by this coincidence that he became an active member of his wife's congregation.[37] Like DeMille, although he was less vocal about it, Koster

seems to have regarded this as a sign of a "calling" to make religiously evocative films. Koster referred to The Story of Ruth as the "only [Bible film] I did for the Jewish faith. I did Catholic, Protestant, really everything."[38]

After his series of symbolic acts and pronouncements, Jerome slips out of prophetic voice to ask Naomi for "bread for a hungry traveller." She runs into her house to bring out bread, but when she returns, Jerome is gone. She walks to the well, standing next to the water-filled bucket. As she looks around for Jerome, she hears the sound of thunder. Koster intercuts between a full shot of Naomi and the sky, which flashes with lightning. Rain begins falling, and Naomi looks down into the well. This is the most archaic of romance images, linking the sky-god with the earth-mother.[39] Jerome and Naomi are not a couple in the film, but rather the representations--as is typical of romance--of this divine couple. As they have been out of balance, leading to the nadir of catastrophe just prior to Jerome's appearance, so now they are restored. Koster intends by this scene to show us a numinous vision of the true divine order, and its true agents, to contrast with their manqué images in Hagar and the Old Man by the well of Bethlehem.[40] In The Song of Ruth, Slaughter has a portentous thunder storm as well--but he places it at the point at which Boaz, at the head of his army, kills Hedak in single combat and destroys his superior army. Corwin redirects the emphasis of divine intervention to Ruth's significance, rather than Boaz.[41]

Ruth's trial follows. As Koster has just presented a scene of divine recognition, the anagnorisis that reveals Ruth is the true romance hero, what

follows is less a trial of Ruth than a trial of society. This is one of the instances where romance, by linking the past to the future, has the potential to be almost revolutionary in the present. The youngest judge, who earlier implied that Boaz was a traitor, acts as the prosecutor of Ruth's trial. Interestingly, Corwin has his intermediaries use as their authority references to the story of Moses, with its theme of a movement out of bondage to the promised land, an oblique reminder that this Israel is itself in bondage to prejudice.

> Young Judge: If three thousand of our people were put to death for only once having worshipped a golden calf, then shall a Moabitess who worshipped Chemosh all her life be spared for a worse iniquity?
> Boaz: As the Lord lives! I will sit quiet no longer! What if she had been a priestess of Moab? She was not then under the Law of our land, but of another land--the land that had given her birth. And that was in the far past. She is now a true daughter of Judah!
> Young Judge: Well, we shall soon find out. Will the Moabitess Ruth deny that she worshipped false gods across the Jordan?
> Boaz: So did Seporah the wife of Moses worship false gods! Was not her father a priest in the service of an alien god? If the Lord our God accepts, who are we to refuse?

This is close to the "are you now or have you ever been" character attack that any adult would have recognized in 1960. Koster shows a medium shot of Tob entering to watch. He then intercuts between medium three-shots of the Young Judge, Naomi and Ruth, from Boaz's point of view, and a medium three-shot from behind Ruth of her, the Young Judge, and Boaz, cutting back and forth on questions.

> Young Judge: Wait, we will see if the Lord our God accepts. (to Ruth) Did you instruct children in the rituals of Chemosh?
> Ruth: Yes.
> Young Judge: Did you teach them that to die for Chemosh was noble and good?

Ruth: Yes.
Young Judge: Did you lead them to the altar to be slain?
Ruth: Yes.

Koster cuts to a close-up of Boaz to show his reaction to Ruth's answer. He has been looking around as the crowd has murmured disapproval at Ruth's answers. Now he narrows his eyes as he watches her intently.

Young Judge: And did you not then stand by and watch their bodies thrown into the flames of Chemosh!
Ruth: Yes!

Koster cuts to a close-up of Ruth for her fourth "yes." She is agitated by this, evoking as it does Tamar's death. Koster cuts to the Boaz close-up, and then to a medium shot of gossiping women, an associative montage linking their suspicions that Ruth is the cause of all Judah's troubles to Boaz's suspicious look. He seems to have replaced his own feelings about Ruth with theirs. Koster cuts back to the medium three-shot for the Young Judge's questions, but Koster cuts to a two-shot close-up of Naomi, reacting with concern, and Ruth, as the questions become more intense.

Young Judge: When did you last perform these (pause) rites?

Koster cuts to the closeup of Ruth and Naomi; Ruth is silent, aware that her answer will prejudice the crowd further. Koster cuts to the medium shot of the Young Judge. "Speak," he orders, and Koster returns to the closeup.

Young Judge (voice-over) Was it a very long time ago, years ago?
Ruth: No. It was within past months.

The assembled crowd murmurs. Koster cuts from Ruth to the Boaz close-up. Boaz raises his eyebrows, his eyes widen, and he twitches. Koster then cuts to

Tob, watching near the door, impassive. As he is not concerned about the Law, none of this really perturbs him. Koster cuts back to the medium shot.

Young Judge: (scornfully) Is this what Boaz calls the `far past?'

Koster cuts from the closeups of Ruth to Boaz. They look at each other silently, and then Boaz lowers his eyes and sits down, too filled with doubt to defend her life. The man next to Boaz looks on in amazement as Boaz sits. Koster cuts to a medium shot of Ruth and Naomi as they look at each other in shock and despair. Boaz had told Ben Adir, the old man at the well, that he should "never" give his staff, the symbol of phallic authority, to a woman; women are not fit instruments of the Law, he implied. Following the feminine mystique, women in his eyes are sexual, emotional creatures, not beings of law and reason. He seemed to understand when Ruth explained to him why she had come, but clearly now, under the pressure of community prejudice, he does not believe her. He conforms his beliefs to the majority opinion. But as Koster's associative montage cut indicates, he has handed over the power of the Law to Hagar. His own sense of law remains too unstable for him to follow his own patriarchal vision of law.

Koster then cuts to Tob. Tob is antisocial, as Koster has shown. He does not believe in the Law, but rather cites it in support of his interests, which are entirely personal and materialistic. In this circumstance, oddly, this gives him the freedom to defy community prejudice and the pressure of conformity.

Tob: If Boaz has naught to say, then I do.

Tob walks out of the frame, and Koster cuts to Ruth and Naomi as they look up in hope. Koster cuts to a tracking medium shot as Tob addresses the lead Judge, Shammah. Koster blocks his actors in the scene so that the camera must begin moving to stay with the actors in the following questions. The more that the characters and camera move, as opposed to remaining still, the closer the trial comes to the truth.

> Tob: I have just returned to the city from the field to find talk of stoning among us! Are we so thirsty for blood that we must accuse a woman of a crime for which there is no proof?

Koster cuts to a medium shot of Hagar tracking with her as she rises, settling to a medium three-shot with Naomi and Ruth as Hagar shouts at Ruth.

> Hagar: The proof was in the calamity that fell on us when she came!

Many "unfriendly" witnesses before the House Un-American Activities Committee had asked to face their accusers, only to be told by investigators that they were not going to fool the committee with such evasions of answers as insistence on proper legal procedure. Koster cuts to a reverse medium three-shot as Naomi answers, and back to show Hagar's reaction.

> Naomi: Have the rains not wet you, woman? The drought is ended. Our crops have been spared. We'll have a richer harvest than ever.

Koster returns to a tracking medium close-up of Tob as he walks around.

> Tob: Shammah; Judges; people of Bethlehem: We have been taught that every accused person comes to judgment pure of guilt, until his wrong-doing is proven. Our law demands at least two eye-witnesses to any crime performed upon our soil. Where are the two? Where's one!

Confronted with the letter of the Law, no one answers.

Koster cuts to a close-up of the young judge, looking troubled. The Moabite spy commander walks into the frame and whispers in his ear, and the young judge rises, camera tracking with him in close-up. "They are here," he says. "Two eyewitnesses." Ruth and Naomi look at each other in confusion. Koster tracks his camera in a full shot to follow the young judge as he asks the two spies to identify themselves. They give false names, Alzar and Sehn, and say that they are from the tribe of Reuben. The young judge has them swear to speak the truth. The commander, Alzar, then tells that he saw Ruth worshipping a Chemosh idol before dawn. Koster cuts to the lead judge, Shammah. "If it was not yet light, how do you know it was Chemosh?" he asks. Koster cuts back to the spies. "By the flame burning in its middle," "Alzar" says after shifting his eyes.

Naomi steps forward, addressing herself to the lead judge. "I pray you, a word to our brother from Reuben." The judge nods. "Speak, Naomi." Ruth looks at the spies. "You are a son, as we all are sons and daughters, of Jehovah." "Yes," the spy says. Naomi smiles. "Name the twelve tribes of Israel." The spy and his lieutenant shift around in alarm. The fact that the Lead Judge allows Naomi to question the witness is interesting: He passes the authority of law to her. This is just what Boaz told the old man who gave his staff to Hagar should never be allowed: A woman in possession of power. But in a romance, the dominant social order of the blighted society is a fallen society, and its rules false rules. In the grail myths, the task that needed to be done to

release the people from bondage, and to awaken the land to life, was to ask the right question, "who is to be served by it." The answer is not one person, but all people. The "fisher-king," the ruler of the fallen society, cannot ask the right questions. However, the fisher-king knows what they are. The lead judge cannot act, but he certifies Naomi's right to speak, her right to assume the power of the Law.

"Alzar" recognizes the authority she has been given immediately, and attempts to evade it by addressing himself to the Young Judge. He tries to deny her right to speak. "Am I here like some criminal, to answer questions--" Koster cuts to the lead judge. "The widow Naomi questions your being one of us," he says sternly. "Answer her." Tob and Naomi's appeal to justice under the Law is the question which has unbalanced the spell. "Alzar" begins naming tribes as his lieutenant grows increasingly nervous. "Why there's Judah, and Dan, and Reuben, and Benjamin, and Asher--" The assembled crowd mutters at this slip. "There are many of us who cannot name all the tribes," the spy says nervously, as the crowd continues to mutter.

Ruth has been silent except for her one-word answers to questions. Now, given the right to exercise the Law, Ruth steps forward and speaks, as Naomi turns to smile at her. "But we all must know the ten commandments. Do you?" Koster returns to the spy, and tracks out as he steps forward, and speaks with an angry edge to his voice. "How many do you know, idolatress?" Koster returns to Naomi and Ruth. Ruth lifts her chin. "All. I would be grateful if you could remember only the ninth. Do you?" Koster cuts back to the spy, who

gulps as his anxious lieutenant stares at the crowd, and the young judge looks at his witness, eyes wide in shock. Koster returns to Ruth. "It is, `thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'" She takes another step forward. "Perhaps, Alzar, you have a poor memory. This then requires no memory. Would you and your brother from Reuben bless the name of Jehovah and curse the name of Chemosh?" Koster cuts from the alarmed spy to a medium shot of Ruth's accusers--Hagar shocked, like the prosecutor, other women interested, astonished, one smiling at the craft of Ruth's questions. Koster then cuts to a group of men, who lean forward, and to the lead judge, also leaning forward. "Well? Will you?" Koster cuts back to the shot of "Alzar." Behind him, his lieutenant creeps forward, and the camera shifts slightly with them as they move slowly toward a door. They make a dash, but are caught. "Cursed be the name of Jehovah! Honor and glory to the name of Chemosh!" The crowd hauls them before the judge. "Twice over you have doomed yourselves. You have blasphemed the name of the lord; you have borne false witness against the widow. Let it be done to you as you would have done to the widow. The judge asks if anyone else has any evidence against Ruth, then orders that those who threatened her shall ask forgiveness. Tob and Naomi have helped, but it is ultimately Ruth who, in freeing herself, has freed the society from the bondage of prejudice and conformity.[42]

Romance, Frye, argues, is the basic narrative form out of which all other narrative forms derive.[43] The final stage of romance is comedy, with the joining of a couple around whom the new society centers. Tob defended Ruth because

her beliefs were irrelevant to him. Boaz could not, because her beliefs were important to him, and, filled with a comic eiron's self-doubt, he relapsed into his churlish type. Koster cuts to a close-up of Boaz as Ruth says to Tob, "thank you--thank you for your belief in me." This establishes the comic problem that remains to be resolved. Tob is an imposter, pretending to an absolute adherence to the Law that he does not really have. He does not believe in the Law, and he certainly does not believe in Ruth. He is the comic "humor," which Frye defines as follows:

> The humor in comedy is usually someone with a good deal of social prestige and power, who is able to force much of the play's society into line with his obsession. Thus the humor is intimately connected with the theme of the absurd or irrational law that the action of comedy moves toward breaking.[44]

In order for comedy to be relevant to a society, it must invoke problems which are of real concern to the society for which it is written. The underlying romance themes of prejudice and conformity do not disappear, but rather are the underlying contexts within which the particular excesses of a society dominated by a humor and his obsessions become elevated to laws. Tob's obsessions are his materialism, and the status of Ruth as an object or a person.

Koster and Corwin have signaled that Tob's kindnesses to Ruth have all derived from his lust for her, rather than from his sense of moral duty. The romance protagonist's marriage partner is significant, as their union is the foundation of the new social order, the society of the future--a theme with which the Bible film is always concerned, and which Corwin invoked with the film's prologue. Tob's dominating passion is his materialism. Whatever is abstract is

of no interest to him. A romance is always a movement from anomie, or lack of identity, to epiphany, in which the divine order is manifested in an individual or a society, usually both. Boaz values Ruth because her identity has called forth his own. Tob, on the other hand, seems interested in Ruth only because she is beautiful. To marry him is not to establish an identity, but to lose it.

He meets with Naomi the next day to ask for Ruth's hand in marriage. "How do you know she loves you?" Naomi asks Tob. "How do you know she doesn't," Tob replies happily. "See here, Naomi," Tob tells her, "haven't I courted her? haven't I repaired your farm? I've sent her spices, ointments, food, clothes. She's accepted them all." This list of material offerings--a purchase price, essentially--is for him the epitome of true love. This would be in accordance with the 50's and early 60's rules of the feminine mystique: The woman should seek security, above all else. Femininity finds its fulfillment in marriage to a good provider.[45]

The property theme has its source in the Book of Ruth, which reflects traditional patriarchal society. How Slaughter and Corwin each modified this theme reveals the strategies of their narratives. In the Book of Ruth, 4:3-6; 4:9-10, Ruth is part of Naomi's property. Tob is much more interested in the property than Ruth. Boaz and Naomi use the Levirate law, which would make Ruth's children legally of Mahlon's clan, to make Tob renounce his claim so that Ruth and Boaz can marry. The Story of Ruth kept the identity of Ruth as part of Naomi's property, in spite of many other changes, but Slaughter makes Ruth herself Tob's interest, not land, and her identity entirely sexual rather than

familial. Through Naomi, Slaughter explains Ruth's status as property as part of the burden and challenge of womanhood:

> `Tob might give you up for a price, and Boaz is wealthy.'
> `I am not a cow to be bought and sold,' Ruth cried indignantly.
> `You are a woman,' Naomi reminded her. `Women are owned by the men who take them to wife.'
> `Without anything to say about it ourselves?'
> Naomi smiled. `We may be chattels, Ruth, but women still find ways to make them men they pick out decide to choose them for their wives.'[46]

Slaughter's Ruth will enable law, in the person of Boaz, to progenerate. Ruth is so far from identifying with the Law that she tells Boaz, after Tob uses the Levirate law to betroth her involuntarily, "`I hate them! They are unjust! Why must I obey an unjust law?'"[47]

Corwin took the idea of a person who embodies the Law and transposed it to Ruth as part of his methodology of shifting the narrative focus from Boaz to Ruth. He also eliminated the land context, but kept the levirate law as an obstacle rather than an asset for the couple. Corwin also has Ruth become angry at the Law, but he places this scene at the potentially tragic crisis just prior to the film's resolution. Where Slaughter makes this a casual comment, it is the moment of final crisis for Corwin's Ruth. At that point, Boaz will state the humane purpose of the Law, a purpose that Tob clearly violates in his insistence on the letter of the Law. As a result, Corwin transformed the narrative from Slaughter's version that reinforced the feminine mystique to one which tacitly challenges it, even as The Story of Ruth has the conventional narrative goal of fulfillment in marriage. Because of the way the story is modified, when

Ruth and Boaz marry, it is as much a fulfillment of Ruth's passion for the Law and her mission to restore the Law to Judah as it is her passion for Boaz.[48]

Naomi gently tries to disillusion Tob that she is the woman of his materialist dreams, only to be presented with the irrational law. "I don't believe Ruth measures love by the ability to help or provide. If she did, she would have very little use for me." Tob looks at her, but does not listen. He starts to list more material benefits and assistance he has provided. "Didn't I defend her when the rabble were--" Naomi cuts him off. "You were eloquent. We know that, and we thank you for it." Tob tries another tack. Is there another man, he asks. When Naomi tells him that she cannot decide for Ruth whom she will marry, Tob becomes angry. "I think you can!" "All that matters is what Ruth feels," Naomi tells him. To a materialist, this is unsatisfactory. "No," he mutters, rising. "No, it is you! You hate me because of my contempt for your husband. Well, let me tell you, it doesn't matter what Ruth `feels,' she is obliged to become my wife." Naomi is surprised. "Obliged?" "Are you feigning ignorance, or have you forgotten the Levirate law? The law that the next of kin of a deceased man has the right--even the obligation!--to marry his widow?" Naomi reacts, lowering her eyes. "Well," Tob says. "I am your nearest male kin." "So you are," Naomi says resignedly. "Good. Then you see it." Corwin's use of the metaphor Ideas are Objects in Tob's reply is probably done consciously; the Law is a thing, not an idea with a purpose. "And when you think it over then you will be happy with my decision. Now go back to Ruth and tell her, ah, tactfully, of my intention to

announce our betrothal tomorrow." Ruth, who loves the Law, ironically is now the object of the Law mechanically applied.

Ruth spends the night sitting up looking at her gold tablets of the Ten Commandments, a visual signifier of this conflict. What must be done is to liberate the intention of the Law from Tob's self-interested use of it. In the morning Tob's servant Huphim arrives with a dress for Ruth. "My master sends this dress," he tells her portentously. "He bids you to come to the harvest celebration tonight. Wear it." He steps forward to give it to Ruth, who shrinks from it. Naomi takes the dress from him. "He asks if you have any word to send him," Huphim adds. "Only peace," Ruth says. "That is all?" Huphim says, affronted. "That is much," Ruth tells him. Ruth tells Naomi that she will not go to a celebration. But Naomi realizes that the celebration is an opportunity. After Ruth's trial, Koster signaled with images that Boaz no longer feels that he can approach Ruth directly, and Ruth is uncertain about Boaz. Naomi first extracts from Ruth a blind promise to do as she requests. Then she tells Ruth to go to the harvest celebration. When Boaz lies down by the grain, as is the custom on the harvest night, Ruth is to lie down beside him. Ruth, confronted with the implication that she should consent to premarital sex, stands, shocked and then embarrassed as Naomi continues.

> Ruth: Naomi, what are you saying?
> Naomi: Do you not love him?
> Ruth: Why-- If-- How can you ask that?
> Naomi: Think about it! Do you love Boaz?
> Ruth: Even if I did love him, how could I possibly do what you ask?
> Naomi: Please, Ruth, do not question me. I know Boaz, and I know you. Do as I ask! Promise me!

Ruth does not promise now, though at the festival she obeys Naomi.

Slaughter's version of this scene provides more of a reason for why Ruth should find Boaz on this particular night. He has Ruth and Boaz disclose their love for each other prior to Tob's forcible betrothal. In the Book of Ruth, Tob never is betrothed to Ruth; if she had been, and Boaz and Ruth had done as Naomi suggests, they would have been guilty of adultery under the Law, and subject to the death penalty. Slaughter acknowledges that this is a violation of the Law, but obscures the nature of the penalty[49] to emphasize Boaz's power of choice:

> `On every other night of the year the man must choose the woman. But tonight, after the hour of midnight, it is the woman's privilege to choose for herself.'
> `Do you mean she selects the man she will stay with tonight?'
> `Yes.'
> `Then why am I going? I will certainly not choose Tob, although under your law I am betrothed to him.'
> `You must do just as I tell you,' Naomi said mysteriously.'...
> `Why?' Ruth asked, frowning.
> `As I told you, only tonight in all the year does the woman choose the man. And an old law among my people says that if a woman lies under the cloak of a man in the night, he must buy her as his wife.'
> Ruth jumped to her feet, horrified. `I will not do it, Naomi. I will not trick him, not even to---'
> `You love Boaz, don't you?'
> `Yes, but---'
> `And he loves you.'
> `That would be deceiving him---'
> `Don't you prefer Boaz's embrace to Tob's?'
> Ruth shivered. `Anything is better than that.'
> `Then you will do as I have planned,' Naomi said briskly. `Would you deny me strong grandsons such as yours and Boaz's would be?'[50]

Later, at the festival, Ruth balks again:

> `But even if Boaz does want me, he cannot marry me. The Law comes between us.'
> `Love has been known to laugh at laws,' Naomi said practically. `He loves you and you love him. At least this one night will be yours, whatever happens afterward.'
> Ruth caught her breath at the implication of Naomi's words. her face was hot in the darkness and her heart was beating fast. `And then?' she asked in a whisper.
> `Boaz is an honorable man. He would not rest until he had made Tob give him the shoe (turn over the right-of-kin to Boaz). Then all of your troubles would be over.
> `But if he speaks, what will I say?'
> `Let him speak,' Naomi advised. `Once you go to him, all the decisions are his. He will make them.'[51]

In comparison to Slaughter's version, Corwin's explanation that Boaz is available that night and Ruth should go to him is undermotivated. But Slaughter's romance hero is Boaz. Corwin's romance hero is Ruth, and to adopt this Women's Choice law is to say that his romance protagonist Ruth, who is the embodiment of the Law, actually only has the right to be an agent rather than the object of the Law one night a year. Corwin consequently removes the Law, and makes the Harvest Night meeting the night in which the couple recognize their love, rather than ratify it. Both authors have their characters who are identified with the Law become subject to an involuntary liberation from their own strict adherence to the Law--Slaughter's Boaz the counter-tradition of women's choice, and Corwin the counter-law of obedience to parents--in order to move from Tob's illusion of carrying out the intent of the Law to a true manifestation of law.[52] The differences between their stories stem directly from whom they take as their narratives's protagonist.

Koster takes the occasion of the harvest festival to show, by Bible movie standards, the rather chaste spectacle of the Harvest festival celebration. In virtually every other Bible film, the celebratory spectacles are assigned to the Alien nation in order to display the maximum of 50's titillation, which then is promptly punished. Corwin's narrative is directed at the Chosen society's problems, however. Aptly, given the context of the cocktail party decade, Corwin and Koster show Tob drinking to excess. "Happens every festival," Huphim exclaims fussily, as he drags his master off the dance floor.

Later, Ruth creeps up to where Boaz is sleeping. Boaz, interestingly, sleeps up on a little ridge. Tob and the other men sleep below, by the threshing floor. By this staging, Koster invokes implicitly the metaphor Moral is Up/Immoral is Down; Boaz, as a "high-minded" person, is above Tob and his "low" tricks.[53] This separation from the other men serves another purpose as well. Action in the romance comedy mode begins in the normal world and moves into what Frye calls the "green world," a place outside the normal restrictions of law and social roles. There the protagonist couple undergo a metamorphosis of identity, resolving the conflicts between them that they have brought into this place. Once this is done, the couple returns to the normal world, where they try to establish this new understanding.[54] Instead of lying down at Boaz's feet, Ruth stands above Boaz and looks down at him, reflecting her status relative to him. Boaz awakes, and looks up at Ruth. As he speaks, appropriately, the tone of his voice is apologetic.

Boaz: I was dreaming of you--and you are here! I wanted so much to explain.

Ruth kneels, and Koster switches from separate close-ups to a two-shot closeup, alternating between facing Boaz and Ruth. She still looks down on Boaz as he props himself up with his elbows.

Ruth: There is no need. I've always understood.
Boaz: I love you, Ruth. I've loved you from the day we met in my field.
Ruth: It must have been God's goodness that brought me to your field that day. Perhaps he's been directing me to you all my life.

They kiss, and Boaz asks her to marry him.

Ruth: But--the Levirate law! Tob is next of kin. He's going to claim his right to me before the elders in the morning.
Boaz: I will get him to renounce his right. Ruth: But what if he refuses?
Boaz: Never. He will yield. I will make it worth his while. Have no fear. If I know Tob, he will come to terms. He likes property. It will be light soon. Go now, my Ruth. No one must see us together before this is settled. There must be no more suspicion to hurt you.
Ruth: I love you.

Metamorphosis accomplished, Ruth returns to tell Naomi.

In a romantic comedy, the metamorphosed couple itself is the focus of attention. Their return to the world to establish in it their new understanding has a local significance. In a comic romance, the focus is on the social significance in the marriage. Ruth awakens Naomi to tell her what has occurred, but Naomi tells Ruth instead, to the accompaniment of the shofar horn theme that signals the reconciliation of earth and heaven:

Naomi: He asked you to marry him.
Ruth: How did you divine he would?

> Naomi: I did not divine it. I had help. The day Boaz said he would sit in judgment, I prayed for you. A holy man came to the well and told me.
> Ruth: That--that I would marry Boaz?
> Naomi: He told me that from the widow of my son would issue children, and children's children, numbering among them a great king, a royal house, and a prophet that many will worship as the messiah.
> Ruth: Through me? A Moabitess?
> Naomi: Yes, from you, my daughter. And who but Boaz could father such a family? Have no doubts. I believe the holy man, and so must you.

Ruth's own awareness of what has happened and what is at stake in Boaz's negotiations with Tob changes.

Ruth walks from the house to the well where Naomi received this news, lifts the water bucket and drinks. Koster cuts to a shot of the well water as Ruth looks at herself in it. As was the case when Ruth looked at herself and Tamar in the mirror, she is seeing herself through another's eyes. This time she is seeing herself through Naomi's eyes. The well and the bucket, as previously, serve as vagina-symbols. In this looking-into-herself now, Ruth sees herself not as the doomed child, but as a figure in history, existing in time. But as she looks, a drop hits the water, and the image is blurred. From the edge of the reflection, Boaz enters. Koster cuts to a close-up two shot over Boaz's shoulder as Ruth looks up and smiles at him. Her face changes from happiness to concern, and Koster cuts to the reverse angle to show Boaz, his face suffused with sadness. "I have failed," he tells her.

> Boaz: Tob will not renounce his claim to you. I offered him everything I own. Even now he is announcing your marriage before the elders.
> Ruth: No! No! It can't be!

> **Boaz:** It's the Law.
> **Ruth:** The Law! All I have heard since I came here is the Law! The Law! What kind of justice binds a widow to a man she can never love? the Law!
> **Boaz:** It is meant to be kind, not harsh, meant to keep alive the inheritance of the dead. But for that law I would not be here. My mother was such a widow. I know that's of small comfort to you, Ruth. If only there was some way.

This is the moment Frye terms the "point of ritual death," the point of near tragedy before a comic resolution.[55] Often this point is a seeming reversal of the underlying contextual theme the narrative takes up--a seeming victory of the blocking humor or humors, and their causes. In this case, from the moment in which Ruth is a person of historical importance and an agent of the Law, she is threatened with being made an object of Tob's, another of his material possessions.

But the Law, momentarily cast in the role of Ruth's enemy, changes her destiny. Aptly, it is the Law made into an object that is the catalyst for this change. At the threshing floor, where Boaz is pacing, he finds in the straw the gold tablets of the Ten Commandments Mahlon made for Ruth. He would have avoided Tob and Ruth's wedding. Once he finds the gold tablets, however, Boaz brings it to Tob's wedding celebration. "I hope I am welcome, Tob," he says. "Welcome! I cannot tell you what satisfaction it gives me to see you here!" As Corwin and Koster have taken care to show that Tob does not like Boaz and does not care about his opinion, the reason for his satisfaction must be the knowledge that Boaz will witness Tob's consolidation of his ownership over Ruth. Hagar and the women who always accompany her bring Ruth a bouquet,

which she accepts. Hagar herself smiles at Ruth, a foreshadowing of the social reconciliation that is part of the comedy's new order of being. Boaz comes to Ruth and returns the tablets to her, which Tob observes with raised eyebrows. "I found these," he says, handing the tablets of the Law to her. "They brought you to our land and kept you from harm. They will keep us strong." Tob halts the wedding ceremony. "God has been good to the Tribe of Judah," he tells his guests, and cites all the blessings that have come to Judah: The rains, which have brought in bountiful crops; the return of his kinswoman Naomi; and "crowning it all," Ruth.

> Tob: My fair bride and dear Naomi: Praise for you both has just been on my lips. Speak, Ruth. Say if it is not true that your heart is in this land, that you obey our Law and trust in the Lord, and honor my claim to you.

This is like the scene from the beginning of the film, when the rectoress called Ruth to step forward and recite the ritual prayer to Chemosh. Tob recites the basis under which he lays claim to her, with the implication that by divine blessings it is proper. He then tells her to give a pledge of her loyalty--knowing that Ruth and Boaz wanted to marry, and in the context of their meeting. It is a ritual reminder to both her and Boaz: If she is to be of the tribe of Judah, she <u>will</u> be true to the Law, and loyal to him.

Koster cuts to a medium shot of Ruth. She has been wearing a veil, covering her face. Now she takes it off to speak, and makes open what she, Tob, and Boaz all know, that this is a coercive pledge. She steps forward, and the camera tracks in to a close-up.

Ruth: It is true, Tob, that my heart is in this land. It is true that I obey the law, and that my trust is in the Lord. It is true that I honor your claim to me, my honorable kinsman.

Koster cuts back to a medium long-shot of Tob, standing above his guests. Tob smiles, and sighs with satisfaction. But Ruth is not through. Koster returns to Ruth and the camera tracks with her as she walks forward; like the trial, the camera movement signifies a breaking of restraints.

Ruth: But it is also true that I do not love you.

Koster cuts back to Tob as he loses his smile and the crowd reacts, then to close-ups of Boaz and Naomi, each pleased at her response. Koster returns to Tob, who rapidly climbs down from the platform on which he stood, then stops suddenly, like a logjam that breaks and catches again.

Tob: Have no fear, you will, in time.

As Tob speaks, Koster cuts from Tob to a close-up of Ruth, and back to Tob again, as Ruth responds "I will try." "Good," Tob responds, smiling again. "I'm a patient man, and I appreciate your truthfulness." The unnecessary truth may now be ignored.

But Koster cuts to a tight face close-up of Ruth as she continues to speak. In his intercut back to Tob in his medium long shot framing as he replies to Ruth, Tob loses his smile. Ruth has brought him down from his platform, and now in the size contrasts, Koster uses the dynamics of image size to signify her ascendancy over Tob.

Ruth: Then I must keep nothing from you. I must tell you everything which is in my heart.
Tob: Of course.

Ruth: You have the right to know that on the night of the harvest celebration, I sought out Boaz on the threshing floor.

Tob's face fills with anger. Koster tracks back to keep Tob in medium long-shot framing as he advances toward Ruth. As she comes in at the edge of the frame, Koster cuts back to the tight close-up of Ruth, her face impassive, and then to Boaz and Ruth before returning to Tob. Like Boaz at Ruth's trial, Tob now looks around him at the people, talking to each other. Koster cuts to Tob's oblique point of view as he looks over at the lead judge Shammah and the other judges, who look nonplussed; they give him no guidance. Koster returns to the medium long-shot of Tob as he turns and looks back at Ruth.

Tob: As you say, woman of Moab, I have always upheld the law. And because I intend to keep on doing so, I will permit no other to come into my house and bear my name!

Tob had hoped to make Ruth state her adherence to a law in which she did not believe, and instead she has forced him in a position where he must either declare that he does not care about the law, or where he must renounce his intention to marry her.

Koster cuts to a close-up of Ruth, who raises herself slightly as if a burden is lifted off her, then of Boaz, who steps forward through the crowd. "Then give up your claim to her!" he shouts. Koster returns to the medium long shot of Tob with Ruth in the corner as Tob reacts, and then to a long shot of Boaz over Tob's shoulder as the crowd parts between them.

Boaz: According to the custom of our fathers, take off your shoe and give it to me as a sign of renouncement.

Koster cuts to his first close-up of Tob, who now looks sickened. Boaz offered all of his property to Tob, which made Ruth all the more valuable to Tob. Now he has cast her away--though he really does not care about the law--and he cannot take back his words without being revealed as an imposter. Koster cuts to Boaz. "For as next of kin, I will marry her." Koster cuts to Ruth, who looks over her shoulder at Boaz, and returns to Tob. Tob realizes there is nothing else he can do, and his face hardens in anger and resignation. He shifts his eyes from Boaz to Ruth, and Koster cuts to the tight close-up of Ruth. She looks serenely back at him, slowly starting to smile. Koster cuts to Naomi, who looks triumphant. Koster returns to the medium long-shot of Tob, with Ruth in the right corner. Staring at her angrily, he takes off his shoe. Koster cuts to the over-the-shoulder shot of Boaz as Tob throws his shoe at Boaz's feet.

Boaz steps forward, looking triumphantly at Tob, then turns and takes Ruth's hand. Koster cuts away to a reaction shot of Naomi, and back to Tob, Boaz and Ruth. Boaz turns and looks in the direction of the judges, and starts toward them with Ruth. The camera turns and pans to follow them, and Koster reverse-cuts to a medium shot as they stand in front of the judges.

> Boaz: Ruth of Moab, Widow of Mahlon: Swear with me that nothing passed between us on that night or any other time except spoken vows of love.
> Ruth: By the Holy Commandments, I swear it.

Koster reverse-cuts to a shot over Ruth and Boaz's shoulders of the lead judge Shammah and other judges. Behind Shammah, the other judges nod and

smile at each other, then look at Ruth and Boaz. As Shammah speaks, Koster cuts to a tight two-shot close-up of Ruth and Boaz, and back to Shammah.

> Boaz: We are without blemish in this matter. Jehovah is witness to this our oath between us and him forever.
> Shammah: You have sworn a holy oath; sworn that your word is truth and bound your souls to the bond. Go in peace, my children. Go in peace, as Man and Wife.

Koster cuts back to the medium shot of them to show the reactions of the people as Shammah concludes. The people surround Ruth and Boaz as they embrace, now the center of a circle of people; the new society has begun.

Koster again emphasizes that this is not simply the union of Boaz and Ruth, but the restoration of the lower world with the divine world. He cuts to a close-up of Naomi, looking happily at this scene, then back to Ruth and Boaz, in a scene of social unity. Koster cuts to a two-shot close-up of Tob and his servant. Tob grimaces and turns, and Koster tracks rapidly in profile close-up as Tob walks out of the area. The camera stops suddenly, and Tob turns around. The old man, Jerome, to the accompaniment of his shofar horn theme, hands Tob his sandal he had thrown at Boaz. Tob snatches it and leaves the frame. The camera stays on Jerome, panning and tracking in to a low-angle close-up. Jerome turns and looks to frame right, and Koster cuts to Naomi, who looks to frame left and recognizes him. She looks at him and raises her eyebrows quizzically, with the silent question: Is this the right man for Ruth to marry? Koster cuts back to Jerome, who smiles and nods. Koster cuts back to Naomi, whose eyes widen in response. Jerome walks into her frame as she watches him, and pauses as he is about to exit. He smiles, nods, and looks

back to the couple. Koster cuts to a tracking close-up shot of Ruth and Boaz; the forward movement of the camera--indeed, all the camera movement of this scene--emphasizes the character's freedom. Koster cuts back to Naomi, who is alone again in her frame. She is looking upward, and Koster cuts to what seems to be her point of view--though it cannot be, as it is in the desert, of Jerome climbing a ridge; he is returning, in Koster's image-metaphor, to the upper world.

Jerome pauses and looks back. In voice-over, he speaks the last lines of the Book of Ruth, slightly abbreviated. As he completes the story of the film's characters, Jerome turns and begins walking over the hill--as with Lincoln at the end of Young Mr. Lincoln, walking into the future, walking into history.

> Jerome (voiceover): So Boaz took Ruth, and she was his wife, and she bore him a son. And Naomi took the child and laid him in her bosom, and became nurse unto it. And they called the name of the son Obed, and Obed was the father of Jesse, and Jesse was the father of David, the king.

ENDNOTES

1. See Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 43.

2. In Frye's terms, Lawrence and Barabbas each are pharmakos characters, scapegoats, "guilty in the sense that he is a member of a guilty society, or living in a world where such injustices are an inescapable part of existence." Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 41. I would add that Chemene in Anthony Mann's El Cid (1960) is also one of these characters, the one heroine besides Ruth. The Cid is the hero, but his doubt and uncertainty are displaced onto Chemene; they are really two halves of a whole. Only when she has made the journey to his level of heroism is Rodrigo able to become completely the Cid, forsaking his human existence entirely in order to fill the inhuman dimensions of heroism. The Cid is, in effect, Rodrigo and Chemene's spiritual child.

3. See William Manchester, The Glory and the Dream Vol. 2 (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), pp. 1009-1021.

4. "Acknowledgement," Frank G. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth (New York: Permabooks, 1955) Maxwell Anderson also did some work on Ben-Hur.

5. Aubrey Solomon, Twentieth Century-Fox: A Corporate and Financial History, discusses the studio's "star" problem on page 139.

6. Aubrey Soloman, Twentieth Century-Fox: A Corporate and Financial History (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1988), pp. 138-139.

7. Frank G. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 8.

8. I would point out the closeness of Tamar to tamer, and refer the reader to a dictionary. The implications of a child being made "docile and submissive", "subject to cultivation," "deprived of spirit," and the other associated meanings connoted by "tame" are certainly relevant to the film's theme. Ruth's movement in the film is one from constraint to release, and from submission to freedom. That she should see her own bondage through observing the subdued, docile child in her care, is suggestive that Corwin gave the child this name purposefully.

9. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, pp. 52-63.

10. Specifically, this corresponds to Northrop Frye's second phase of tragedy. See Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 220-221.

11. Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, p. 175.

12. See Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 195-196.

13. I cannot help observing that in this conclusion, Hedak really does not disagree with the book of Job; but that is another story.

14. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 22. Compare also with pp. 156 and 188 on the significance of Ruth's actions.

15. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, pp. 119-152.

16. See Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, pp. 170-171

17. See Northrop Frye's comments on the tragic phase of romance in The Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 215-216.

18. Slaughter, pp. 158-159; p. 165.

19. Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 187.

20. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 2.

21. Old women, c.f. the knitting women around the guillotine in The Scarlet Pimpernel (1936), frequently are the emblems of a social order dominated by passion rather than law.

22. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, pp. 190-191.

23. The law in question is Exodus 23:21; Leviticus 20:33.

24. It is possible that this suggestion of political and legal awareness on Ruth's part itself marks her as something of a radical, making her additionally suspect. People--especially women--who critiqued the practice of United States law by citing constitutional rights were frequently assumed to be Communists in the early 50's. See Brett Harvey, The Fifties: A Women's Oral History (New York: Harper, 1994), pp. 204-206.

25. See Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 175-176.

26. Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 201-202.

27. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 201.

28. Philip Wylie, A Generation of Vipers, p. 191.

29. Billy Graham, "Wither Bound?", America's Hour of Decision, p. 140.

30. Dwight D. Eisenhower, "The President's News Conference of February 17, 1960," Public Papers of the Presidents (Washington D.C.: National Archives, 1961), item 38, pp. 189-190.

31. Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," The Radical Right, pp. 6-7.

32. See Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, pp. 112-113.

33. The comparable passage in Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, is pp. 202-204. Frye discusses the "rescued bride" structure of romance in Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism pp. 192-193.

34. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 195.

35. See John 4. Part of the significance of this event is that it is regarded as symbolic of a new covenant between the God of Israel and the Gentile nations.

36. Irene Kahn Atkins, Henry Koster (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1987), p. 156.

37. John Steinbacher, "A Christmas Story," Classic Images Vol. 246 (December 1995), p. 7.

38. Irene Kahn Atkins, Henry Koster, p. 158. Steinbacher, in "A Christmas Story," elaborates this point further than Atkins. "The great and abiding legacy of Henry Koster is found in these two contrasting periods in his directorial life--before The Bishop's Wife and afterwards.

39. Northrop Frye, The Secular Scripture, pp. 181-184.

40. It is perhaps not by accident that this woman is named Hagar; that is the name of Sarah's servant, with whom Abraham has Ishmael, the traditional ancestor of the Arab nations. In Judean tradition, Hagar arrogantly claims the right to be Abraham's true wife, the ancestress of Israel. See Genesis 16.

41. See Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, pp. 278-285.

42. Slaughter has this same scene later in The Song of Ruth, pp. 247-265. In Slaughter's version, Ruth's two accusers do not come from Moab and pretend to be Israelis, but are citizens of Judah--Tob and his friend Cheb, a travelling

merchant who trades between Moab and Judah. Slaughter's Cheb is a spy, and Tob a "fellow-traveller," lured by his selfishness to act against the community. As with Corwin's version, their charges against Ruth are hypocritical: They accuse her of being a spy sent from Moab, rather than an idol-worshipper. Tob takes the function that Corwin assigns to an unnamed young judge. Boaz--after what one would think would be the decisive meeting on Harvest night, still doubts Ruth. In spite of this, Boaz is her only defender, as Naomi is barred from the council room. Boaz, not the lead judge, insists that Ruth will be allowed to speak in her defense. When Ruth's questions of Cheb reveal that he might be a spy, however, the trial is interrupted by the news that Hedak and Moab's army is marching on Judah. Cheb insists that he can prove his innocence by leading Judah's army to a position where they can ambush Moab's force. The pacing of the scene is similar, but Slaughter's version makes Boaz more heroic, and the resolution of the trial is displaced from Ruth's cross-examination to Boaz's defeat of Moab.

43. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 192.

44. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 169.

45. Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, p. 167.

46. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 225.

47. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 230.

48. Slaughter's Boaz must explain the importance of the law to Ruth, not the other way around. In this conflict in The Song of Ruth, p. 230, Boaz tells Ruth: "`It would be like death to me to see you taken to wife by Tob....But you must understand that to an Israelite the Law is above everything else.'" "`Even above our love?' she whispered. `Even above that, Ruth,' he said slowly as if every word hurt him to the quick, as indeed it did. `Our love is from ourselves,' he explained. `But the Law is from God.'"

49. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 248, acknowledges the Deuteronomy penalty of stoning for adultery, which applied to betrothed women, but has one of his characters say that the laws are not enforced on the Harvest festival night.

50. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 235.

51. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 243.

52. Slaughter, The Song of Ruth, p. 236, gives Boaz's lieutenant Joseph the following lines, to drive the point home:

Why Boaz had not taken her already he could not understand. Certainly any fool could see the love in her eyes, and Boaz had admitted he loved Ruth in return.

That business about Tob and the token payment, now, he thought. It was hard to understand Boaz's reasoning. Tob owed Boaz a lot of money, and if Boaz were to demand payment and Tob could not meet the debt, he would have to satisfy his creditors somehow or be stoned. That was the Law about not paying one's just debts.

But when Joseph had suggested that Tob would be glad enough to give his shoe in return for settling the debt, thus escaping payment and saving his own skin at one stroke, Boaz had stubbornly refused to consider the suggestion. His reason was that it would not be fair to press Tob for payment as a leaver to gain something he wanted himself that now belonged to Tob.

Sometimes, Joseph thought wryly, Boaz was too upright for his own good. It was too bad that he, Joseph, was not the one Tob owed instead of Boaz. Tob would get the same consideration that the merchant would give anyone else, which was exactly none at all.

53. Lakoff et al, Master Metaphor List, p. 187.

54. Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 182-184.

55. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 179.

CHAPTER FIVE

> "In self-discipline, reasonableness, readiness to compromise, the early Romans set an example for all time. These were the qualities...through which Rome survived while the more brilliant Greek civilization, for lack of them, disintegrated. They were finally swamped, as Livy believed, by the growth of luxury and selfishness. This phase of Roman history carries uneasy implications for modern America.
>
> -- H.J. Haskell, The New Deal in Old Rome[1]

Like the "United States is Israel" metaphor, the "United States is Rome" metaphor is one with a lengthy history that predates the United States itself. Athenian democracy and Arthurian romance, which I will mention below, were also significant models in the 50's and early 60's as patterns for understanding the role of the United States in the world. But Rome, from colonial days to the present, remains the most important historical model through which the United States views itself.

Indeed, Rome in its imperial aspect has been the most important metaphorical model for Western cultures. With the rise of the great European empires in the Renaissance, the classical world--and in particular Rome--became the standard metaphor through which Europeans evaluated their new problems of political order. European nobility gradually ordered representations of themselves to be shifted from disciples of Christ worshipping at Golgotha, or at the feet of saints, to commanding imperial figures in the garb of the ancients. The museums of Europe are awash with paintings and

sculpture implying an identity between the martial accomplishments of Louis XIV or Napoleon to Alexander the Great, or Britain's king to Rome's emperor. Gothic style gave way to Baroque, with its imperial columns and gilt, and to neoclassicism. Even the coins of the age replaced modern with ancient dress in order to look more like Roman coins. Scholars engaged in the "War of the Ancients and Moderns," an academic conflict over whether the greatness of the modern empires surpassed that of the classical empires, and whether modern science and arts surpassed that received from the ancients. The Moderns' claim became the accepted belief, and the characteristic faith in human progress of the 18th and 19th centuries was the direct result.

But the Moderns' victory did not mean that the past was wholly irrelevant, even to revolutionaries, first in Britain and then in America. History assumed a new importance: not to legitimize the status quo but rather to provide data on human nature and political systems, to facilitate critical analysis.[2] This study was of passionate interest to the American Colonials. As Henry Steele Commager has shown, America was the blank slate on which Europe wrote its dreams of the ideal state.[3] As heirs to the Puritan Commonwealth and "Glorious" mixed monarchy revolutions of England, and as authors of colonial compacts and constitutions, the British colonial elite, even before the revolution, were deeply interested in the classical republics. The "City on a Hill" imagery of Governor John Winthrop's "A Model of Christian Charity" sermon on the mission of the Massachusetts commonwealth is an example of this. Surely Winthrop

intends to evoke Augustine's contrast between the City of the World and the City of God, but he took the phrase from Cicero's In Catilinam, in which Cicero says that the "senate and people established Rome like a city upon a hill, a light to all nations."[4] In the time of the revolution, the colonists turned to the English commonwealth theorists Harrington and Sidney, to Machiavelli, to Locke, to Montesquieu, and every other authority on alternative political arrangements. In each case they found themselves referred back to the Roman classics.

The Colonials needed the examples of the ancient democracies and republics to help them visualize the form of a government without monarchs. From Hume's history of England they would have known of the Polybian constitution of Rome, the government of "the one, the few, and the many," which inspired the constitutional monarchy Bill of Rights of 1689.[5] Cicero, Livy and Tacitus's commentaries on Rome and other republics were also well known, in Latin and in translation, and cited as authorities--indeed, Cicero's orations and De Officiis were basic grammar-school texts in the colonies.[6] From Trenchard and Gordon's Cato's Letters, artifacts of the early Hanoverian post-revolution period, they learned by the Roman republic's example to replace faith in civic virtue with checks and balances.[7] But even as they proposed their innovations they pretended to be ancients, like "Cato;" in the debates prior to, during, and after the Revolution, M.N.S. Sellers notes: "Judging strictly from journalistic pseudonyms, the models for American Republicanism were first (and

overwhelmingly) republican Romans, and secondarily the heroes of the English commonwealth."[8]

John Adams' writing is perhaps the best example of the mixture of affirmation and rejection of the classics that characterized the time. On balance, the colonists found much to censure in recorded history, but Rome was admirable, and the republic's fall more tragic accordingly. In his Thoughts on Government (1776) and especially Defence of the Constitutions of the United States (1787-89), Adams provided to the constitutional delegates a survey of all prior republics.[9] In his first (and most influential) volume of Defence, he comments in passing on the dangers of demagoguery that "popular and ambitious men" had "destroyed the wisest republic, and enslaved the noblest people, that ever entered on the stage of the world," and closes his discussion of Rome with: "[t]his commonwealth...exhibits the fairest prospect of our Species [ie. republics], and is the most signal example, excepting England, of the wisdom and utility of a mixture of the three powers in a commonwealth."[10]

John Adams concluded of all other non-monarchical governments that they were liable to "never-ending fluctuation," as he said of Athens. His cousin Sam spoke wistfully for creating a "Christian Sparta," and some antifederalists for commonwealth; but for the most part Adams' view was representative. "It is impossible to read the history of the petty republics of Greece and Italy without feeling sensations of horror and disgust," Alexander Hamilton commented in The Federalist No. 9.[11] All the classical republics had destroyed themselves.

But after overthrowing its king, the Roman Republic had been stable for centuries. John Adams stated that the science of republican politics was much advanced since Rome through the efforts of theorists, and through practice in England and in the individual American states. It would be wrong to say that the United States constitution was an attempt to recreate Rome. But in designing their new state the Americans particularly looked to what Harrington called the `ancient prudence' of the Roman republic. Rome was the guiding narrative through which the Colonial elite understood themselves and their nation.[12] It was permanently woven into the separation of powers in the constitution of the new republic, in rituals such as carrying the fasces into the Senate at the beginning of each session, and in such material expressions of the state as the Capitol.

In the 19th century, ancient Greece replaced Rome as the narrative metaphor of choice, both in Europe and the United States. The Barbary pirates power was broken in the 1810's, and travel to Greece became safer. In the context of the Greek war for independence against the Turks, ancient Greece became the symbol of democracy for the age. The romantic poets celebrated both the modern war and the ancient culture. For many, Byron's Childe Harold served as inspiration and guide-book.[13] The Greek revolution against the Ottoman empire--evocative for Americans of their own revolution--captured public imagination.[14] The Greek revolution corresponded also with the second

great revival period, and Americans sent missionaries as well as travellers to Greece, increasing the interest in its history and culture.

Moreover the Greek association with democracy had a political overtone in the Jacksonian age. The Roman republic, as Polybius had noted, seemed very like an aristocratic oligarchy; the aristocracy ruled, with popular consent. Athenian democracy was a useful symbol of Jacksonian democracy, in that it was more directly a "people's" government.[15] In keeping with the democratic symbolism of Greece, the monuments to the Greek Revival in architecture, which lasted until the Civil War, were manifested not only in public buildings, but in private homes; Lincoln built his house in Greek Revival style.[16] Rome did not disappear,[17] but rather began to shift from a positive to a negative symbolic model.

Yet even Greece was still a possession of the elite, and as the 19th century wore on, classic models in general began to be ignored or, if invoked, used as negative symbols. Jackson might have been represented as Pericles, but he himself had no knowledge, or wished to, of ancient Greece. Evangelizing Eastern Orthodox Greeks proved to be less successful than missionary societies hoped, cooling somewhat in the late 40's and 50's the romantic ardor for Greece. In the congressional debates prior to the Mexican War during the 1840's, the Whig opposition began to compare the Democrats' administration with the Roman empire.[18] Ralph Waldo Emerson, himself a student of the Greek revival founder Edward Everett, spoke out for a new,

individual, American intellectualism, freed from "the courtly muses of Europe."[19] The many romantic travelogue books of the 1830's and 40's became displaced by newer, more cynical views of Rome. In The Marble Faun (1859), written after a trip to Rome, Nathanial Hawthorne made the city an image of decadence and decay. Satirical comedy is often a sign of the end of a symbol's resonance; the hero of Americans in Rome (1863) wanders around the city, asking Romans what the meaning of immondezzaio (rubbish-heap) is, the most common sign he sees. Alas, they are illiterate.[20] The protagonist of Walter in Athens (1865) announces "Athens is a humbug."[21] In 1869 Sophia Hawthorne, daughter of Nathanial, returned to Rome. The sight invoked a thought of the "terrible and desolating hand of Rome," which had replaced her image of Roman virtues. When she now reviewed history, she saw the "six thousand crucified men of Crassus," which had thrown "into black eclipse forever my flashing Empire."[22]

The reference to Spartacus' slave revolt is significant. Part of what motivated this change of attitude toward the ancient societies was the issue of slavery. As early as 1831, a popular play called The Gladiator used Spartacus's slave revolt as an oblique critique of the South, surely with Nat Turner's rebellion in the same year as the contemporary referent.[23] But as the abolition movement rose in the 1830's and 1840's, Southern slavery apologists in particular turned to the classics for defense. They cited Aristotle's Politics, in which (alone among classical authors) he speaks of "natural slave" nations, in order to provide a moral basis on which to defend slaveholding.[24] The first and

most profound slavery apologist, John Calhoun, credited Aristotle as one of his primary sources of inspiration.[25] "Greece and Rome, Egypt and Judea, and all other distinguished States of antiquity were indebted [to slavery] for their great prosperity and high civilization," George Fitzhugh argued in 1854.[26] Fitzhugh drew extensive comparisons between the American South and ancient Greece, and contrasted the "humane" treatment of the South's human capital with the indifference of the North's master class to their free labor in Cannibals All! or, Slaves Without Masters (1857). It was far better, he concluded, that the "natural slaves" of the north be bound into servitude, for their own advantage as well as society.[27]

The Civil War was not least a war of ideology, of competing visions of the good society. Both North and South had shared an identity with the classics. The North however was becoming an industrialized market economy, and enamored with progress. Christianity, in the form of the Social Gospel, could be part of the progressive age; the classics could not.[28] The South, by taking up the identity as the defender of the classical virtues of aristocracy, hastened the decline of the positive classic metaphor that was already under way.

In the second half of the 19th century, the negative image of Rome assumed a new relevance and became popularized. The post Civil War period was an age of newspapers and magazines, and of photogravures; mass-produced imagery was becoming a more important medium of communication. Rome became useful in these media as an stereotypical image of oppression.

The most common image of Rome was portrayed in the popular photogravure reproductions of Jean-Léon Gérôme paintings. Gérôme specialized in Colosseum pictures of gladiators and Christian martyrs--shown from the point of view of someone within the arena, looking up at emperors and spectators. Thomas Nast's cartoons of corrupt politicians were inspired by Gérôme's works.[29] Edwin Howland Blashfield, in such paintings as The Emperor Commodus, Dressed as Hercules, Leaves the Amphitheater at the Head of the Gladiators (1878), also specialized in images of a decadent and oppressive empire.[30]

The new referent of empire these images served to symbolize were the power of interstate businesses that arose after the war. In the North, small-scale industrial organizations and railroads were being conglomerated into giant trusts and corporations, creating the "robber-baron," and drastically affecting labor relations. Political corruption by the "plutocracy" was rampant at city, state and federal levels. Inadequate currency supplies particularly depressed commodity prices from the levels prior to and during the Civil War. This kept the class of small farmers, reliant on annual loans for supplies and with mortgages to pay, perennially threatened with bankruptcy. The United States economy was becoming more powerful and prosperous than ever, yet average citizens felt themselves alienated from this prosperity, more victims than participants within the social order. The prosperous turned to Social Darwinism for an ideology to justify their wealth.[31] The victims of the trusts, the politicians and the

bankers turned to the Social Gospel for defence, and also to images of imperial Rome to illustrate the nature of the new oppression.[32]

Henry and Brooks Adams invoked the fall of the Republic to explain what the implications of the new financial order were for the United States. The Adams brothers as a group tended to see themselves as outside of the spirit of their age, and the republic of their forbearers already nearly lapsed into empire. They thought that societies, as they grew larger, responded to similar internal and external pressures. Thus the changes the Roman republic underwent foreshadowed those the American republic would suffer. America had already made "so vast a stride to empire," Henry Adams said, that since the Civil War Americans had become "as familiar with political assassination as though they had lived under Nero. The climax of empire could be seen approaching, year after year, as though Sulla were a President or McKinley a Consul."[33] Brooks Adams, in The New Empire (1902), prophesied that Europe and Great Britain would shortly become dependencies of an American empire of commerce; the United States' lone competitor for panimperical rule would be Russia.[34]

Brooks Adams combined his theory of similarities of social complexity with Social Darwinism to derive a precise model for just how the United States was beginning to resemble Rome. In his The Law of Civilization and Decay (1895) Brooks Adams, "as one of the debtor class,"[35] wrote that the contraction of currency produced by the gold standard in the 1880's and 1890's indicated the rise of the "economic" over the "imaginative" type of human in American

society, and that it would fall into decline until infused by "barbarian blood."[36] Adams proposed that human genetics revolved in a bipolar cycle, in accordance to the state of social development. In earlier ages, the less rationalized forms of social organization favored the instinctively imaginative types, inclined to military, religious and artistic interests. In the more organized societies that evolved from the efforts of this type, the rational economic type rose to predominance; unable to create societies, they were uniquely adapted to exploit organized societies to their own advantage.[37] The emergence of the economic type in Rome was an early instance of this pattern, and Rome's history was a model of what the United States' future would be. The robber-barons of the United States were indeed the Darwinian survivors of the age, paralleled in the evolution of Rome from a republic to a dictatorship, and from a disciplined state of laws to a luxurious state of usury and servitude. Henry Adams concurred with his brother's analysis, and calculated that the United States should probably complete its evolution into dictatorship by 2095.[38] "Our revolt," he wrote his brother of their writings, "has been a slave insurrection" against the prevailing "anarchy" into which the republic was sinking.[39]

The conventional Social Darwinists denounced Brooks Adams' book as a "monstrous free silver invention."[40] Theodore Roosevelt also thought the book excessively influenced by Populist ideology. Yet Adams had a point: "One does not have to accept either all Mr. Adams's theories or all his facts in order to recognize more than one disagreeable resemblance between the

world as it is to-day, and the Roman world under the Empire, or the Greek world under the successors of Alexander."[41] The United States faced the same problems as Rome, Roosevelt agreed, and genetic shift might well be occurring. But Roosevelt fixed the cause of Rome's downfall not on a darwinian expression of subspecies adaptation, but rather on another contemporary American issue, alien immigration. Aliens from Asia and Africa forced the Roman plebeian "into competition with races of lower vitality,"[42] thus destroying the Roman middle class. He argued furthermore that the political leadership of the United States was not in the hands of the usurious class, but rather was led by McKinley, a former soldier "in no sense a representative of the moneyed type."[43] Careful control of cheap immigrant labor would prevent the United States from losing its "virile, manly qualities."[44]

Daniel De Leon, a spokesman for the Socialist Labor Party, made his own Roman comparisons in "Two Pages From Roman History" (1903). In his first "page," "Plebs Leaders and Labor Leaders," he argued that the true revolutionary impulses of the working class were being stifled by a corrupted leadership:

> As the Plebs leader of old was a strategic post of peculiar strength for the patriarchate and of mischief for the proletariat, so and for like reasons is the Labor Leader of to-day nothing but a masked battery, from behind which the Capitalist Class can encompass what it could not without--the work of enslaving and slowly degrading the Working Class, and, along with that, the work of debasing and ruining the country.[45]

In "The Warning of the Gracchi," De Leon warned that attempts to make the United States more democratic through reform (such as the contemporary effort to pass a constitutional amendment for direct election of Senators, which passed in 1912) was doomed to failure, just as the Gracchi brothers' attempts to reform Rome were doomed; "sops are not palliatives," he argued.

As De Leon, Roosevelt and Adams' comments suggest, the mood at the turn of the century at home, and indeed abroad, seemed to be that the United States was growing into something very like the Roman empire, whether or not it was by intention or random selection. Imperial Rome was condemned, as the antipode to Christianity,[46] yet frequently discussed and even emulated. To be sure, in such novels as Lew Wallace's Ben-Hur (1880), the temptation to transform the empire of the Chosen Nation from that granted by a spiritual covenant to a material power was brought forward and roundly condemned. Judah Ben-Hur learns by Messala's example that imperialists are made evil by power, and exchanges his desire to "raise and support a Jewish crown over the wrecks of the Italian,... remodel society, and convert mankind into one purified happy family,"[47] for participation in the spiritual empire of Christianity.[48] Yet even as Ben-Hur and its spiritual kin Quo Vadis? (1895) sold millions, and even as William Jennings Bryan and others denounced the idea of American imperialism, the Beaux-Arts architecture of the time adopted Rome as its model. The Columbian Exhibition took place in Roman palaces. Pennsylvania Station in New York was modeled after the Baths of Caracalla.[49] Abroad, the British

author Baron Corvo had his title character assign one quarter of the world for the United States to administer as its natural due in his novel of the peace of empires, Hadrien the Seventh (1904). The Italian historian Guglielmo Ferraro argued in Ancient Rome and Modern America: A Comparative Study of Morals and Manners (1914) that Europeans could have no conception of Roman society without experience of the New World version that was in the process of developing.[50]

Other American historians followed Brooks Adams' lead, if not his biology, and argued directly or by implication over whether or not the assumption of Empire would destroy the United States. Tenney Frank's Roman Imperialism (1914), written strictly as a history of Rome, had the stated intention to analyze "the precise influences that urged the Roman republic toward territorial expansion," from a New-World perspective. Europeans assumed that "the desire to possess must somehow have been the mainspring of action whether in the Spanish-American war or the Punic wars of Rome."[51] Frank argued instead that Rome had no other interest than to preserve peace among its trading partners through diplomacy, and that the complexity of diplomatic relations among the vast numbers of city-states with which it dealt in the end forced it to assume reluctantly the burden of empire. Substitute the word America for Rome, as Henry Adams advised in his Education of Henry Adams, and the problem of Empire and why Rome's began and collapsed became personal; this was the issue to which Frank implicitly addresses his book.[52] The

rule by superior force Rome was forced to take up corrupted the Roman character, he observed, and created "a military power that would ultimately turn upon the state itself and subject it also to the position of servitude it imposed upon others."[53]

Franklin Giddings proposed quite a different outcome in Democracy and Empire (1912). He argued that the United States, a nation endowed with superior ethics, and possessed of a political system which was capable of infinite expansion. It was furthermore the final expression of a spiritual evolution in human institutions. The pax Romana had been echoed in the "Pax Britannia;" "Pax Americana" would complete the evolution of human society toward world peace, which the much-maligned Roman empire began. "Rome, the conqueror, the mistress of the world, the seat of unrivalled splendour, of unbridled indulgence,--these are pictures that we know." But Rome in fact had been "the teacher of self-denial," and the "promulgator of highest wisdom" by teaching its laws to "those Northern races, which all far-seeing men knew must overrun the Roman dominions."[54] The United States, as heir to this wisdom, was capable of becoming a "democratic empire." Far from collapsing into tyranny, such an empire

> can become, decade after decade, more democratic; it can even permit its colonies or dependencies to be democratic, while at the same time maintaining a strong imperial government for the purposes of a common defence; all on the one inviolable condition that, *as it lengthens the reach of government, it must curtail the functions of government....* An imperial government must...confine itself practically to three things, namely: the imperial defence, the suppression of conflict between one part of the empire and

> another, and insistence that local administration shall come up to a certain standard in its protection of life and property, and in its respect for enlightenment.[55] (Gidding's italics)

This modern ethical empire the United States was destined to create (how, precisely, Giddings neglects to say), would "perfect the human race in the spirit of brotherhood, under the single law of liberty."[56]

The imperial democracy theory certainly was an expression of the American imperialist movement of Beveredge, Mahon, and others. Yet in some sense it also was a nationalistic extension on the international plane of the rationally perfected society of radical progressive ideology, as exemplified in the writings of Walter Weyl and Herbert Crowly. Standard progressives, such as Woodrow Wilson, had been more likely to look at the task of the age as one of managing more effectively the existing institutions of society. When he proposed the League of Nations, Wilson's emphasis was more on the moral necessity for doing so, using the religious language of the Social Gospel. Radical progressives believed that humans should assume conscious control over their destiny. In order to do this, social and political institutions needed to be rebuilt, not just reformed. Humanity--in the United States and in the world--needed to cultivate a critical understanding of social institutions in order to bring about rationalized new republics. Democratic activity was the ideal form through which this would be achieved.[57]

World War One was fought, Wilson said, to make the world "safe for democracy." In effect, however, it ended for the time in the United States both

the veiled totalitarianism of the American republic-empire dream as well as the more rationalized democratic-republic dream of the radical Progressives extended outward to the world. The war discredited in the United States both the ideal of nation-state empires and the ideal of rational public debate, as I have noted in the section on Biblical ideology. The language of rational society and world-unity was left to the Social Gospel. Indeed, one of Crowly's proteges, Walter Lippmann, who as an advisor to Colonel House had helped to formulate Wilson's 14 points, devised a new theory of administrative progressivism in Public Opinion (1922). In it he exchanged the critical public of radical progressivism for an administrative aristocracy to research reality and shape the public's opinion in accordance to the administrators' understanding. Lippmann thought the league that Wilson brought back from Paris sufficiently weak in its administrative practicality and compromised in its execution that he advised the opponents of the League of Nations in the Senate in order to kill it, lest it prevent a proper world order from coming into being.[58]

Yet something of the secular empire of peace implied in radical progressivism and in Gidding's book surely inhered to the idea of the League of Nations. In 1918, James Brown Scott published James Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 and Their Relation to A More Perfect Society of Nations. Scott suggested that the Society of Nations to come could learn how to structure a governmental body to achieve a democratic League, rather than empire, through study of the American constitutional

convention.[59] Wilson himself suggested much the same theme in his "Peace Without Victory" speech, in which he describes American leadership in the League as "the opportunity to which [the American people] have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their polity...ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty."[60] Clarence Streit would take up Gidding's theme in 1938, in Union Now; he compared the League of Nation's failures with those of the American Confederation prior to the 1787 constitution that established the United States.[61] The modern world of democratic nations was a disunited Rome, Streit said, in danger because they did not realize their common dependency. If only they would unite, "[o]ur Rome need not fall."[62] This was one of the lines of thought which would influence the organization of the United Nations.

During the interwar years until World War Two, however, the use of Rome as the model of an international empire sank into the background. In its place, Rome as the model of a republic degenerating into a tyranny arose again in the thirties. Brooks Adams had written as one of the debtors against the oligarchs. His successor to the theme of Republican decline, H.J. Haskell, was Populist in his sympathy for farmers, yet on the whole more like the conservative reformist Theodore Roosevelt.[63] Haskell, somewhat like Tenny Frank (who was one of Haskell's sources), did not write directly about the United States; his stated intention was to write "an objective survey of instances of government

intervention in the ancient world," in order to "call attention to certain warning signals of the past."[64] But the title of his first book, The New Deal in Old Rome (1939), combined with anachronistic descriptions and modern comparisons, made clear his intent that the "general reader" should "not fail to see the significance for our own day of the various successes and failures of the New Deal policies in Old Rome," as one reviewer commented.[65]

Haskell's view was that the Roman Republic had been crushed by a corruption of morality, produced by the excessive greed and lack of civic duty of the rich, and the destruction of spirit and self-reliance produced by government dole given to the poor. Like Theodore Roosevelt, he blamed poverty on cities and immigration:

> An economist has written of the United States that if it had not been for the importation of a great mass of cheap labor in the second half of the nineteenth century, `we would have had fewer millionaires and no slums.' In Italy the same blindness to long-run welfare brought in cheap slave labour (sic), [and] increased the gulf between rich and poor.[66]

Unlike Teddy Roosevelt, Haskell thought that the damage was done. Now Franklin Roosevelt was introducing the same "New Deal" measures the Gracchi brothers, Catiline and Caesar had promoted in the last years of the Roman republic. Haskell allowed that some degree of public spending was necessary as a preventative measure to relieve social stress, particularly among the farmers whom he thought were the strength both of Rome and the United States. But such New Deal activities as "spending for non-productive public works, for the bureaucracy, and for the army"[67] and spending to establish

permanent doles of wheat in the cities, which "undermined the old Roman ideas of self-reliance,"[68] produced public debt and rising taxes. In the case of Rome, the rich avoided taxes, the poor were paid for votes and given the dole, and when the Republic became a dictatorship, the middle class were gradually drained until the Roman empire collapsed, unable to sustain itself. These were the ominous lessons for the United States' future Haskell drew from the past.

Haskell's second book, This Was Cicero: Modern Politics in a Roman Toga (1942), was even less directly topical, yet hinted of parallels between European and domestic troubles to the Republic of the first century B.C. and the Republic of 1942. It contrasted Julius Caesar's pragmatic will to power with Cicero's idealistic constitutionalism. Cicero's tragic flaw, the Senate's flaw, was to fail to respond to the late Republic's polarization of classes at the very time when international crises required social unity. Caesar, like Franklin Roosevelt, was less concerned with theory than trying to resolve problems. With less philosophy but more practical awareness of the domestic and international crises Rome faced, Caesar acted--and unbalanced the Republic.

The Second World War changed everything. Haskell's emphasis was on internal affairs, and his 1939 book was published in the midst of what Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles described as the "climax of out-and-out isolationism."[69] But four years later, even in the Midwest, traditionally the most isolationist part of the country, people expected "to participate in world affairs when the war is over," according to Life."[70] Clarence Streit's call for a federal

world government, Union Now, printed at his own expense in 1938, was picked up by Harper and Bros. in 1939. This was part of an explosion of internationalist proposals.[71] As the war continued, Herbert Hoover and other better-known figures of internationalist sympathies proposed either systems of world governance or at least a peace-keeping organization.[72] Wendell Willkie's Wilsonian One World (1943) became a best-seller. Even conservatives and isolationists, while unwilling to commit to world government, thought that a permanent military alliance with Great Britain was wise. "A recent Gallop poll showed that 74% of the American people favor an International Police Force, which (whether those polled realize it or not) in practice means a world government," John K. Jessup observed in Life.[73] Nor were government expressions in accordance with this public opinion simply a matter of public relations, at least in the opinion of other governments. Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador to the United States, informed the new Labour government late in 1945 in response to their concerns about the American response to the 1945-46 Iranian crisis that the American government had a "stubborn determination to rationalize Soviet actions whenever possible and thereby to reduce the prevailing fear of the Russians in the hope of realizing the American dream of one world."[74]

Rome played a relatively small role in this rhetoric of world federation, except in the writings of one very influential reporter, Walter Lippmann.[75] In June, 1939, at a time when most of the country was still inclined toward

isolationism, he took up the subject of "The American Destiny" in a Life issue devoted to America's future. "The American people have no vision of their own future," he wrote, and blamed it on their fear. "The attitude of the American people at this moment is one of recoil from those very constituents of greatness which vigorous peoples have hitherto everywhere and always struggled to obtain." Nevertheless, in spite of a foreign policy designed systematically to suppress it, the United States could not "neutralize the fact that America has preponderant power and decisive influence in the affairs of the world." He had quietly fought against Wilson's league because he thought it too compromised. In 1939, he now commented blandly that "twenty years ago the Congress refused to proceed with the difficult work of organizing the world for peace." But that duty could not be avoided:

> In the lifetime of the generation to which we belong there has occurred one of the greatest events in the history of mankind. The controlling power in western civilization has crossed the Atlantic. America, which was once a colony on the frontiers of Europe, is now, and will in the next generations become even more certainly, the geographic and the economic and the political center of the Occident.... There is no way to refuse this destiny.
>
> What Rome was to the ancient world, what Great Britain has been to the modern world, America is to be to the world of tomorrow. We might wish it otherwise. I do.... But our personal preferences count for little in the great movements of history, and when the destiny of a nation is revealed to it, there is no choice but to accept that destiny and to make ready in order to be equal to it.[76]

In his own articles and in articles and editorials by other writers in Life, Lippmann, and more particularly his followers in the Luce press empire amplified this message. America had a destiny, and must begin to think of its

identity, and the strategic purposes that came naturally from this identity. For this task, Rome was a mentor. "The Roman empire was not created by a plan but was the result of consistent application of fundamental Roman policies through several centuries," Life editorialized in 1943, in discussing the need for policy planning.[77] Lippmann might have had more effect in establishing a Rome-U.S. identity, except that he decided Rome was the wrong model, and proposed instead a "Spheres of Influence" model for world government in U.S. Foreign Policy (1943). Thereafter he resisted relating the United States to Rome until late in the Johnson administration.[78]

If Haskell's books served to reawaken the use of Rome to understand the United States, and if Lippmann recalled to memory from the Progressive era the idea that the United States was destined to become the equivalent of Rome in the modern world, Arnold J. Toynbee's abridged A Study of History (1946) and essay collection, Civilization on Trial (1948) provided patterns for the Rome-United States analogies that developed in the 50's and early 60's. The latter book in particular directed itself to how his theory of historical cycles could be used to understand the Cold War. "The problems that have beset and worsted other civilizations have come to a head in our world to-day," he wrote,[79] and the lessons which other civilizations failed to heed we could follow. Toynbee had no doubt about what these lessons were: "What shall we do to be saved? In politics, establish a constitutional co-operative system of world government."[80] His theory of why this was necessary is as follows:

> Civilizations, I believe, come to birth and proceed to grow by successfully responding to successive challenges. They break down and go to pieces if and when a challenge confronts them which they fail to meet. Not unnaturally, there are challenges that present themselves in the histories of more than one civilization. And the peculiar interest of Graeco-Roman history for us lies in the fact that the Greek civilization broke down in the fifth century B.C. through failing to find a successful response to the very challenge which is confronting our own Western civilization in our lifetime.... So long as the economic life of each city-state remained parochial, they could all still afford to be parochial in their political life as well.... But the new economic system...was based on local production for international exchange. It could only work successfully if, on an economic plane, the city-states gave up their parochialism and became interdependent...within the framework of a system of international political interdependence.[81]

The Graeco-Roman world failed to unify itself until it was already fatally wounded by internecine strife; "the Pax Romana was a peace of exhaustion,... a peace and an order which came four centuries after its due time."[82] The West had extended a socio-economic "scaffolding" within which all the nations of the world might interrelate--indeed, according to his analysis of history, had to interrelate. But this was more than a pragmatic task that this cycle of history required of the West. It was the fulfillment of human destiny. The West had now the task to transcend itself and form, not the great colonial empire of Western Civilization, but rather the fulfillment of the goal of all civilizations, "the communion of saints on earth," the Social Gospel's millennium-empire.[83] Toynbee thus recreated the linkage of religion and pragmatism that Wilson used for the League of Nations.

Toynbee's abridged A Study of History and Civilization on Trial were books which happened to be published just as the United States was in search of a new guiding narrative. As their message became broadcast in the press, Toynbee's works served as the medium through which much of the socially-aware public saw themselves and the world. The isolationism of the interwar years would no longer do. As Adlai Stevenson put it:

> There was a time, and it was only yesterday, when the United States could and did stand aloof.... The world at our mid-century is, as someone has said, like a drum--strike it anywhere and it resounds everywhere. The problems of peoples whom we scarcely knew existed, unless we read the National Geographic, now resound in our ears and sap our strength, and also our patience. And those distant people too have suddenly become aware that they too are not masters of their own destiny; that their future, their history, is inseparable from ours.[84]

Like Rome and like Greece, Toynbee said, the United States and its allies needed to discover how to create an international order, or, in the event they failed to do so, witness the end of Western civilization.

Rome and Greece were traditional means through which the United States understood its times and its place in history. The patterns of their use, from the Populists, the imperialists and the Progressives, were in living memory. For intellectuals in particular who were unwilling to subscribe to a Fundamentalist vision of the latter days, or to Dulles' conservative Manichean vision of the Social Gospel, Toynbee's theory of historical cycles was extraordinarily attractive. It allowed the old cognitive metaphors of Greece and Rome to become relevant in new ways. Furthermore, Toynbee's apocalyptic

concept of the trials through which civilizations must be tested provided both an epic identity for the United States, with the hope not only that civilization might survive, but that--seductive for a messianic nation--this cycle in history might well be the final cycle to which all history had been building. It became in the 1950's a major influence on intellectual interpretations of issues facing the United States, and indeed, gradually in the rhetoric of politicians.

President Truman at first glance would not have seemed to be one of these intellectuals, yet he was well-read in history--and Toynbee's theory of historical cycles were a context of discussion in the public sphere. In the last years of his presidency, he began to draw parallels between the trials the United States faced, and those of other nations in other times. On January 19, 1951, President Truman said that "there isn't any difference between Hitler and Mussolini, in the Tarquins of Ancient Rome, in the Kings of Sparta, in Charles I of England, and Louis XIV--and Stalin," equating the United States Cold War conflict against the U.S.S.R. with itself against Germany in World War II, the Roman people against the Roman kings in the 7th century B.C., Athens against Sparta during the Peloponnesian War, and England against France in the 17th Century respectively.[85] Truman made a similar series of comparisons in a speech on January 11, and told National Reserve troops on September 6 that "[y]ou know, the original greatness of Rome depended upon her citizen-soldiery."[86]

President Eisenhower was less inclined to see Roman or Greek parallels to the United States, as one would expect from the religious basis of Dulles's writings on foreign policy. In a 1956 press conference, when a reporter asked Eisenhower whether his frequent meetings with Billy Graham meant that he was preparing an American plan to mobilize religion against communism, he disavowed it. But he went on to say that Graham was "a man who clearly understands that any advance in the world has got to be accompanied by a clear realization that man is, after all, a spiritual being." That was Eisenhower's belief; and that was "exactly what [the Cold War] is. It is atheism against some kind of Religion. And I believe that we should do our very best to get people to feel the way we do."[87] Nonetheless, in 1960 he warned the nation not to become too materialistic, lest it lose its sense of national destiny and fall like the ancient civilizations.[88] Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, advised his readers in 1962 to read Will Durant's Caesar and Christ, and examine the reasons why Rome fell. "Note them carefully and try to determine in your mind if there is anything in evidence in our own country today which smacks of these causes, which this historian asserts were largely responsible for the fall of the great Roman Empire." Benson was particularly struck by the decline in Rome of family values and morality.[89]

The one unambiguously positive Rome film in the Eisenhower era, Sign of the Pagan (1954), reflects the fundamentally religious interpretation of the

Cold War, and the themes of irreligious pragmatism as a threat to civilization--a concept John Foster Dulles had taken as a theme in his attacks on the Truman administration in 1952. The film begins by noting that Rome had become a Christian empire, but had split in two parts. The emperors of Constantinople and Rome did not act in concert, and the resulting weakness attracted "Barbarian" attacks. As it turns out, both emperors "pragmatically" act in such a fashion as to assist the Barbarians, led by Attila, to capture Rome. The empire is strong, the film suggests; only its leaders, who each are shown to be perfidious rationalists rather than honest Christians, have made it possible for Attila to become so strong. The film's plot structure is loosely derived from Macbeth: Attila believes he has been given signs that he shall conquer Rome, and become emperor of the world. He seems unconquerable, but the Christian sister of the Eastern Emperor, Pulcheria, and a Christian Centurion of the Western empire, Marcian, fall in love. In spite of reason, they refuse to surrender the Empire to Attila. "Rome is now conquered. Not by sword, but by Christians who carry only a cross. And now Rome can never fall," Marcian warns Attila, "because man can never conquer God." Attila laughs at this. But with the assistance of the faithful armies of the East, Marcian and Pulcheria depose the emperors, defend Rome, and succeed in ambushing and defeating Attila's more powerful army. The Centurion fulfills an image in a dream Attila could not interpret, and becomes co-regent with Pulcheria over a reunited Roman empire. Attila, who is deathly afraid of the Christian god, sees his

foretold death come about as he is stabbed from behind by a woman he has raped. Dying, he sees next to him the shadow of the cross formed by the dagger hilt. "Your god brought me to my fall," he tells the new Emperor, Marcian. "It was in my stars."

Adlai Stevenson, in contrast to Eisenhower, was the standard-bearer in politics of the Toynbee paradigm in the 50's. "Communism `originated as a product of uneasy Western consciences,' to use Dr. Arnold Toynbee's words, and now these Western weapons in Russian hands have been turned against us," Stevenson said at Harvard in 1954. "Thus at the mid-point of this incredible century the West faces the most serious challenge of modern history."[90] Stevenson's understanding of how the United States had to change was Toynbee's understanding:

> Now in the air age the whole United States is no larger than a Greek state 500 years before Christ.... In the past we have seen the small Greek city-states submerged in the Roman Empire, the medieval city-states enveloped by the European nation-states, and the nation-states grow larger and stronger under the whip of technological development. Where political unity and hence effective power have lagged behind the procession, the result has usually been subjugation and disaster for the laggards.[91]

The United States, in other words, faced exactly that trial of political unity with the world that Toynbee said Greece and Rome had failed to accomplish in time. And the clock was ticking for the United States.

Among presidents, John F. Kennedy was Toynbee's best student.[92] Kennedy's economic strategist for foreign aid, Walt Rostow, had devised his theory of "Take-off" in part under Toynbee's influence.[93] "In the strange

geometry of modern politics, the distant Congo can be as close to us as Canada, and Canada, itself, is worth more attention than we have sometimes given," Kennedy wryly joked in an address at Boston College. "Cultures not our own press for understanding. Crises we did not create require our participation."[94] Toynbee argued that a great civilization became so by undergoing trials, and declined when it became reactive to them rather than proactive. Kennedy tried to redirect all aspects of national life toward a common striving to achieve excellence by overcoming trials. He argued consistently in his speeches that the United States faced great challenges and would accomplish great things because of it. "I think to be an American in the next decade will be a hazardous experience," he said during the campaign for the presidency. "We will live on the edge of danger."[95] The Eisenhower administration was a failure, he argued, because its foreign and domestic policies were "reactive." But history demanded of the United States that it create a new world order, not just react. "We must indeed take the initiative again--we must start moving forward again--at home and abroad."[96]

Toynbee argued that societies became decadent not because of a Spenglerian "biological" limit on the life of a society: "The biological heritage of the epigoni is the same as that of the pioneers, and all the pioneer's endeavors and achievements are potentially within their descendant's reach." If the pioneers' descendants doubted their ability to match their forbearers' achievements, it was because they suffered "a breakdown of their social

inheritance, which debars them from finding scope for their unimpaired faculties in effective and creative social action."[97] If, as one contemporary author put it, the idea of flight to the frontier "remains the great image of the American sense of possibility,"[98] and the old frontier was closed, then the nation needed a new frontier in which creative action could take place. "The New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises: it is a set of challenges," Kennedy told the delegates at the Democratic convention on July 15, 1960.[99] The national purpose, he wrote for Life, "consists of the combined purposefulness of each of us when we are at our moral best: striving, risking, choosing, making decisions, engaging in a pursuit of happiness that is strenuous, heroic, exciting, and exalted."[100] The "essentiality of artistic achievement" was part of this striving, he wrote in Look. It was part of "a nation-wide movement toward excellence."[101] As part of that movement, the United States would enter the new frontier of space. It would send a man to the moon and return him safely, not because it would be easy, but "because it is hard."

The international trials the United States faced were repetitions of earlier historical cycles, Toynbee had said in Civilization on Trial. The Hellenic world had fallen because it failed to unify before it was fatally weakened. It had united briefly during the period when it had faced the challenge of the Persian empire, but then broke apart.[102] The ancient Greek city-states were too nationalistic to unite for the common good, and Rome, by its lack of representation in its dominions and its incompetent bureaucracy, too inefficient. Rome's empire was

decadent at its birth.[103] At home, Kennedy sought to educate the American public on how the United States should be guided by history in its hour of destiny:

> I have therefore chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived--yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.
> What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow.... Not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women. Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament [because of the U.S.S.R.]. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude, as individuals and as a nation, for our attitude is as essential as theirs.[104]

Abroad, the world needed to know the United States would not shrink from unity, or impose bureaucracy needlessly. Kennedy told an assembly of government officials in Frankfurt, Germany, that "[t]he ocean divides us less than the Mediterranean divided the ancient world of Greece and Rome." What was required under such circumstances, to a reader of Toynbee, was obvious.

> The future of the West lies in Atlantic partnership--a system of cooperation, interdependence, and harmony, whose peoples can jointly meet their burdens and opportunities throughout the world. Some say this is only a dream, but I do not agree. A generation of achievement--the Marshall Plan, NATO, the Schuman Plan, and the Common Market--urges us up the path to greater unity.[105]

Europe was not to fear that the United States would lay down this burden in this cycle of history. "For 18 years the United States has stood its watch for freedom all around the globe," and it would continue to do so.[106] A little later in the day,

Kennedy made, next to his inaugural address, his most famous speech--famous in part because he made a public commitment of identity between West Berlin and the United States. It began thusly: "Two thousand years ago the proudest boast was civis Romanus sum. Today, in the world of freedom, the proudest boast is "Ich bin ein Berliner."

In the months after Kennedy's assassination, Peace Corps director Sargent Shriver took up the Toynbee line:

> Can we, the richest and most powerful people on earth, can we who have been so blessed, bring out the best within us to do what we know we ought to do?
> If we fail to do enough, if it is the old story of too little too late, then our whole civilization may go down. The historian Arnold Toynbee says that all twenty previous civilizations have collapsed because they failed to solve the twin problems of war and poverty.[107]

The Peace Corps, combined with Johnson's new Job Corps, Shriver argued, was part of a guiding strategy in both the Kennedy and the new Johnson administrations to create dynamic organizations that would mobilize national and ultimately international resources toward resolving those problems that had destroyed previous civilizations.

Kennedy implicitly used the conceptual parallel of the Roman empire more consistently and deliberately to define the problems the United States than his recent predecessors, but this was not simply a product of his own pattern of thinking, of his staff's, or indeed, of Alfred Toynbee's. Rather, it was part of an evolving process of the cultural mythology I have outlined which the Cold War crisis brought to the surface, and which Toynbee's serendipitous

historical cycle theory channeled. Kennedy's conscious articulation of the United States to Rome was not itself novel; Truman and Eisenhower also used Rome in much the same way. The extent of Kennedy's usage suggests however that Rome, in the way Toynbee framed it, became a progressively more useful and accepted tool of identity for the United States in this period. Roosevelt mentioned the Roman empire once, and that in reference to Germany.[108] He did not see a relevant comparison between the United States and ancient Greece or Rome. Marcus Aurelius speaks the same words of unity in Germany that Kennedy did in the last important Rome film, The Fall of the Roman Empire (1964).

It is not by accident, I would suggest, that of the three films which are most positive in their linkage of problems of ancient Rome to those of the United States, Sign of the Pagan (1954), Spartacus (1960), and Fall of the Roman Empire (1964),[109] two of them bracket the Kennedy administration. His administration coincided with the apogee of the Toynbee influence. That influence in its direct form was to be short-lived. Johnson made two references to ancient Greece in the first two months after Kennedy's assassination, and then ceased the use of ancient civilizations in speeches.[110] This is all the more remarkable as Johnson had defined the need after Sputnik for the United States to control the "high ground" of space with the following influential words: "The Roman Empire controlled the world because it could build roads. Later--when it moved to sea--the British Empire was dominant because it had ships. In

the air age we were powerful because we had airplanes. Now the Communists have established a foothold in outer space."[111] President Nixon made no comparisons during his presidency between the United States and ancient civilizations.

Rome as a metaphor did not disappear in the years of the Johnson and Nixon presidencies--far from it--but the Toynbee-based collective interpretation of Rome's meaning broke apart, as such consensus meanings had done during the Jacksonian period, the Civil War period, and the Progressive period.[112] As the example of Ezra Taft Benson above suggests, I think it likely that had Nixon won in 1960, he too would have had use for Roman metaphors--less, perhaps, than Kennedy, and shaded differently--because Rome was the consensus medium of understanding the problems the United States faced in that time.[113] This consensus meaning fragmented with the differing interpretations of American society that emerged the close of the decade. This is a matter which I will take up in the last chapter.

The sense of identity with Rome took the decade of the 50's to develop fully in the United States. Popular publications tended to ignore empire comparisons until late in the 50's. Popular intellectual journals on occasion would raise the idea only to dismiss it, in ways that seem unconsciously to suggest a linkage with the pre-World War One imperialism; the ideal of Rome as a conceptual model was still being worked out. An editor at Harpers noted in 1954 that a lot of people in Europe and Asia seemed to think the United States

was becoming an empire. Perhaps there were now "Americans with slide rules and bulldozers in all kinds of unlikely places, but:

> If they knew a little more about the American character, they would stop worrying. Empire-building calls for a very special combination of talents. The Romans had it; the Russians have always had it... the British had it, with two pairs of pants. We don't.... We don't enjoy the proconsul business. Our government has constant trouble in finding people who are willing to serve overseas for more than six months; and once there, their chief ambition is to get back home.[114]

Whatever the truth of this comment is, it seems oddly juxtaposed as an introduction to an article on Syngman Rhee by Frank Gibney, whose time "for the past ten years has been spent in intimate association with the Koreans and Japanese--as a World War II Intelligence officer, a member of MacArthur's occupation forces, and head of the Time bureau in Tokyo."

The tone of Gibney's article on Rhee is rather reminiscent of Franklin Giddings, confronted with a nation in the democratic empire that is not sufficiently democratic. In contrast to the U.S.S.R.,

> There are no American satellites. But there must be American Allies. And if communism is to be defeated, a large number of these allies must be Asians. The small but essential ally is now as much a part of the United States foreign policy as the tributary kingdom was part of Roman foreign policy, or the dependency a part of nineteenth-century British.
>
> But the relationship between the United States and this sort of ally, in a world stormed by the aggressive pseudo-morality of the Communists, cannot be the simple tributary one of the Romans or the British. Nor would American ideals and inclinations comfortably permit such a relationship. This poses a problem: How far can the United States indulge the independence and assertiveness of small allies when they thereby threaten the policy of the United States, its safety, and the world it leads?[115]

While Gibney speaks in his article quite like a member of the proconsul's staff that he in fact had been in Japan, the Harper's editor draws quite a different moral from Gibney: Thanks to Rhee's knowledge of his unimperial ally, "the United States sometimes looks like a colony of South Korea"! The Harper's editor concludes:

> [Rhee] (and others like him in many countries) are forcing us to invent something entirely new in world history--something infinitely better, and more complicated, than the old-fashioned imperialism. Painfully and slowly, we are trying to discover some way to exercise world-wide responsibility, without colonies, without satellites, without Kipling, and without proconsuls.

The United States was an anti-empire. Outside of the intellectual world, the Roman empire possessed a negative association. Thus, for the United States to become Rome was a bad thing. Another article from Harper's three months later, "The Real Mafia," invoked Rome in this sense to explain how the mafia exerted authority in communities: "Sicily (and more especially the Western half of the island) is a close and intricate mesh of these delicate relationships, cutting across class lines--great men who rely on humble men and humble men who serve their protectors as the clientes waited on their lords in old Roman days."[116]

Arthurian romance served as one form of visualizing an alternative empire. Northrop Frye has noted of the Arthurian narratives that the reason why Arthur, rather than King Alfred (a figure of much greater historical importance) is the focus of myth was intimately related to the Roman Empire as symbol: "When we read in Geoffrey of Monmouth that Arthur conquered the armies of Rome,

and remember that his colleague in romance was Charlemagne, we get a clue: he is a prototype of the reborn Christian Caesar, the Holy Roman Emperor.[117] Arthurian romance was an attractive cognitive metaphor, in that it was Christian, had the touch of puritanical reformism, and had within its narrative symbols and plot elements an extraordinarily broad number of structural elements that were available to map to the American Cold War context.

This is particularly the case with T. H. White's Novel, The Once and Future King (1958), in which the various elements of Arthurian myth were woven into what immediately became for the period the canonic Arthur, and the source for the broadway musical Camelot (1960), the Walt Disney Film The Sword in the Stone (1963), and the Warner Brothers film Camelot (1968). It emphasized Arthur's reluctance to be king, and his uncomfortableness with the duties imposed on him; it acknowledged the existence of mistakes (Arthur's incest with Morgause; Arthur losing his temper and nearly killing Lancelot with Excalibur) while justifying them as the natural outcome of imperfect humans trying to live up to standards of inhuman perfection. Arthur, or "Wart," in his youth in T.H. White's novel, had his isolationist "hidden" stage prior to his emergence as the natural leader. Excalibur, the unbeatable magic sword that Arthur wields, whose possession is the symbol of leadership and whose innate powers are beyond Arthur's control, has its parallel in nuclear weapons. As NATO had the Warsaw pact, so Arthur's Round Table of equals has its negative double in Mordred's renegade knights. Arthur also had the American problem

of attempting to bring into being a new kind of collective society out of a set of touchy little kingdoms, and a new kind of leadership that was non-coercive. As Arthur had his wayward Sir Bors characters who, as T.H. White describes him in The Once and Future King had a hard time understanding Arthur's new system of law, so the United States had its Syngman Rhees. As Arthur's leadership is confirmed by his moral status and his sense of purpose, so did the United States see its ascendancy as a natural outcome; and Arthur's hidden doubts in White's book about how he should go about doing things, and whether he was right, matched contemporary American concerns.

The applicability of Arthurian legends to the United States' situation received little attention in either popular or intellectual journals. Nonetheless, it emerged in 1954 as a cognitive metaphor for the Cold War in two films, Knights of the Round Table and Prince Valiant. The latter of course is from the long-running comic strip.[118] T.H. White's book came out four years later, and finished the adaptation of Arthur to the United States. The fact that the Kennedy years are still represented in popular imagination as "Camelot" is a testimony to the hold that this popular myth has on the public imagination. Romance, as a genre, is "a form generally disapproved of, in most ages, by the guardians of taste and learning," as Northrop Frye observes.[119] In general, popular romance simplifies; it requires of its audience more the recognition in the romance of beliefs already held than it does the articulation of new theories of belief. Yet it is also potentially revolutionary in that it valorizes a given community's ideal for

the world as it should be. Frye argues that the ritualistic quality of romance derives from its invocations of accepted belief, and that in its revolutionary aspect, romance provides a glimpse of a higher world that the romance itself does not realize; this is the audience's task.

Thus romance may both confirm the values of a given society, yet also destabilize it by idealizing these values beyond the conventional boundaries of their application; they tend to end where they begin, with the heroic task remaining to be done yet again.[120] Arthur goes to his death, in T. H. White's book, with his society destroyed and his task undone. Yet prior to his death he meets a young child who knows of all his history, and is content. His victory is that the story of his attempt will live on and inspire others to the trial until it does indeed come into being. T. H. White identified the Kennedy administration within months of Kennedy's death as Camelot. The 60's as a decade were part guided by the myth until the Once and Future King came again in 1968 and, in violation of all reason or mythology, died in the time of greatest need. "There is now a special terror, a flashing feeling of here we go again with the words, `We interrupt this program to bring you a special news bulletin," a Los Angeles Times reporter wrote in 1970. "The moon that excited us yesterday seems stale today. Camelot keeps fading."[121]

There are three other significant narratives that also embodied the Arthurian quest, yet were not Arthurian stories. I would include them structurally with the direct Arthurian stories as part of a "quest" genre. They are the film El

Cid (1961); the Broadway musical and later film, Man of La Mancha (1966 musical; 1973 film); and Lawrence of Arabia (1962). El Cid I will have cause to discuss when I turn to Anthony Mann's other 60's epic, The Fall of the Roman Empire. Man of La Mancha transforms Cervantes' ironic comedy into an idealized romance of the United States as the nation that succeeds in spite of the mistakes it makes and the impossible dreams it has for justice in the world. It is in a sense an attempt to make a myth out of Syngman Rhee, and figures like him among the United States' allies--especially, in the context of the Broadway show, South Vietnam. The central plot movement in Man of La Mancha is the transformation of an angry, embittered, powerless barmaid into Dulcinea, the noble ideal for whom Don Quixote fights. He persists in telling her that she is this ideal, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, and in spite of her own resistance. At the end, as he is dying, she accepts the identity that he has made for her.

Lawrence of Arabia is a considerably more ironic romance. It is a good deal more honest in its analysis of the contradictions inherent in the use of imperial power to help other nations discover their identity, as a brief summary of its romantic development indicates: Lawrence is a romantic hero, in that he comes into an Arabia blighted by an evil empire, and successfully casts it off with his ability to organize the empire's oppressed people. In the process--and very much unlike the standard romantic hero--he both discovers his romantic persona and loses his personal identity. Because he acts for Arabia yet is not of

Arabia, he can only partly accomplish his epic quest, and he cannot find the personal salvation that the romance hero usually discovers in the completion of the quest; he is possessed by history, and then is dispossessed of everything. He wins freedom for his people, and a kingdom for Prince Faisel. But because he is an outsider, in doing so he at the same time casts into bondage both kingdom and people to Great Britain. Because Lawrence's motivations for his actions are never purely idealistic, but also the mixture both of his personal ambition and the ambition of the imperial figures he serves, he himself enters the story as a guilt-ridden outsider, and leaves the story as a guilt-ridden outsider. His salvation--as is true of each of the quest narratives--is not in accomplishing the quest himself, but inspiring others to complete it. In Lawrence's case, the Dulcinea-figure is Ali. At the beginning of the film, Ali is simply a member of a clan. At the end of it, he has become the pan-arabic patriot Lawrence could never be.

Although the Arthurian cycle contains some of the most interesting films of the period, Lawrence of Arabia also indicates the limitations the genre had. To the extent that the Quest film dealt substantially with the contradictions of justice and empire, it either denied the existence of contradictions, or it created a narrative in which the United States could only be seen as self-delusive and tragic. The Rome genre also evolved, but because the Roman genre began in the 50's as a negative example and ended in the 60's as a cautionary parallel

world, it could embody the conflicts more easily; Rome was always a morality tale.

The negative use of Rome is what one commonly sees in the early Roman-Biblical epics. Until late in the decade, most of these films were variants on the Bible film, and share that genre's similarities with noir. From film to film there are subtle shadings of a Roman identity with the United States, yet at least on the surface, from Quo Vadis? (1951) to Ben-Hur (1959), filmmakers typically used Rome as a pagan foil for Christianity. Rome in these films seems to be more a fantasy image of the U.S.S.R. than it is of the United States, a carryover of the identity of the Roman empire with fascism in the 30's and 40's that was indeed in use.[122] The Silver Chalice (1955) is a good example of the Bible-noir transposed to Rome. In it, the conflict of ideals the film presents is very much like that which Eisenhower described in his press conference, the war between agents of religion and materialism. The protagonist, Basil, has to choose between the virginal love of a Christian disciple, Deborra, or the more experienced desires of Helena, supposed reincarnation of Helen of Troy, and assistant to Simon Magus, a magician who claims to be a god.[123]

Basil is the noir man of the film, the detective who wanders through a world with a hidden sickness, in search for truth. He is a sculptor, and his task is to discover from people who knew Jesus how to sculpt His image on a silver chalice to commemorate the Last Supper. As with Spartacus in Howard Fast's novel Spartacus (1951), no one can quite seem to give Basil the information he

needs to sculpt Jesus's face. Simon Magus is a magician, whose skills seem to his audiences to be manifestations of divine power. He himself begins to believe this, and catches the attention of the emperor Nero by claiming to be the equal or superior of the Christians' Jesus. Basil is Greek, and in a sense representative of the empire: The romantic triangle in which material or spiritual love will triumph is parallelled by implication on an imperial scale in the triangle between Simon Magus and the apostle Peter, each of them in effect agents for their respective patrons Caesar and Christ.

Quo Vadis? (1951) presents us with a more subtly nuanced Rome. Again, the conflict in the film is set in the form of romantic triangles that represent a choice on the protagonists' part between the material power of Rome and the spiritual redemption of Christianity; between Christ and the Anti-Christ that early Christians took the emperor to be, as Will Durant stated it in his 1944 history, Caesar and Christ.[124] I will set aside this inevitability for the moment, in order to look at the nature of Rome as we are shown it. In Rome, law, truth, beauty and art are what the emperor Nero says they are. The powerful in Rome fawn around Nero, hoping to win favors and avoid the possibility of death to which the out-of-favor are exposed--the false promise of life which Christianity will defeat. The most artful of these powerful is Petronius, who (by a mixture of complements with criticism) maintains a precarious balance between flattery and mockery, and endears himself to Nero as an honest man--thus multiplying the effect of his flattery. But Nero, his sense of

importance fanned by less crafty courtiers, goes beyond the pale when, in a fit of artistic inspiration, he burns the property and the people in Rome. In order to maintain popularity with the masses after this, Nero takes a suggestion of an advisor and blames the Christians.

The interesting nuance to this is that being a Christian becomes in the film something very like being a Communist was in 1951. To add to this structural device, the relation of persecution of Communists in the United States was not novel. "I would say that the Communists are the closest things to the early Christian martyrs," Henry Wallace was quoted as saying in Time, at the 1948 Progressive Party convention.[125] As I will note later, this same linkage was made by the Saturday Review in 1952. Thus, there is a double edge to the film's opening prologue about how individuals in Nero's Rome are at the mercy of the state. The film presents us both with the U.S.S.R. as Rome, and also with an image of the United States ruled by McCarthyism as Rome is ruled by Nero.[126] In this context, Petronius's letter announcing to Nero his suicide, when it becomes clear that he, too, has lost his precarious hold on Nero's favor and shortly will join the ranks of those falsely accused and murdered, has an ironic antiMcCarthyist ring, particularly as it is spoken in a Hollywood film:

> To Nero, Emperor of Rome, Master of the World, Divine Pontiff. I know that my death will be a disappointment to you, since you wished to render me this service yourself. To be born in your reign is a miscalculation; but to die in it is a joy. I can forgive you for murdering your wife and your mother, for burning our beloved Rome, for befouling our fair country with the stench of your crimes. But one thing I cannot forgive: The boredom of having to listen to your verses, your second-rate songs, your mediocre

> performances. Adhere to your special gifts, Nero--murder and arson, betrayal and terror. Mutilate your subjects if you must, but with my last breath I beg you: Do not mutilate the arts. Fare well, but compose no more music. Brutalize the people but do not bore them, as you have bored to death your friend, the late Gaius Petronius.

After the deaths of Petronius and Nero, the film concludes with an appropriately Toynbeesque peroration of what Rome/United States has lost in Nero's reign, as the protagonist Marcus, now a Christian, and his friend Fabius watch the arrival of the army of Galba, the new emperor they have helped to bring to power, who himself shortly will be killed:

> Marcus: Galba has a tough task ahead of him--rebuild Rome and bring back Roman justice.
> Fabius: I fear the glory that was Rome will never fully be reached again, Marcus.
> Marcus: Babylon, Egypt, Greece, Rome. What follows?
> Fabius: A more permanent world, I hope. Or a more permanent faith.
> Marcus: One is not possible without the other.

Rome was still on the whole a negative image, but as early as 1951 it was an image in flux, from the image of the enemy to an image of identity for America.

Intellectual Journals during the 50's led the shift of Rome identity. Some found parallels between the problems of the United States and the classical civilizations in the area of international relations. Others noted parallels in domestic politics. The incidental use to which references of Rome were put in this time were so frequent, and in such odd places, that I will concentrate on one journal's systematic use of Rome.[127] The Saturday Review made a regular practice of criticizing McCarthyism through Roman history. In a 1952 editorial

entitled "The Suspicious State," the editors compiled quotes from Tacitus's Annals and Histories of Rome, primarily relating the purge of Sejanus's friends during the reign of Tiberius. Typical is the following quote: "People were incriminated for some casual remark in the forum or at the dinner-table, for everyone was impatient to be the first to mark his victim, some to screen themselves, most from being, as it were, infected with the contagion of the malady." The United States government had encouraged praise of the U.S.S.R. during the Second World War, and the Senate and House punished those who did so in the late 40's and 50's as Communists or "fellow-travellers." Tiberius had encouraged prominent Romans to pay court to Sejanus, and then killed or ordered the suicide of those who did so as traitors when Sejanus's conspiracy to become the next emperor came to light. The Saturday Review's editors apparently thought their readers would find the parallels of history and mood obvious, as they provide no additional comment.[128]

The Saturday Review had two significant Rome articles in 1953. "Rome's Last Chance" discussed the last years of the Roman republic. Its theme was the McCarthyite fear for the United States, on how the Roman republic degenerated into "despotic state Socialism,"[129] and how the empire collapsed. The author, C.A. Robinson, Jr., implicitly blamed McCarthyism itself: "To speak generally, the dangerous foreign situation, religious strife, and financial needs combined to set the social structure of intense regimentation during the late Roman Empire." In these days, "an awful fear permeated the entire empire, for it was

felt that a secret religious sect, known as Christians, consisted of potential traitors; accordingly the Christians were persecuted with increasing severity until even pagans were shocked into becoming Christians."[130]

But the fall of Rome to the Christian Fifth Column came well after the point when Rome irredeemably was in decline. In the context of the Republican party's attack on labor unions and New Deal legislation, Robinson thought Rome's last chance was when the wealthy prevented the Gracchi brothers from carrying out reforms. "The failure of the Graccan reforms made Caesarism, or one-man rule, inevitable," because some means had to be found for people to act in the interest of the common good. If the state itself existed solely for the economic benefit of the wealthy few, then patriotism could no longer motivate the masses. In order to continue its existence, the state would then have to compel obedience by force. Military rule could preserve the form of the state, but it could not preserve the state's economic vitality. Thus the wealthy, by destroying the political activity of the lower classes, and creating a society of fear and injustice, brought about the destruction of the republic, and doomed the empire.

In consonance with Robinson's article, two weeks later The Saturday Review devoted a cover to the 1953 film, Julius Caesar--the only time they gave a cover to a film in the 50's. The film's producer, John Houseman, who had produced Orson Welles' Fascist Julius Caesar on Broadway in the late 30's, had noted elsewhere that "there are certain parallels between this play and

modern times."[131] The Saturday Review film editor, Hollis Alpert, concentrated on such modern parallels. His review ignores the conspirators' claim in Shakespeare's play and the film that they killed Caesar to restore the republic. He passes over Brutus in his commentary, and concentrates on the conflict between Cassius and Caesar. Tyranny was inevitable, he implies, and the only question is which it will be, of the Left or the Right:

> I kept seeing in [John Gielgud's Cassius] the prototype of the Marxist intellectual. And it is Cassius, after all who shows most knowledge of the revolutionist's handbook.... You see in him not only the prophet and the organizer of revolution, but the possessor of the seeds of corruption that would seem inevitably to attend a bid for high power.[132]

These articles suggest that Rome, to the editors of the Saturday Review, was not just a means of thinking about the United States in the present, but--as Toynbee argued--of determining more precisely the crises it faced and of foretelling its possible future.[133]

The Saturday Review editors also employed another metaphor in 1953 to think about the United States.[134] Their concern this time was international relations during the Cold War and their effect on the United States. In order to understand this, they used Athens during the Peloponnesian war:

> Two thousand three hundred and eighty-six years ago two great powers, former allies, now enemies, glowered in angered distrust. The future hung on their decisions. Three decades of intermittent war were climaxed in tragedy. Mankind has been forever poorer. The only thing some men learn from history is that men do not learn from history. Can we learn from the mistakes of Athens and Sparta?[135]

Athens' great mistake was that it had "never actually given sincere and complete commitment to the democratic ideals she professed." Again, as in Rome, Athens denied civil rights to many of its citizens, which brought about a decline of belief in the state. "Faith is what men live by: refusal to live by the articles of faith meant the destruction of the faith itself. I don't want modern Athens to repeat ancient errors. Modern Sparta means business."[136] But modern Athens already was committing the same errors, abroad, and especially at home: "We can flatly challenge the alleged Americanism of McCarthyism. It belongs in modern Sparta, not Athens."[137]

The Peloponnesian War metaphor was never as popular during the 50's as Rome--perhaps because Athens lost, or perhaps because, in Toynbee's reckoning of the Hellenic world, to respond accurately to the metaphor would mean that the United States should federate itself to the U.S.S.R.--but representatives of the intellectual Left used it intermittently through the 50's and 60's. Athens was both a less ambiguous symbol of the Good Society than Rome, and useful in that Athens' fall as described by Thucydides could be attributed directly to its failure to uphold its own ideals.

Gilbert Murray used Athens as the model for the dangers awaiting the good society that forgot itself in his The New Republic article, "A `Liberal' Civilization Wrecked by War." Athens before the war was a "free, liberal civilization." With the advent of the on-and-off Peloponnesian war, however, an "ideological" war, all of this was lost. Pericles had spoken of Athen's propensity

to "make friends abroad by doing good and giving help to our neighbors." By the end of the war however, Athens destroyed the small city-state of Melos:

> The Melians have committed no offence, but their island would be useful to Athens. The Melians appeal to law, to established custom, to justice, to man's regard for the gods; the Athenians explain frankly that such considerations are of no account to them; it is only Power that matters. They use their power, conquer Melos, kill the men, sell the women and children into slavery, and therewith--the historian grimly adds--they set off triumphant on the fatal expedition against Sicily which is to leave imperial Athens in the dust. The great liberal Hellenic civilization failed to get rid of war, and war was able to destroy it--by inward poison as well as by outward violence.

The "Hellenic civilization"--a significant phrase, as it was Toynbee's preferred term for the Graeco-Roman period--failed its trial. Murray hoped that "modern Athens" would take this lesson to heart.[138]

Adlai Stevenson invoked Athens again in 1961 for Harper's Magazine in his article "America Under Pressure," as the illustration for his theme that the United States should work to achieve "the kind of confederal association under law which the nations of the world must ultimately achieve if they are to avoid the final horrors of atomic war." This was, he wrote, the great "adventure" by which history would judge the modern age, just as other civilizations had been judged.

> It was the glory of Athens--prototype of all free societies--that by the spontaneous will of the citizens, it could outface the might of Persia and outthink the leaden discipline of the Spartans. We carry in our minds echoes of Pericles' great Funeral Oration: "We admit anyone to our city and do not expel foreigners for fear that they should see too much, because in war we trust to our bravery and daring rather than stratagems and preparations. Our enemies

> prepare for war by a laborious training from boyhood; we live at our ease, but are no less confident in facing danger.... We love the arts, but without lavish display and the things of the mind without becoming soft." So long as this temper prevailed, Athens proved invulnerable.... During its greatest days, it proved once and for all that free societies can show this vitality, that free societies can be the history-making forces in the world.

Stevenson warned that as Athens had fallen from its Periclean heights, so the United States had grown "cautious and `reluctant to do even what is necessary.... I hope that I can say that while free society may have slumbered for a little and rested and drawn breath, it is ready again for great purposes and great tasks, and that its creative imagination, re-aroused and refreshed, is equal to all the crisis and challenge of our perilous days."[139]

There were no Peloponnesian war films,[140] but there was one play which invoked the war in order to interpret the Cold War and McCarthyism: Maxwell Anderson's Pulitzer-prize winning play, Barefoot in Athens (1951) was about Socrates, who "lived during a long quarrel between a communist state and a democratic state. Sparta was a complete, thorough and conscious communist society. Athens was the first conscious attempt at a democracy."[141]. Anderson seems to have written the play directly in response to the congressional search for traitors in government and media. Anticipating (or partly inspiring?) the commentary in The Saturday Review and The New Republic, Anderson argues in his preface to the play that even if there were traitors in the state, the inevitable accompanying condemnation of innocent people on suspicion of

being traitors would result in the destruction of faith in that state's justice. Plato was driven to embrace dictatorship in The Republic

> ...because he lost the great man who was closest to his heart; he was young; he turned against the rabble (or what seemed to him rabble) of Athens. He turned against democracy and tried to work out a new kind of government in which philosophers would not run the danger of being killed by inferior people who did not like their views.... The democratic--or republican--method is the best we know; though it's not too admirable.... The communist system, with its gang of assassins in office, is the worst we know. Plato was sufficiently astute to see that the rigid structure of a communist society could be maintained only by a ruthless use of assassination, yet he chucked democracy and came out for communism. At least his philosopher-kings, once chosen, would be safe from the mob.[142]

The play compresses the five years between Athens' fall in 404 B.C. to Socrates' death in 399 B.C. Its theme, as one would expect, is of the individual's rights in a society made conformist by war, traitors, and fear. Socrates' son is embarrassed because his father does not wear sandals, like all the other respectable fathers. Almost all the characters in Anderson's Athens dislike Socrates' stupid, embarrassing questions about why they're sure their actions are patriotic or pious. "People don't ask such questions," they keep saying. At his trial, Socrates says: "The unexamined life is built on lies, and a free world cannot live by lies. Only a world of slaves can live by lies!" Nonetheless, because this Athens is to scared to allow free discussion any more, Socrates is of course condemned, by a close vote--and Athens, as the historically-informed audience would know, fell under sway of the Macedonian empire within a generation.

One of the kings of Sparta, Pausanias, is Anderson's interpretation of a Platonic philosopher-king--the perfect version of the tyrant Socrates' former student, the Oligarch Critias, tries to be. He finds Socrates fascinating. Socrates returns the interest; Pausinias has "the endearing qualities of the frankly criminal class." He wants to break Socrates out of jail and take him to Sparta. But Socrates has conditions: Would he be able to go around asking questions about things? "It wouldn't be encouraged," Pausanias says, and when Socrates persists, says "look, you dizzy old goat you'd get your neck twisted;" despotisms can only bear discussion of what is true in private.

Socrates is the hero of the play, yet in an odd sense, it is Athens itself, the silent chorus for whom Socrates speaks, which is the tragic hero. It is this quality that Vernant mentions, of a society speaking to itself, which gives Anderson's play its epic dimensions. The Magistrate who presides over the trial is the personification of this voiceless chorus, only aware of the need to speak as they are placed in a position where they cannot speak, where it is too late to do so. As in the Vice President's facial expressions in the film Mr. Smith Goes to Washington (1941), the Magistrate expresses in his few words both his sympathy and belief in Socrates, and in his silence, his powerlessness to overcome what he sees as the unjust vote of the Council of Five Hundred. The play is about a nation literally divided about its understanding of itself, unable to speak its true identity. Fall of the Roman Empire ends with the same crisis, and although it is the last Rome film, it is interesting to note that Hallmark chose this

play to present as a Hallmark Hall of Fame special in 1966, as dissent to the Vietnam war rose, and as racial strife became more violent.

The useful parallel for the United States of Ancient Greece, and Athens in particular, spread outward from intellectual to popular media in the early 60's, catalyzed both by further popularized versions of Toynbee, and probably most decisively by Kennedy's frequent references to Ancient Greece in his speeches.[143] In 1960, Arnold Toynbee presented his "Lessons for Us from Athens and Rome" in the New York Times Magazine, presaging his more extensive discussion on the same theme in America and the World Revolution (1962).[144] Between April 1963 and April 1964, NBC broadcast a series of programs entitled, "Greece: The Golden Age."

Ancient Greece was also the subject of a Life magazine series in 1963, which emphasized the positive aspects of Greece and tended to downplay Toynbee's "lessons." The series had two "Wars of Destiny", one against a common totalitarian foe which united Greece, and the Peloponnesian war, which pitted the nations aligned with Sparta against those of Athens. The series empathized Athens, the sea-power, over the land-power Sparta; Athens, the democratic nation, over totalitarian Sparta. Other Greek city-states receive a mention now and then. Although, with the other Greek city-states, its "narrow, provincial and chauvinistic" tendencies "led eventually to their undoing," Athens, Life wrote, could boast of a "catalogue of genius" in its statesmen, artists and playwrights. It was the commercial center of the Aegean. It gloried in its

unique constitution, as celebrated in Aeschylus' The Eumenides. "Its greatness dazzled even its enemies and its glory was remembered even in Athens' hour of deepest humiliation," when Sparta defeated it at the end of the Peloponnesian war.[145] Tucked at the end of Life's Athens Special Issue in the series was a sparsely-illustrated story on Sparta, where, "like Russian commissars, ephors enforced laws, controlled public morals and education. They could order the kings around and use the Spartan secret police to carry out their meanest whims."[146]

If Athens was attractive, it was nevertheless problematic. As leader of the Hellenic world, it had been awful, and its political system appeared in the 60's no more stable than the Founders had found it. Rome was both greater, and had historical moments where, had it only behaved differently, a historical populizer could argue, it could have avoided destruction. In January 1957, the Saturday Review published another lengthy article on Rome by the historian F.R. Cowell, "A Republic and its Natural Diseases." In it, the issues that Rome is used to analyze cover most of the concerns liberals had at the time for the United States. Cowell begins his essay with a problem. Although Cicero sought to save the Republic and Caesar to destroy it, both agreed that, in Caesar's words, "'the republic is a sham.'" But why did they say that? What happened to Rome, that Romans no longer believed in it? Some had attributed the survival of republican governments to "reverence for national institutions, national heroes, and devotion to national insignia such as the Roman Standard

or the Stars and Stripes." But these really were only outward forms of belief, fetishes of something deeper:

> Nothing can so damage or paralyze the republic as continual hesitation, uncertainty, and conflict over the nature of the future ends or values which the community exists to realize. Nothing gives greater strength to a state than singleminded devotion to values shared in common.... When a republic is a going concern it derives clear strength from the willingness of all its members to work for the success of their respective undertakings in self-forgetfulness and in the belief that they, their neighbors, and their fellow-citizens are also all working together for a common worthy purpose.... [T]he republican spirit is an inspiration, a state of mind, a prevalent attitude.... Correspondingly, when the members of a republic begin to discover that the values they are supposed to serve are no longer capable of commanding their unquestioning loyalty and devotion, times of trouble and of peril are at hand.[147]

Cowell thought that such a crisis of unity and morality was at hand in the United States, because too many citizens, like the Romans, "had begun to concentrate their energies upon the...principle that everyone should have a free hand to enjoy all the selfish satisfactions he could grab." If "honest citizens who are too lazy or selfish to play their proper, positive role in political life" did not arise and involve themselves with the problems of the nation, "thieves and fanatics" would move into the vacuum.[148] These contradictions and divisions, if not resolved, would divide the United States as Rome had been divided by class warfare:

> The divisions in American society--which I don't think we should assume are less dangerous than in Rome--are sectional and racial, and hence give a different look to the difficulties and disharmonies that trouble the state.... `A State,' said Cicero, `is made harmonious by agreement among dissimilar elements

> brought about by a fair blending of the upper, middle, and lower classes, just as if they were musical tones.'[149]

Harmony could be brought about in the United States, Cowell wrote, if the nation would become conscious of the means by which it violated natural law in the treatment of its citizens. In the context of his analysis of divisions in society, Cowell surely meant to lend the support of Rome to Martin Luther King and the SNCC protests in the American South. But he also had in mind more subtle injustices, produced by an excess of individualism over civil spirit. Cowell concludes with the warning that states of greater tyranny than imperial Rome were possible in modern society.

> But a modern society can also more easily establish a gentler and sounder state than the Romans could--a genuine `welfare state' which cherishes the helpless and encourages the strong, which does away with sham in creating a Republic of the Spirit. This is every free man's aim.[150]

Within a year of Cowell's article, a film that embodied much of his argument began pre-production. In three years, another Saturday Review correspondent, C.A. Robinson, wrote the historical handout audiences were given in the lobby for that film, Spartacus.

ENDNOTES

1. H. J. Haskell, The New Deal in Old Rome 2nd. ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947 [1939]), p. 53.

2. Thomas Hobbes went so far as to blame the English Civil War on the Classical curriculum, as "by reading of these Greek and Latine Authors, men from their childehood have gotten a habit (under a false shew of Liberty,) of `controlling the actions of their Soveraigns' with `the effusion of so much blood; as I think I may truly say, there was never anything so deerly bought, as these Westerne parts have bought the learning of the Greek and Latine tongues." Hobbes, Leviathan, III, cited by M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism, p. 19. Sellers notes that Volney and Desmoulins also attributed the French revolution in part to knowledge of the Classics.

3. in The Empire of Reason, cited above.

4. Cicero, In Catilinam, IV:11: "Videor enim mihi videre hanc urbem, lucem orbis terrarum atque arcem omnium gentium, subito uno incendio coincidentiem," cited in M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism (New York: New York University Press, 1994), p. 93. Sellers comments on Cicero's influence during Constitutional debates, but apparently is unaware of this earlier influence. It is debatable, of course, in that the citation given as the reference in the Norton Anthology of American literature Vol. 1, p. 24, is Matthew 5.14, "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid." Given the substantial editing and inserts all the Gospels received, and given the fundamentally antagonistic attitude toward Rome as the false city, memorably preserved in Augustine, and in John's Revelations, I suggest that it is likely Cicero is the foundation of the idea "city on a hill"--really, descriptive of Rome's physical layout--and that Augustine certainly, and quite likely Winthrop as well, would have been schooled in this common source.

5. M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism: Roman Ideology in the United States Constitution (1994), p. 61. King Charles I, interestingly, in his "Answer to the XIX Propositions of both Houses of Parliament" cited Polybius's description of the Roman constitution in 1642 as an appropriate compromise with Parliament--no doubt with the intention of making oblique reference to Polybius's accurate prediction of tyranny should the Roman popular assembly become too powerful.

6. M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism, p. 94.

7. See Thomas L. Pangle, The Spirit of Modern Republicanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), pp. 30-33. I am reliant in addition to Pangle's fourth chapter, "Classical Republicanism," for many of the references used by Colonial republican theorists. I am also indebted to M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism: Roman Ideology in the United States Constitution (1994), a compendium of the broad range of Roman influences on early American republican theory and practice.

8. M.N.S. Sellers, American Republicanism: Roman Ideology in the United States Constitution (1994), p. 10. James McLachlan, "Classical Names, American Identities," in John W. Eadie (ed.), Classical Traditions in Early America (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976), pp. 81-98 provides a close study of one group of modern "ancients" of the 1770s, the Cliosophic Society--and notes (ff., p. 95) the shift after 1810 to a majority of Greek rather than Roman names.

9. Adams wrote his Defence with the intention of informing and influencing the Constitutional delegates, in which he succeeded admirably. In combination with his Notes and the Massachusetts constitution, of which he had been the primary author, Adams set the terms within which the constitutional discussions took place. See M.N.S. Sellers, p. 35.

10. John Adams, Defence of the Constitution of the United States Vol. 1 (New York: Da Capo Press, 1971 [1787]), p. 101; p. 361. It is perhaps of interest to note in passing that, when free of his burden of advocacy, Adams was rather less enthusiastic about Rome: "To return to the Romans. I never could discover that they possessed much virtue or real liberty. Their patricians were in general, griping usurers and tyrannical creditors in all ages. Pride, strength, and courage, were all the virtues that composed their national character. A few of their nobles affecting simplicity, frugality, and piety, perhaps really possessing them, acquired popularity among the plebeians, and extended the power and dominions of the republic, and advanced in glory till riches and luxury came in, sat like an incubus on the Republic, victamque ulciscitur orbem." Adams to Jefferson, December 18, 1819, in Paul Wilstach (ed.), Correspondence of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson (New York: Capricorn Books, 1966 [1925]), p. 170. In his conclusion--which is consistent with the Defence--this foreshadows the Spartacus critique of the United States.

11. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, The Federalist Papers (New York: Mentor Books, 1961, p. 71.

12. On July 5, 1814, Jefferson wrote to Adams that Plato's Republic was full of "whimsies, puerilities, and unintelligible jargon," to which Adams replied on July 16th that "your reflections...perfectly harmonize with mine." Adams said of reading Plato, "my disappointment was very great, my astonishment was greater, and my disgust was shocking." He was amazed that the world had so long paid so much heed to such nonsense. Paul Wilstach (ed.), Correspondence of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson (New York: Capricorn Books, 1966), pp. 106-109.

13. Stephen A. Larrabee, Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece, 1775-1865 (New York: New York University Press, 1957), p.28, p. 229.

14. Stephen A. Larrabee, Hellas Observed, pp. 230-231 provides both a mention of the collective interest in Greece and a sample of what Greece represented to the American traveller.

15. George A. Kennedy provides a quick survey of the period and its shifts in the afterward to Meyer Reinhold, Classica Americana: The Greek and Roman Heritage in the United States (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), pp. 326-336. Gary Wills provides another short survey in Lincoln at Gettysburg (New York: Touchstone, 1992), pp. 41-46. Wills cites Schlesinger Jr.'s observation that Walter Savage Landor dedicated his Pericles and Aspasia, Vol. 2, to Jackson. Russell L. Hanson, The Democratic Imagination in America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), chapter 4 discusses the rhetoric of Jackson and "Democracy," and Democratic-Republican's use of the democratic ideal after the 1812 war as a weapon against the Federal period's "republic" rhetoric, and the ideology of the politics of deference to the elite.

16. Garry Wills, Lincoln at Gettysburg (New York: Touchstone, 1992), p. 43.

17. Indeed, Jackson himself was symbolized in a contemporary play and painting as Marius, a low-born provincial who became a general, defended Rome against enemies, and was styled the "third founder of Rome." Marius was deprived of office and exiled by opponents in the Senate (as Jackson had been deprived of the presidency in 1824), but returned to conquer his opponents. See William L. Vance, America's Rome, Vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), pp. 27-30.

18. William L. Vance, America's Rome, Vol. 1, p. 64.

19. Emerson, "The American Scholar" (1837), cited in George Kennedy, "Afterward," Meyer Reinhold, Classica Americana (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1984), p. 329.

20. Henry P. Leland, Americans in Rome (1863), cited in William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 30.

21. Stephen Larrabee, Hellas Observed, p. 289.

22. Sophia Hawthorne, Notes in England and Italy (1869), cited in William Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 31.

23. William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 33. For other comparisons of slavery in Rome and slavery in the United States, see Vance, pp. 32-33.

24. See David S. Wiesen, "The Contribution of Antiquity to American Racial Thought," in John Eadie (ed.), Classical Traditions in Early America (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976), note p. 192.

25. quoted in David S. Wiesen, "The Contribution of Antiquity to American Racial Thought", Eadie, p. 210

26. George Fitzhugh, Sociology for the South or the Failure of Free Society (1854), cited in Russell Hanson, The Democratic Imagination in America, p. 171.

27. Russell Hanson, The Democratic Imagination in America, p. 171. Fitzhugh initially claimed that he was not a racist, "because it is at war with scripture." As ideology hardened in both North and South, Fitzhugh shed his delicacy about this--if that is the term--and fully accepted natural racial inferiority. After Darwin, "race" has been the flag of prejudice, and Aristotle forgotten. See E. Genovese, The World the Slaveholders Made, Pt. 2 (1969), pp. 235-237, cited in David S. Wiesen, "The Contribution of Antiquity to American Racial Thought," in John W. Eadie, Classical Traditions in Early America (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976), p. 212. Theodore Parker's response to such arguments is instructive: "O manly, majestic Rome, with thy sevenfold mural crown all broken at thy feet, why art thou here?... 'Twas not injustice brought thee low, for thy great Book of Law is prefaced with these worlds, `Justice is the unchanging, everlasting will to give each man jis right.' It was not the saint's ideal. It was the hypocrite's pretense.... [T]here is a God who keeps the black man and the white, and hurls to earth the

loftiest realm that breaks His just, eternal law." Theodore Parker, "National Injustice," in Henry B. Carrington (ed.), Beacon Lights of Patriotism (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 [1894]), pp. 155-156.

28. see George Kennedy, "Afterward," Classica Americana, pp. 333-334; William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), pp. 62-65; note, p. 32-33, the classical attack of Northerners on slavery. Henry Ward Beecher is the type in this period of the progress-oriented cleric.

29. William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p.48.

30. William Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 49. Figures like "Commodore" Vanderbilt were perhaps the commercial empire referents for such paintings.

31. More rarely, reform Darwinists such as Lester Ward argued that the measure of human evolution was not individual achievement, but rather social activity, through which nature was reshaped for human needs. In the reform Darwinist theory of advancement, social planning did not inhibit advancement of the "race," but rather was at the heart of human advancement. Thus it was "suicidal" to follow the laissez-faire individualist social Darwinism of the wealthy, because the increasing complexity of society required more conscious management, not less, in order for human activity to be rationally directed. This seems rather strikingly to anticipate the rationally reformed society of radical progressives like Herbert Crowly and Walter Lippmann--though Lippmann, in Public Opinion, turned to Freud rather than Darwin in order to explain the irrational behavior of the general public, and to propose an ideal ego of rational administrators for the social body. See Russell Hanson, The Democratic Imagination in America, pp. 208-213; Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (New York: The Free Press, 1965 [1922]), pp. 19-20. These are all interesting variations on the "Society is a Body" metaphor, with which Cicero would have been familiar--but which do not directly touch on Rome.

32. I am particularly reliant on the survey of this period in Russell Hanson, The Democratic Imagination in America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 183-222, and also on Brooks Adams, The Law of Civilization and Decay (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895), pp. 279-295, and Teddy Roosevelt's review, "The Law of Civilization and Decay" (1897), in Theodore Roosevelt, American Ideals and Other Essays Social and Political (New York: AMS Press, 1969), pp. 329-354

33. Henry Adams, quoted in William L. Vance, America's Rome, p. 64.

34. See Brooks Adams, The New Empire (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902), pp. 207-211.

35. Brooks Adams, "The Heritage of Henry Adams," in Henry Adams, The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1920), p. 94.

36. Brooks Adams, The Law of Civilization and Decay (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895), p. viii.

37. Brooks Adams, The Law of Civilization and Decay (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895), pp. 31-32.

38. Brooks Adams, "The Heritage of Henry Adams," in Henry Adams, The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma, p. 99.

39. Brooks Adams, "The Heritage of Henry Adams," in Henry Adams, The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma, p. 100. Some of Henry Adams' other comparisons of the United States to Rome may be found in William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 35.

40. Brooks Adams, "The Heritage of Henry Adams," in Henry Adams, The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma, p. 89.

41. Theodore Roosevelt, "The Law of Civilization and Decay," American Ideals and Other Essays Social and Political (New York: AMS Press, 1969 [1897]), p. 333.

42. Theodore Roosevelt, "The Law of Civilization and Decay," American Ideals and Other Essays Social and Political (New York: AMS Press, 1969 [1897]), p. 340.

43. Roosevelt, "Civilization and Decay," p. 346. Adams of course would have called McKinley, as he did Daniel Webster, a "jackal of the vested interests." McKinley to both the Adams was a tool of the "gold-bugs."

44. Roosevelt, "The Law of Civilization and Decay," pp. 340-341; 354.

45. Daniel De Leon, Two Pages From Roman History (New York: New York Labor News Company, 1935 [1903]), p. 54.

46. It is worth pointing out in passing that, although the Eastern Empire continued long after Rome was taken over by the barbarians, and although the Eastern empire was a Christian empire, Europeans tended to regard it (in accordance with the usual attitudes toward religious deviancy) as a heretic empire at best. In the United States, the Byzantine Church was not regarded as a correct Christian sect, and thus Greek Orthodox territory in Greece was regarded as a "mission field" in the period after the Greek Revolution. Thus, Gibbon notwithstanding, the "Roman Empire" to Americans at the turn of the Century--and indeed until at least the 70's--fell in 476, when Romulus Augustulus was deposed. A general discussion of the meaning of Rome may be found in Glen W. Bowersock, "The Vanishing Paradigm of the Fall of Rome," Bulletin of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences Vol. XLIX, No. 8 (May 1996), pp. 29-43.

47. Lew Wallace, Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ (New York: Harper and Bros., 1880), p. 508.

48. For the progress of this theme, see Lew Wallace, Ben Hur: A Tale of the Christ (New York: Harper and Bros., 1880), pp. 88-94; 107-114; 450-457; 508-509; 543; 560. The other major Roman romances of the period are Francis Marion Crawford's Ave Roma Immortalis (1898), and of course Henryk Sienkiewicz's Quo Vadis? (1896). Sienkiewicz had in mind the parallel of Poles oppressed by the Russian Empire to Christians oppressed by Rome, but presumably American readers would have understood it in much the same terms as Ben-Hur. See Monica M. Gardner, "Introduction," H. Sienkewicz, Quo Vadis?, tr. C.J. Hogarth (New York: Dutton, 1967 [1941]), p. vii. The publication date in London is suggestive of other relevant contexts which the novel has served.

49. George A. Kennedy, "Afterward," in Meyer Reinhold, Classica Americana (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), p. 335.

50. I will not discuss, but I will note again in passing, that Rome has been perhaps the most significant means by which the Western nations have devised mythologies about themselves. In Italy at this time, Rome was the ideal for the fascists. A future Kracauer will need to write of the place the Italian Roman epics of Giovane Pastrone, Enrico Guazzoni, and others have in the creation of Italian fascism. I will not speculate on how this history of the United States fits into that mythology.

51. Tenny Frank, Roman Imperialism (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914), p. vii.

52. Henry Adams, The Education of Henry Adams, cited in William L. Vance, America's Rome Vol. 1, p. 35.

53. Tenney Frank, Roman Imperialism, pp. viii, 106.

54. Franklin Henry Giddings, Democracy and Empire: With Studies of Their Psychological, Economic and Moral Foundations (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1912), pp. 330-332.

55. Giddings, Democracy and Empire, p. 11.

56. Giddings, p. 12.

57. Russell L. Hansen, The Democratic Imagination (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 242-256.

58. August Heckscher, Woodrow Wilson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1991), p. 589; p. 607. The conference was a "failure of technique," he told Felix Frankfurter, in Ronald Steel, Walter Lippmann and the American Century (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p.161. For the radical progressive movement's attitude toward the league, and Lippmann's in particular, see Steel, pp. 155-170. Also of note in Steel, p. 161, is Lippmann's feeling that the League as Wilson had negotiated it would create the suspicion "that the [League] Covenant is a new Holy Alliance," referring to the conservative alliance of allies Metternich engineered in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars.

59. James Brown Scott, James Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 and Their Relation to A More Perfect Society of Nations (New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1918).

60. Woodrow Wilson, "Peace Without Victory," in Francis Farmer (ed.), The Wilson Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956, p. 154.

61. Clarence Streit, Union Now (New York: Harper and Bros., 1940), pp. 59-61.

62. Streit, Union Now, p. 160. The argument I have summarized is pp. 158-164.

63. See, for example, Haskell's sympathetic treatment of Catiline, The New Deal in Old Rome pp. 124-130.

64. H.J. Haskell, The New Deal in Old Rome 2nd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947 [1939]), p. v.

65. Classical Outlook, review quoted from the dust-jacket of H. J. Haskell, The New Deal in Old Rome 2nd. Ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947)

66. H. J. Haskell, The New Deal in Old Rome, p. 177.

67. Haskell, p. vi

68. Haskell, p. 111.

69. Allan Nevins, The New Deal and World Affairs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 211.

70. Eliot Janeway, "The Midwest's Mood: Part I," Life Vol. 15, No. 11 (September 13, 1943), p. 12.

71. Many of these are documented in Julia E. Johnsen (ed.), International Federation of Democracies (Proposed) (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941). Many later proposals are covered in Howard O. Eaton, et al., Federation: The Coming Structure of World Government (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944)

72. Many of these are discussed in a Life editorial, "Plans vs. Policy,", Life Vol. 15, No. 13 (September 27. 1943), p. 36. Time Vol. 55, No. 13 (March 27, 1950) re-examined Streit's plan in "Atlantic Union: 7 into One," with the idea that the NATO nations might join into a Streit-like federation, and eventually admit other nations as well.

73. John K. Jessup, "America and the Future," Life Vol. 15, No. 12 (September 20, 1943), p 105.

74. Peter G. Boyle, "The British Foreign Office View of Soviet-American Relations, 1945-46," Diplomatic History, Summer 1979, p. 313, cited in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Cycles of American History (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1986), p. 213.

75. Rome still tended to be the negative model of imperial power, associated more with Nazi Germany than post-war America. For example, Cortez A. M. Ewing, "The Federal Instrument," Howard O. Eaton et al, Federation: The

Coming Structure of World Government (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944), p 59: "World order may be secured in either of two ways. The first is through the establishment of the Pax Romana, the peace of the conqueror, protected by an all-powerful government, which, by the long arm of administration, reaches down to regulate the lives of individual citizens. The incomparable Roman Empire set the historic pattern for this type of order, but every so-called world conqueror, from Genghis Khan and Timour to Napoleon and Hitler, has dreamed of such a triumph. The all-powerful state prescribes a universal code of human behavior. It punishes deviation from the code in inverse ration to its tolerance. The Roman administrators granted the privilege of local customs to peoples brought under the jurisdiction of the Roman eagle (the praetor peregrinus and the jus gentium were guarantees of a degree of local autonomy), but upon certain specific points there could be no deviation from empire standards.

The second method by which a peaceful world order may be achieved is that of federalism. In a dispensation of this character, local autonomy is not only permitted--it is guaranteed to the citizens of the member states. In theory, federalism reconciles the advantages of large and small state forms. The cosmopolis, of classic Stoic speculation, guarantees peace; the small state makes possible a higher development of the individual through active and vital participation in his government."

76. Walter Lippmann, "The American Destiny," Life (June 5, 1939), pp. 47, 72-73.

77. "Plans vs. Policies," Life Vol. 15, No. 13 (September 27, 1943), p. 36. Lippmann went his own direction with the publication of U.S. Foreign Policy (1943), and more particularly, U.S. War Aims (1944), in which he argued for a "spheres of influence" model.

78. Ronald Steel, Walter Lippmann and the American Century (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p. 577.

79. Arnold J. Toynbee, "The Present Point in History," Civilization on Trial (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 27.

80. Toynbee, "Does History Repeat Itself?," Civilization on Trial, p. 39.

81. Arnold J. Toynbee, "The Graeco-Roman Civilization," Civilization on Trial, pp. 56-59.

82. Arnold J. Toynbee, "The Graeco-Roman Civilization," Civilization on Trial, p. 60.

83. Arnold J. Toynbee, "The Graeco-Roman Civilization," Civilization on Trial, p. 55. See also "The Unification of the World," pp. 80-94; "The Dwarfing of Europe," pp. 124-125; "The International Outlook, pp. 136-138; 148-149; and indeed, scattered across Toynbee's work. His theory of the reason for the cycles of history might be summed up in these sentences from A Study of History (p. 243): "The underlying unity is apparent here; and it appears again if we vary our simile and think of the growths of civilization in terms of the Parable of the Sower. The seeds sown are separate seeds, and each seed has its own destiny. Yet the seeds are all of one kind; and they are all sown by one Sower in the hope of obtaining one harvest."

84. Adlai E. Stevenson, "Ordeal of the Mid-Century," Call to Greatness (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), pp. 14-15.

85. Public Papers of the Presidents, 1951 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1965), p. 116

86. Public Papers of the Presidents 1951 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1965), p. 218.

87. March 21, 1956 press conference, Public Papers of the Presidents 1956 (Washington D.C.: National Archives, 1958), pp. 338-339.

88. Public Papers of the Presidents 1960 (Washington D.C.: USGPO, 1961), Item 328, p. 775. Eisenhower, "Address in Detroit at the National Automobile Show Industry Dinner. Oct 17, 1960": "Since time began, opulence has too often paved for a nation the way to depravity and ultimate destruction. Rich, sluggish societies have put comfort, ease, and luxury ahead of spiritual vigor, intellectual development and the energetic pursuit of noble goals. The ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece, Rome, and more recently the splendid court of Louis XV fell thus, each having developed a false sense of values and its people having lost their sense of national destiny.

"This could be a threat to the United States but for the fact that we are not motivated by materialism. We hold dear the things of the spirit and the intellect. Our ideals of freedom, democracy, human dignity and social justice shine through all our institutions. These are the supreme purposes of our people and the motivation force of our government." close of speech: labor & management must have "communion of purpose and effort, not mutual antagonism.... "there must be an ever-increasing understanding of the total national interest, of its

vital needs at each moment in history, and of the historic mission in which it is engaged. Difference of opinion are natural and good, but there is no room for mutual distrust or bitterness. Labor and business leaders must sit down in a calm atmosphere and regularly discuss--far removed from the bargaining table--their philosophy, their needs, and, above all, their common responsibility to this free nation.

"Your future and the future of our country are dependent on the success you of business and of labor have in this matter. Labor-management statesmanship is today as imperative as labor-management bargaining."

89. Ezra Taft Benson, "The Decline of National Morale," The Red Carpet (Salt Lake City, Utah: 1962), pp. 296-298, in Robert A. Rosenstone, Protest From The Right (Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968), p. 31.

90. Adlai Stevenson, "Ordeal of the Mid-Century," Call to Greatness (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), p. 23.

91.Adlai E. Stevenson, "Ordeal of the Mid-Century," Call to Greatness (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), p. 26.

92. Kennedy mentions Toynbee only once, in introducing his proposal for Medicare and Medicaid, on February 21, 1963 (Item Number 74, Public Papers of the Presidents 1963). That mention consists as follows:

> On the basis of his study of the world's great civilizations, the historian Toynbee concluded that a society's quality and durability can best be measured "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens". Never before in our history have we ever had so many "senior citizens".

This is a small mention, and tangential to my argument. Nonetheless, it is the repetition of Toynbee's content in other speeches to which I would direct attention, and to note here that Theodore Sorensen, or Kennedy, or others of Kennedy's staff certainly saw Toynbee as an authority to cite for advancing legislation.

93. Or so Professor Douglass C. North argues--and Rostow tacitly accepts--in W. W. Rostow (ed.), The Economics of Take-Off Into Sustained Growth (New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 1963), p.400. O. G. de Bulhões of the Brazilian Institute of Economics also cites Toynbee in the same volume as a source for historically-based economic theory in "Agriculture and Economic Development," p. 231. Likely what Professor North is referring to is Toynbee's historical comparisons of the displacements of subsistence agriculture with mass-production agriculture in relation to the "time of troubles" cycle of Toynbee's

historical model. This creates the internal proletariat required for "take-off." See Toynbee, A Study of History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 396-398; Mogens Boserup, "Agrarian Structure and Take-Off," W.W. Rostow (ed.), The Economics of Take-Off Into Sustained Growth, pp. 201-224--note 208-215 in particular. Also note de Bolhões, p. 225, on repetitions of history in relation to the preconditions of "take-off." The Millikan-Rostow for a foreign aid policy served as the background of Kennedy's own proposals. See W. W. Rostow, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Foreign Aid (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1985), pp. 64-68.

94. Public Papers of the President, 1963, Item 136 (pg. 336)

95. John Kennedy, "Citizens for Kennedy" Rally, September 14, 1960, quoted in Henry Fairlie, The Kennedy Promise (New York: Dell, 1974), p. 61.

96. Henry Fairlie, The Kennedy Promise, p. 62.

97. Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History, ed. D.C. Somervell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 249.

98. Walter Allen, "The Frontier That no Longer Exists," Frederick Gentles and Melvin Steinfield (eds.), Dream On, America (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971), p. 254 Frederick Jackson Turner, of course, would be the progenitor of this line of argument.

99. John Kennedy, quoted in Henry Fairlie, The Kennedy Promise, p. 70.

100. Life, August 22, 1960, quoted in Henry Fairlie, The Kennedy Promise, p. 71. Fairlie has quite a collection of such quotes in his book. What he does not acknowledge is that Kennedy simply was better at expressing the Toynbee theme that almost every other politician of this period equally believed. If Kennedy spoke the words of empire better than Eisenhower, it was hardly true that Eisenhower's administration was less likely to act in an imperial fashion. Indeed, John Foster Dulles (given the biblical slant he took toward the United States's role in the world) was more likely than Dean Rusk and John Kennedy to condemn Third World nations of immorality for not choosing sides, and more likely to feel it a moral burden to overthrow their governments.

101. Look (December 18, 1962), cited in Henry Fairlie, The Kennedy Promise, p 179. The U.S.S.R. attempted to prove its superior status by the quality of its citizens' artistic creativity as well. I would draw particular attention to the context Kennedy sets for creative action. It is not merely to keep up, or even simply to

surpass them; it is to be done as part of our process of our resurrection. Toynbee (A Study of History, p. 250) makes much of the Italian will to revive itself in the Risorgimento, which may perhaps have inspired Kennedy and his advisors. I will note in passing that Kennedy's references to "excellence" or "culture" usually were made with reference to a Greek example, as in the following: (Public Papers of the President, 1963 [Washington D.C.: USGPO, 1964]), Item Number 137, "Remarks at a White House Musical Program for Youth, April 22, 1963": "We are, even though we hesitate to admit it, a cultured people and I hope we will be more so. When we use that word, we use it in the sense--really in the Greek sense--of the full man and woman living in a full system of freedom who develops his own resources and talents and in so doing serves the greater good of all of our people."; Item Number 171, "Remarks to a Group of Foreign Students, May 8, 1963": "The ancient Greek definition of happiness was the full use of your powers along lines of excellence. I can think of no area, particularly those of you who come from the southern part of the globe, where you can put your powers to more excellent use and produce more personal and general happiness than in the field of national service in government, either as politicians or as technicians, to help advance the welfare of your people. The world needs you and therefore we are proud, as I said at the beginning, that you chose to come here to learn."

102. Kennedy made three references to the struggle of the united city-states of Greece at Thermopylae (and in particular Sparta) during the first year and a half of his administration, taken from the Papers of the President: 1961: Item #162, "Remarks at George Washington University Upon Receiving an Honorary Degree. May 3, 1961; Item #418, "Address at the University of North Carolina Upon Receiving an Honorary Degree. Oct 12, 1961; 1962: Item #349, "Farewell remarks to participants in the Summer Intern Program for College Students," Aug 28, 1962, p. 647. Each of the quotes made reference to the same quote, in order to argue that scholars needed to become engaged in the activity of the U. S. government in the world. "'Would you have counted him a friend of ancient Greece,' a great American educator asked a century ago, at the time of the Kansas-Missouri struggle, `Would you have counted him a friend of ancient Greece who quietly discussed the theory of patriotism on that hot summer day through those hopeless and immortal hours Leonidas and the 300 stood at Thermopylae for liberty? Would you count anyone a friend of freedom who stands aside today?'" In references to Thermopylae alone, the United States' position in the world was on occasion related to Sparta. The 1962 film The 300 Spartans is the one monument to this metaphor.

103. This summarizes Arnold J. Toynbee, "Lessons for Us from Athens and Rome," The New York Times Magazine (January 31, 1960), p.13 ff.

104. Kennedy, "Toward A Strategy of Peace," Commencement Address, American University, Washington, D.C. June 10, 1963, U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol XIIX, No. 1253 (July 1, 1963), cited in David Larson (ed.), The Puritan Ethic in United States Foreign Policy (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1966), pp.188-189.

105. Public Papers of the President, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1964), p. 517.

106. Public Papers of the Presidents, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1964), p. 517.

107. Sargent Shriver, Point of the Lance (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 59-60. Shriver's book is peppered with exhortatory comments drawn from Toynbee.

108. Franklin Roosevelt, Fireside Chat, Monday June 5, 1944, 8:30 pm EST, on the occasion of the Allies' capture of the city of Rome: "The story of Rome goes back to the foundations of our civilization. We can still see there monuments of the time when Rome and the Romans controlled the whole of the then-known world. That, too, is significant. For the United Nations are determined that in the future, no one city and no one race will be able to control the whole of the world." I will note also in passing that the one radio broadcast I am aware of that used Rome, "The Terrible Meek," (CBS, 4/16/38) seems to have as its subject another fascist parallel. The Centurion in charge of Jesus's crucifixion realizes that persecution and murder are wrong, and swears to Mary that he will never kill again, even though he knows that in Roman society this means his own death. Orson Welles' 1938 production of Julius Caesar, a one-hour version of which may have been broadcast on 11/20/1938, is of course the most famous linkage between fascism and Rome. Cecil B. DeMille's 1932 film Sign of the Cross was re-released in 1944, cut by 16 minutes, but with a nine-minute contemporary prologue added, which established a linkage between the Nazi oppression of the French, and Nero's oppression of Christians.

109. I could add several Italian peplum films to this list, but while they might have been interpreted within the context of American Cold War conceptions by American audiences, I do not think that I can claim them as products of American Cold War narratives. Italian fascism used Rome imagery, and the PCI as well. Peplum like Attila the Hun (1955), in which pagans threaten Rome only to be overwhelmed by Pope Leo the Great's Christian army, or Il Crollo Di Roma [Rome in Flames] (1963), may well have had more contextual relations to

current Italian domestic politics or to World War Two than it did to the Cold War. As I am proposing in part that filmmakers (in this period at least) were making national epics, rather than trans-national epics, I will leave them out of this study. It is an interesting problem, as the boundary between Hollywood and the peplum blur, particularly in films like Sodom and Gomorrah (1962), which had Robert Aldrich as director, Sergio Leone as the second unit director, and quite a number of peplum aspects. My rule with this is that, if a Hollywood studio was in charge of the production, and screenwriter and director principally worked in the United States--as was the case with Douglas Sirk, director of Sign of the Pagan--then it is a product of the United States national cinema. I will note in passing that the peplum film seems to have reached its peak around 1961.

110. The Papers of the Presidents 1963-1964 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965), item #106, "Remarks to the Members of the Davis Cup Team, Jan 16, 1964:" "I think we in modern times sometimes tend to forget the ancient Greeks, whose philosophical thought and standards and beauty and culture still dominate our thinking in the Western World. They really valued athletic excellence with the same fervor that they exhibited in pursuing thoughts of their wise men and their poets. The Olympic games had a standing among the Greek intellectuals equivalent to the discourses of Plato and Socrates and Aristotle. This was because they recognized the value of pursuing excellence in every field, and this Nation can and should do no less." (given just prior to Theodore Sorenson's effective resignation, to write his book on Kennedy); Item #424, "Remarks of Welcome at the White House to Prime Minister Papandreou of Greece. June 24, 1964", "This country and your country are bound together by ties that are both ancient and modern. The founders of these United States drew deeply from the wisdom and the ideals of ancient Greece in formulating the concepts of our own free and democratic society. In this 20th century, your country and mine have stood stalwartly together to defend those enduring ideals against aggressors, and to advance their fulfillment among our people"

111. Lyndon Johnson, quoted in Tom Wolfe, The Right Stuff (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1979), p. 71.

112. Some of these fragmented meanings will be the subject of the final chapter.

113. It does not resolve what is, I am afraid, an untestable hypothesis, but I would offer into evidence Raymond Moley's "perspective" piece for Newsweek (September 2, 1963), p. 84, "Caesar the Destroyer." Moley's piece, next to a conservative attack advertisement complaining of Kennedy's "planned program

for building the power of the executive branch to near-dictatorship" by the chairman of the Board of Hyster Company, indicates that liberals certainly did not have a monopoly on Rome imagery by the early 60's. "Americans have always been intrigued by activist statesmen like TR and FDR but have been left cold by the sober lawfulness of the two Tafts," Moley wrote. Caesar was intriguing too, he noted. "Dickenson says Caesar substituted `a new mystical basis of authority for the traditional sanctions of the Republic. At the moment of his death he had built nothing, founded nothing...(except) a psychological acceptance for his rule.'" Cicero saw through "GJC"'s charisma, but of course no one listened to him until it was too late. "His warnings embody wisdom which our generation will ignore at deadly peril to human liberty." This anticipates Henry Fairlie's The Kennedy Promise (1973), in which Fairlie several times compares Kennedy to Caesar.

114. "The Know-How We Haven't Got," Harper's Vol. 208, No. 245 (February, 1954), p. 18.

115. Frank Gibney, "Syngman Rhee: The Free Man's Burden," Harper's Vol. 208, No. 245 (February 1954), p. 28.

116. "The Real Mafia,", Harper's Vol. 208, No. 1249 (June 1954).

117. Northrop Frye, "Spengler Revisited," Spiritus Mundi (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983 [1976]), p. 196.

118.
It would be interesting to see just how much the comic strip plots changed over the years to reflect the Cold War. I suspect they did, but this is a matter that goes beyond the scope of this paper.

119. Northrop Frye, The Sacred Scripture (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 22.

120. See Frye, The Secular Scripture, pp. 162-166; pp. 172-175.

121. Saul Pett, "Camelot Keeps Fading, Bleak Look At Quality of Life," Los Angeles Times February 15, 1970, reprinted in Frederick Gentles and Melvin Steinfield, Dream On, America (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971), pp. 563-564.

122. This comparison was in use by intellectuals, although with much less popular interest than the American identity with Rome was to become. As with

popular culture--eg. Lloyd Douglas's books during World War Two--Rome in the context of the war meant the fascist powers. Chester G. Starr, Jr., in "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire," American Historical Review Vol. LVII, No. 1 (October 1952), argues that it may be possible to understand better the second- and third-century Roman rhetoric of the empire as a "perfect democracy" by comparing it to Russia. Augustus gave the Romans perfect freedom by anticipating the society's needs, and freeing Romans from the strife produced by politicians. The essay is full of comparisons such as the following (p. 9): "[The Frumentarii] agency was abolished by Diocletian, to the universal rejoicing of the Empire; but just as OGPU gave way to NKVD, so the Roman emperors soon set up a new, even more carefully organized spy system in the agentes in rebus.... Epictetus warns against casual conversations in Rome: `A soldier, dressed like a civilian, sits down by your side, and begins to speak ill of Caesar, and then you too, just as though you had received from him some guarantee of good faith in the fact he began the abuse, tell likewise everything you think, and the next thing is--you are lead off to prison in chains.'" Starr's article is particularly interesting in that he uses references to the U.S.S.R., Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy in order to explain the nature of Rome's "perfect democracy;" they are all of a piece, although U.S.S.R. references are preponderant, as one would expect given the publication date.

123. I don't know that they indeed mention this in the film, but this was the claim made for the real Helena by Simon Magus, a real magician-mystic of the first century A.D. Reportedly, he offered money to the apostle Peter if he would share with Simon the secret of his powers. See Will Durant, Caesar and Christ (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944), p. 577. For a near-contemporary Christian commentary, see also Justin Martyr, "First Apology," Irwin Edwin (ed.), Marcus Aurelius and His Times (Roselyn, N.Y.: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1945), pp. 276-277. Helena "was the first idea generated by him," as indeed she is in the film.

124. Will Durant, Caesar and Christ, p. 575.

125. Time, Vol. 52, No. 6 (August 9, 1948), p. 19.

126. According to Derek Elley, John Huston wrote the original screenplay. In this first draft, Nero's evil was more the focus of the story, and the religious protagonists' theme was diminished. Petronius's speech perhaps is a holdover from this earlier Nero, whom I would imagine Huston would have wanted played by perhaps an actor more menacing and less charming than Peter Ustinov.

127. I will concentrate on the Saturday Review's use of Rome, because they use Rome in a more extensive and deliberate fashion than many others. The idea of a parallel between Rome and the United States permeated an extraordinary amount of writing on the United States during this period. Daniel Boorstin, in "Our Unspoken National Faith," Commentary Vol. 15 No. 4 (April 1953), p. 329, wrote: "We have not found it necessary to invent an Aeneas, for we have had our William Bradford and John Winthrop.... We have needed no Virgil to make a myth of the first settlement of our land or the first founding of the Republic; the crude facts of history have been good enough." In his book of the same year, The Genius of American Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), one finds occasional references to Rome, among which is the following, p. 181:

> The doom which awaited the Roman Empire, according to C. N. Cochrane, `was that of a civilization which failed to understand itself and was, in consequence, dominated by a haunting fear of the unknown.' Much the same could be said for us. Our intellectual insecurity, our feeling of philosophical inadequacy, may be explained at least in part by our failure to understand ourselves.

Michael Harrington concluded his article, "Myths of U.S. Liberalism," Commonweal Vol. 61, No. 11 (December 1954) with the warning that the United States must respect civic rights at home and democracy abroad: "Otherwise, we may soon have reached the terrible point at which Livy found Rome: "...we can no longer support either our vices or the remedies which would cure us of them." Horace Gregory entitled his review of Samuel Becket's Waiting for Godot "Becket's Dying Gladiators," in Commonweal (October 26, 1956), p. 88. He explains his title as follows: "In speaking of Beckett's `Dying Gladiators' I use the phrase advisedly. A gladiator's martyrdom was not that of a king-like tragic hero. The tragic fall was not his; his death was for the amusement of those who witnessed his fall in a Roman circus.... Beckett's heroes also exist, or try to, outside the conventions of a society as complex as any in the ancient world."

128. P. Cornelius Tacitus, "The Suspicious State," The Saturday Review (August 23, 1952), pp. 22-23.

129. C. A. Robinson, Jr., "Rome's Last Chance," The Saturday Review (March 21, 1953), p. 46.

130. C.A. Robinson, Jr., "Rome's Last Chance," p. 8.

131. John Houseman, quoted in Ian Johnson, "Merely Players: 400 Years of Shakespeare," Films and Filming Vol. 10, No. 7 (April 1964), p. 46.

132. Hollis Alpert, "The Abuse of Greatness," The Saturday Review (June 6, 1953), pp. 26-27.

133. Predating this film was the 1949 radio broadcast of "You Are There: Caesar Crosses the Rubicon" (CBS: 6/12/49), which may also bring up certain points of Robinson's article; it apparently contains an "interview" with Caesar in which he discusses the aristocracy's abuse of power. In the aftermath of the Suez crisis, as it became apparent that Britain and France would need to abandon pretensions of an independent foreign policy, other publications increasingly adopted the Rome metaphor. The editors of The New Republic, for example, entitled a critical review of Dulles' foreign policy "The Decline and Fall of American Foreign Policy" (The New Republic Vol. 135: pp. 11-16 (Dec. 10, 1956); pp. 14-18 (Dec. 17, 1956). The author, H. J. Morgenthau, argued that the United States must be realistic, and become an empire in order to protect itself.

134. The use of Athens for the United States and Sparta for the U.S.S.R. was first raised in H.E. Mierow, "Some Admired Sparta," Catholic World No. 167 (July 1948), pp. 351-355.

135. Buell G. Gallagher, "Hope and History," The Saturday Review (July 4, 1953), p. 24.

136. Buell G. Gallagher, "Hope and History," The Saturday Review (July 4, 1953), p. 25.

137. Buell Gallagher, "Hope and History," p. 25.

138. See Arnold J. Toynbee, America and the World Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 7-22, which summarizes his view toward the Hellenic failure of their "trial", and, on p. 7, of his preference of terms. In passing, it is hard, in these post-imperial days, when we know now of the Meloses subjected to CIA subversion in the 50's and 60's, and in the aftermath of the Vietnam war, not to see more than a little aptness in the choice of these metaphors.

139. Adlai E. Stevenson, "America Under Pressure", Harper Magazine August 1961, in Paul S. Burtness, Warren U. Ober, and William R. Seat, Jr. (eds.), The Contemporary University Reader (New York: American Book Company, 1963), pp. 147-155.

140. There was, however, Alexander the Great (1956), in which a moody Alexander of the upstart nation Macedonia, in the aftermath of a great conflict in which the powers of the world have destroyed themselves, takes over all of Greece, much of the known world, and sacrifices the rights of his subjects, and his morality and belief in himself in the process. This is consonant with the Left's critiques of the United States in the intellectual journals of the period. Life magazine did one of its not-infrequent movie cover stories on the film, "The Mystery that was Alexander," Life Vol. 39 (November 14, 1955), p. 86+. Alexander reappears in 1963. Horizon Vol. 5 (March 1963), pp. 12-13: 28-32 did two articles entitled "Great Confrontations," contrasting Alexander with Diogenes and Napoleon respectively. Alexander was also the subject of "Godlike Conqueror," Life Vol. 54 (May 3, 1963), pp. 62-77, as part of their multi-issue series on Greece in that year. Perhaps there was some idea of the Alexandrian charisma and leadership style as having a relevance to Kennedy which would explain this small flurry of Alexandrianisms. Athens, however, was the primary focus of Life's articles, and in the final analysis, the metaphor of choice, as we shall see in Henry Fairlie's The Kennedy Promise and Murray Kempton and James Ridgeway's eulogy in The New Republic, was Rome. C.A. Robinson, whose commentary on Rome we have seen, also wrote Alexander the Great, published in 1947. H.J. Haskell reviewed it in "Meeting of East and West: Act One," Saturday Review of Literature Vol. 30 (July 12, 1947), pp. 7-9. There is very little in the article that would lead one to see in Alexander any metaphorical usage except for the title itself; presumably, in 1947, we were seeing Act Two in Europe. Cessna, if I recall correctly, was running advertisements in Time as early as 1948 in which American businessmen are supposed to sympathize with Alexander; he could not travel back and forth across his far-flung empire, but the modern Alexanders of business would be able to do so with a Cessna airplane.

141. Maxwell Anderson, "Socrates and His Gospel," Barefoot In Athens (New York: William Sloane and Assoc., 1951), p. xii.

142. Maxwell Anderson, "Socrates and His Gospel," Barefoot in Athens (New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951), pp. xi-xii.

143. One of the recurrent uses Kennedy made of Ancient Greece was as the model of vitality in action. The presidency was attractive to Kennedy, he said, because it enabled him to pursue the Ancient Greek ideal of full use of his powers in the pursuit of excellence, as he stated at more than one press conference.

144. Arnold J. Toynbee, "Lessons for Us From Athens and Rome," New York Times Magazine (January 31, 1960), pp. 13+

145. "Greece, Part IV: Golden Age of Athens," Life (March 8, 1963), p. 61.

146. "Sparta's Iron Way," Life (March 8, 1963), p. 77

147. F. R. Cowell, "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases," The Saturday Review (january 12, 1957, p. 11.

148. F.R. Cowell, "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases," pp. 10, 11.

149. F.R. Cowell, "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases," p. 34.

150. F. R. Cowell, "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases," p. 34.

CHAPTER SIX

Spartacus (1960) is a film which embodies the contradictory interpretations Rome held for the United States in the 50's. It is the product of at least five competing conceptions of the narrative held by influential members of the production. Each narrative interpretation was itself subject to assaults from the major cast members, who improvised or commanded new scenes to be written by the screenwriter, Dalton Trumbo. In addition to Trumbo, Howard Fast, the novelist and initial screenwriter, secretly rewrote some scenes during the production with director Stanley Kubrick, and openly rewrote scenes after the rough cut.[1] Peter Ustinov also rewrote several scenes, particularly those between him and Charles Laughton. The film was successful, but showed the marks of these various narrative pressures. It seems to have pleased no one involved in making it. Peter Ustinov afterward recalled that the Spartacus production was "as full of intrigue as a Balkan government in the good old days."[2] Each of the principals involved seems to have thought that the opportunity of completing a truly great film had been squandered by the obtuseness of everyone else involved, and those who are living are still angry.[3] As a result, there are few films about which there has been so much information published on its production, and exchanged in unpublished memoranda in archives.

If the resulting film was, as New York Times critic Bosley Crowther complained, a bit of a "mish-mash," it was nevertheless extraordinarily rich because of its contradictions, certainly more than the "heroic humbug" with which Crowther dismissed it.[4] On the occasion of the Criterion videodisc issue of the restored film, Gary Crowdus in Cineaste referred to it as an "ambitious but flawed film," which seems to be the current consensus opinion.[5] J. Hoberman in the Village Voice reminisced that "the usherettes at the DeMille [the theater where the film premiered in New York] wore gowns modeled after the one worn by Jean Simmons," and suggested a reason for why the film seemed contradictory:

> Of course we identify with the Romans--we are them. The film's real political conflict isn't even between Spartacus and Rome, it's between the right-wing authoritarian Crassus and the corrupt liberal Gracchus.... Did JFK appreciate the sophisticated realpolitik behind Gracchus's cynical assertion that Rome had `stolen two-thirds of the world from its rightful owners?' Or did he nod with approval at Crassus's pledge of eternal vigilance?
>
> Probably it was both. In Spartacus, the schizoid nature of the Pax Americana is most blatantly revealed. We shed tears for the noble Spartacus while shouldering Crassus's tragic burden.[6]

This is insightful, yet too cynical; the popularity of Bible films rested precisely on their expression that the United States was still a nation whose strength was in its moral purpose, not its military might or its pragmatic politics. The moral conflict, personified in Spartacus and Crassus, is the film's center. To the degree that the United States could be identified with each side, Spartacus posed the following question: Whether the nation was indeed following

Spartacus's example as a moral leader whose actions derived from a common identity with humanity; or Crassus's example as an imperial ruler, whose actions derived from pride of ancestry and pursuit of power.

Ben-Hur (1959) brought up similar issues, but Spartacus explored the complexities of national identity that Ben-Hur, in the style of Bible-films, made inevitable. Spartacus was secular, a consciously liberal narrative that presented both the national ideal of the United States' traditional identity, and the left-of-center national fear of what it was becoming. The film as it stands is more confused than it might have been, but it is no justification of empire. Key members of the film's production staff--Screenwriter Dalton Trumbo, Studio Production head Edward Muhl, and Producer-Actor Kirk Douglas in particular--saw in Fast's novel the chance to dramatize in Rome the conflicts over identity that animated American culture. In this they succeeded. The possible societies in the film represented by Spartacus, Crassus, Gracchus and Julius Caesar each potentially could be our own. Like Lincoln's "House Divided" speech, Spartacus presents us with a vision of possible national identities and possible futures, which the audience may bring about by their actions.

The film's first scenes were directed by Anthony Mann. The backward track which begins the film is characteristic of his style. Mann, like Welles, had a preference for using a moving camera to shift point of view within a scene. As a voice-over narrator speaks a prologue, we open on a guard tower on the crest of a hill in the midst of a barren desert, and then track backward and down to

look in depth at a line of grimy, almost naked men carrying immense weights of rocks on wooden ricks. The camera continues backward and down to a medium-close shot of men struggling with the rick.

> In the last century before the birth of the new faith called Christianity, which was destined to overthrow the pagan tyranny of Rome and bring about a new society, the Roman republic stood at the very center of the civilized world. `Of all things fairest, says the poet, `first among cities and home of the gods is golden Rome."

We cut to a longshot of a hillside at the beginning of this line, where men break up stone and load it into ricks. We cut to the top of the hillside to a medium shot of a guard, and track down and left following the track of his whip as he beats a slave.

> Yet even at the zenith of her pride and power, the Republic lay fatally stricken with the disease called human slavery. The age of the dictator was at hand, waiting in the shadows for the event to bring it forth.

We cut to a close-up of an axe striking a rock, echoing the movement of the Roman's whip. The camera travels up and to the right, contrasting with the downward camera movements that characterize the rest of the scene. It shows us in a full shot--though we do not know it yet--Spartacus.

The camera continues up and right to a medium-long shot, obscuring Spartacus behind another prisoner, and then moves to a long-shot of the hillcrest. The narrator tells what little is known of Spartacus's origins, and then tells us where we are:

> A proud, rebellious son, who was sold to living death in the mines of Libya before his 13th birthday. There, under whip and chain and sun,

we cut now to a closeup of Spartacus; this is the man, the camera tells us by its cut from the tracking shot to a new position, returning to this man among many. "...he lived out his youth and young manhood, dreaming the death of slavery, 2000 years before it finally would die." We cut to a medium long shot, and the camera tracks right, following Spartacus carrying a basket of stone. We cut to an oblique point of view shot from Spartacus's position of another man, smaller, frailer, staggering under his load of stones. He collapses, and we cut to the medium-long shot, now stationary, of Spartacus's reaction. We cut to a high angle shot--in effect, isolating the two and placing them as if on a pinnacle, as Spartacus first throws his own basket and then that of the crushed man away. From this height--in which we see Spartacus's human empathy for this suffering, perhaps dying man--we cut back to a medium-long tracking shot, moving down the hillside and to the left. Instead of commanding the frame, Spartacus is now on the bottom of an descending diagonal. A guard runs down that diagonal and shouts "back to work!" As the camera keeps descending, he pushes Spartacus down the hill. He slides on his back along the gravel toward the camera, helpless, to a close-up. We are brought into his face, and made to feel by the angle of the shot and the movement of the camera the degree of Spartacus's oppression, and the forceful renewal of the downward trajectory of movements that dominate the scene.

After this brilliant sequence of shots, Spartacus bites the heel of the guard who begins to beat him--bringing the guard down to his level. This both

is the logical climax of the scene, and it foreshadows exactly the film's theme, that the Roman republic itself will be brought down as a result of its habituation to the cruelties and intolerance of the master-slave relation. These shots control our perception such that, when Spartacus attacks, it is the outcome of an attempt, literally, to force him down from his humanity to a bestial level; in biting the guard's heel he asserts his right to return again to the human pinnacle from which Rome has forced him. It is a brutal scene; yet Mann has evoked through his poetic control of our spatial perception our permission for Spartacus to be brutal. This is an odd idea, now, as heroes are so casually brutal in American films. Clint Eastwood's "Dirty Harry" character perhaps initiated this trend, but it is common now. In Hard To Kill (1990) for example, Steven Segal actually taunts and tortures his opponents prior to killing them, rather like a cat with mice, but without the innocence. But in 1960, brutality was the mark of villainy. Indeed, Howard Fast--who seems to have had no formal role in the film at this point, but apparently was viewing rushes and advising Kirk Douglas, loathed the scene. He missed the compassion of Mann's scene, and saw only a "bearded, dirty brute."[7]

It is possible that this sequence, combined with some shots of Marcellus taunting Spartacus at the gladiator school, cost Mann his job. Why, precisely, Mann was removed from the film and replaced by Stanley Kubrick remains a mystery. Edward Lewis and Douglas both say that the Studio insisted Anthony Mann direct the film; Mann was an experienced director, and Universal's head

of production, Ed Muhl, trusted Mann. Douglas saw Mann as the studio's director and wanted to get rid of him. Mann was a very experienced director, and in no way beholden to Douglas. A "brutal" scene, combined with Fast's comments, might have been the leverage Douglas was looking for. Douglas claims in his autobiography that the Studio came to him, after seeing rushes up to the gladiator school, and told him to get rid of Mann. Douglas does not define "Studio," but presumably this would be Ed Muhl, as mediated through his close associate Mel Tucker, and the "studio" intermediary, film Co-Producer and Executive Vice-President of Douglas's production company Bryna, Eddie Lewis. In particular, Douglas claims, Mann couldn't control Ustinov, who kept making his own speeches. This might have been used to attack Mann, and it would be more believable as a cause for complaint, if Ustinov had not done much more extensive rewriting of his own and others' speeches later in the film, with Kubrick's approval.[8] It seems likely that Lewis and Douglas are ascribing to Mann problems which Trumbo in particular later claimed about Kubrick; I will return to that later. At no other time of the production, if Trumbo's frequent and voluminous complaints are to be believed, did Douglas and the "Studio" show such concern for the script as written. Mann, Douglas says, was "relieved" to be taken off the film.[9] Edward Lewis claims that Mann knew he wasn't competent to handle the actors--which Douglas supports and Ustinov denies--, could not make the film, and "asked to be relieved."[10] As Mann went on to make epic films for the rest of his career, Lewis's claim that Mann couldn't handle the

scope of the film, which Douglas supports, seems least likely.[11] Howard Fast, astonishingly, claims that after shooting the brutal scenes Fast hated, and after having shot some gladiator school footage, Mann called him up to tell him that he was fired because "`they handed me a new script'--that is, Trumbo's, which had been the working script for months--"`and I wouldn't shoot it.'"[12] Ustinov thought Mann was "a very, very good director for actors, which is not saying that Kubrick wasn't.... I think the public should make up its mind for itself."[13] Dalton Trumbo, who had the least personal involvement, commented at the time in his notes on the rough cut that "Tony Mann was fired because of bad taste in relation to cruelty. Stanley is trying to do it in good taste."[14] Ustinov, ironically, thought that the way Mann was fired was brutal.[15]

Stanley Kubrick was Douglas's choice for director. Firing Mann made it possible for him to exchange a strong-willed experienced director with studio connections for a young director, relatively inexperienced, with whom he had worked before, whom he had under contract for three films, and whose career he had sponsored.[16] Mann was gone, but at least initially Kubrick's work was executed under the shadow of Mann's concept of the film. Mann directed at least some of the gladiator school footage, and the "physical" storyboards Saul Bass had prepared for Mann continued to serve as a basis for setups--although Kubrick modified them when he arrived, and most of the footage is by all accounts Kubrick's work.[17] It is probable that some of the tracking shots at the school are Mann's, particularly those where the spatial relations of characters in

their settings change--as in, for example, the shot that travels through fighting gladiators to settle on a close-up of Spartacus, just prior to his first sight of Varinia. Trumbo complained of Kubrick's "tendency to master scenes, which is to say his admiration for the general over the particular." Kubrick uses moving camera, but the camera's relation to the actor tends to remain the same in Kubrick's tracking shots--as in, for example, Kubrick's famous steadicam shot of the child riding a tricycle in The Shining (1980); the background moves, but the character remains stationary relative to the camera. How much of the film Mann directed, and why he was fired, will continue to remain a mystery.

Lentulus Batiatus (Ustinov's character) arrives at the mines. With his arrival, the subtleties of the script become primary. Batiatus looks at slaves in order to find potential gladiators, but he never talks to them. He addresses his questions to the Roman "captain" of the mines; direct speech to them violates some unwritten hierarchy--something that notably does not apply to the bearer of his shade umbrella, whom Batiatus orders around. These slaves are beasts, not human, and the Captain is like a trainer. The Captain has prospects lined up along the path he and Batiatus take, and Batiatus has the Captain order another slave next to the road to come down and be examined.

When Batiatus sees Spartacus, however, Mann has so arranged the mise-en-scene that in order to look him over, Batiatus has to climb up a hillside and to the right--again, the upward movement that characterizes the camera's approaches to Spartacus in this scene--to a medium shot, with Spartacus

between the two men. Batiatus is impressed with Spartacus, whom the Captain informs us is being "starved to death" as an example to the rest of the mine slaves of what resistance will bring them. Batiatus taps Spartacus with his fly-swatter, and observes Spartacus's twitch. He looks over to the Captain and tells him, as though to educate him in the craft of noting what Batiatus needs, "He reacts. Good muscle tone." He then tells the Captain that he would like to see Spartacus's teeth, and the Captain slashes at Spartacus's throat with the whip. "Open your mouth, Spartacus," he demands. We cut to a closeup of Spartacus, who turns and silently glares at the guard in calm contempt. We cut back to the medium shot, repositioned slightly closer, as Batiatus leans over him and addresses Spartacus directly, with interest; this one is more than a dumb beast. "You smell like a rhinoceros." Licking his lips and changing his tone of voice, Batiatus addresses the Captain as he looks Spartacus's body up and down. "You asked him to open his mouth. He doesn't (pause) obey you?" The Captain obliquely admits he cannot control Spartacus. "His teeth are the best thing about him. He hamstrung a guard with them not more than an hour ago." "Hamstrung! How marvelous! I wish I had been here." Batiatus exclaims. Mann cuts again to a closeup of Spartacus, to register his dispassionate surprise at someone who finds such a thing marvelous. Batiatus is decided; here is his prize. "I'll take him. Let's look at some of the others."

We are shown a travel montage, and then Batiatus's arrival with his new cohort of trainees. In what is probably the last remaining Mann shot sequence

of any note in the film, Batiatus arrives at one level of the gladiator school, passes through a foyer, pauses to hear of the profit his last sales representative obtained for trained merchandise, and then walks to a balcony where, from what is now a great height, he looks down at the raw material arriving in carts which he has obtained. He turns to smile and accept the bow of his head trainer Marcellus, whom Mann has placed two head-lengths below in the frame. "Marcellus, there they are. They're a dirty looking lot, but it's the best I could find." Marcellus complements him on his eye for talent.

At a nod from Batiatus, Marcellus blows a whistle to get his trainees' attention. Batiatus then gives them what amounts to a leader's motivational speech. They are now in training to become part of a team--his team, the School of Lentulus Batiatus. They are to be trained to fight for the death, but only for "ladies and gentlemen of quality--those who appreciate a fine kill." They are, he implies, the nobility of their type. "A gladiator is like a stallion; he must be pampered." Their bodies will be prepared, and their minds will be cultivated. "A good body with a dull brain is as cheap as life itself. You'll be given your ceremonial caudas (a ceremonial "tail" curl at the back of the head indicating their status as gladiators); be proud of them." After his offer of status, he then offers them pleasure--"the companionship of a young lady" if they please him--and life. "Approximately half our graduates live for five--ten; ten years. Some of them even obtain freedom, and become trainers themselves--Marcellus." Batiatus smiles at his head trainer, and Marcellus bows in

recognition of his employer's benediction. "I congratulate you"--for the signal honor they have received to be selected as gladiators--"and may fortune smile on (pause) most of you."[18]

It is a clever speech, but Mann undercuts it with close-up shots of Spartacus's reactions to the speech, and to Spartacus's point of view of areas he notices on his entrance. Spartacus listens with interest until he hears that he is to be trained to fight to the death. His eyes drop, and the slave next to him looks at Spartacus. We cut back to Batiatus, and then to a medium close-up of Spartacus, 180 degrees reversed from the previous close-up. Spartacus was looking at Batiatus. Now, the slave next to Spartacus is still looking at Batiatus speaking, up on the balcony

in the background, but Spartacus is looking at the School, in a calm appraising manner. We cut to a pan shot of his point of view--men, behind bars, looking at Batiatus. The camera stops on the most visually dominant gladiator in the pan, close to the bars, a tall, powerful looking African man--Draba, we will later learn. The man turns and stares dispassionately back at Spartacus--a mirror image of his own gaze. We cut back to Spartacus looking as Batiatus says "a good body with a dull brain is as cheap as life itself," then to Batiatus, who makes his offer to the trainees of life and pleasure if they please him and fight well. We cut back to the medium-closeup of Spartacus and the gladiator next to him. Spartacus looks down as the other trainees we see are looking up attentively at Batiatus.

Spartacus starts and looks up as Batiatus says "some of them even attain freedom."

As the speech ends, we cut behind Batiatus to see the school resume its activity. In the resulting privacy produced by the surrounding noise, we are told again that Spartacus is unusual, and the real purpose of the school is made more clear. Batiatus points out Spartacus to Marcellus and tells him to pay particular attention to pay particular attention to the Thracian who was going to be killed for hamstringing a guard. "We'll cure him of that," Marcellus says. "Don't overdo it, Marcellus--he has quality." What the cure consists of becomes clear in the succeeding shot. Spartacus is to be broken like a dangerous stallion. If too dangerous to handle, he will be killed. Marcellus gives Spartacus a sword and taunts him, beating him in a shot/reverse shot sequence of close-ups with a wooden sword in order to provoke him. Spartacus controls his desire to lash out. "You're not as stupid as I thought. You might even be intelligent. That's dangerous for slaves. But you just remember: from now on, everything you do I'll be watching."

We cut from this scene, in which we see Marcellus is the enforcer, the bad cop to Batiatus's good cop, to--yet again--another descending tracking shot. The camera tracks with Draba and the senior gladiator-trainees as they descend a stairway and then a ladder to a tepidarium pool below, where the new trainees wash themselves with other schoolmates. As Draba and the new arrivees watch in the background, one of the older trainees at the pool tells

Spartacus that he was wise not to fight back--Marcellus kills a trainee now and then, to teach others a lesson. Draba approaches the pool and washes off his face. We cut to a medium two-shot. Spartacus and Draba have already met gazes--the only two we have seen who turned away from Batiatus's speech. This is something they share; the camera has linked them. "What's your name," Spartacus asks Draba. "You don't want to know my name. I don't want to know your name," Draba replies. "Just a friendly question, Spartacus says. "Gladiators don't make friends," Draba replies dispassionately. "If we were matched in the arena together, I'd have to kill you." Draba completes the rejection of Batiatus's speech by reducing it to its true meaning. This is no team, this is simply another form of servitude that perhaps is even more dehumanizing. The scene establishes Draba's understanding of the school, and what he will later reject. Even as Draba denies they can have anything in common, it reinforces the link between the two men that began earlier. Each have their passions, but they hold them in check. Draba, too, is an experienced slave, marked by his experience: rational, deliberately dispassionate, realistic. Each of them are not part of a group, but islands of humanity, whose right to be human exists only within themselves, not together.

We next cut to the scene in which Spartacus meets Varinia. Here, again, we have a scene with a downward camera track--one which is, however, definitely Kubrick's. The camera descends from a long shot in which the women who are about to be assigned for the trainees' pleasure enter and

descend a stairway, to Batiatus and Marcellus in a medium shot. Women approach, and Marcellus reads from a list the name of the trainee to which they will be given. Kubrick has over the years "gone out of his way to disown Spartacus and knock me," according to Douglas.[19] Here perhaps is one of the scenes from which Kubrick's attitude toward the film derives. He came into a film during shooting, with storyboards for some scenes drawn, and no time to think through scenes for himself. The production lost no days of shooting for the director change, which means that Kubrick must have filmed some shots as they were already laid out, with sets built for particular camera placements that he could not change.[20] This is probably one of these shots. Someone, probably at the studio, suggested that some of the women should be laughing as they enter, pleased at their prostitution. Trumbo wrote a withering response to this notion, pointing out from his personal knowledge of women and his reading of slavery histories that this was idiotic. It would "affront every woman in our audience," and "its falsity will offend most men."[21] The women are somber and resigned in the scene as shot.

The camera tracks in slightly as Varinia approaches the table to receive her lot. Batiatus, who otherwise has been silent, without looking up countermands Marcellus's order that Varinia be given to one of the other trainees, and orders her to Spartacus's cell. He then looks up to glare at Marcellus. Again, this is a mark of Batiatus's intelligence. He is not simply an owner of property. He needs to inspire his gladiators. Marcellus sees

Spartacus as dangerous, but Batiatus sees him as potentially an extraordinarily valuable gladiator, if only his passions and hatreds can be directed. He offers Varinia to Spartacus as the carrot through which, by habitual giving, he can inspire gratitude, and through whose withholding--after his gladiator has become habituated to the carrot--he can command.

And then Spartacus defies Batiatus's expectations. She is placed in his cell, and in a sequence of medium shots he approaches her--not to unleash himself, to feed on the carrot, to rape the woman whom he has been given, a woman habituated to rape and brutality. A quiet flute theme comes up on the soundtrack, a leitmotif that will be associated with Varinia. He approaches her with curiosity, wonder. He touches her gently, and tells her "I've never had a woman." Varinia does not know what to make of this, but does know her job. She steps back and disrobes, and Kubrick cuts to a closeup of her, staring dispassionately at Spartacus; like Draba, she is beyond emotion. Spartacus remains where he is, staring. The mood is broken by loud laughter. We cut to a shot, from Spartacus's point of view, of Marcellus guffawing. Batiatus chuckles then, smiling in spite of his strategy; they too, see a mystery, one which is so amusing because it is so unthinkable; they too are brutalized by slavery's power of objectifying people.

We cut to an over-the-shoulder shot (Marcellus's point of view) of Spartacus through the roof bars. The music changes from Varinia's gentle e-major theme to an e-minor augmented chord, played ascendingly on a

harpsichord against violins playing an F-sharp above middle c; tension. Marcellus continues laughing as Batiatus controls his amusement and speaks to Spartacus. "Well, what now, Spartacus? You must take her." "Go away," Spartacus responds--the first words we have seen him address to a Roman. This is a new type of torture, not exactly a denial of his humanity, but one which suggests that he has no right to himself. "What will she think of you? Indeed, what will I think of you?" "Go away." "Come, come, be generous. We must learn to share our pleasures." This infuriates Spartacus; he is not an unconscious object, a spectacle whose feelings, fears and desires are not his own but available to be viewed by others. But he is not expected to have feelings, as Varinia is not. This is again another form of training for the ring; Varinia is not just given to him for him to use, but for those who have a right to their own feelings to use through his activity. He is to learn to take his pleasure on command, and to associate it with himself being seen. "I'm not an animal," he shouts, and lunges up, grabbing the roof bars and reaching for Batiatus." "Ah, now, now!" Marcellus steps on Spartacus's fingers gripping a bar, and Batiatus strikes away his other hand. The music ceases. "Direct your courage to the girl, Spartacus!" They leave the opening.

Now that Spartacus is alone with Varinia, the true rebelliousness of Spartacus to slavery follows to completion. He is not prepared to see himself exploited as an animal. How does he see others? He has shown moments of empathy, but his manner has been more that of a panther behind bars. Will he

remain an island? We cut to a closeup of Varinia, the witness of this scene, who speaks for the first time. "I'm not an animal," Spartacus says to himself. "Neither am I," she says. Varinia's theme resumes again. We cut to a medium shot as he becomes aware of her again. He reaches down, with his eyes on her, and hands her the dress she has dropped on the floor. We cut to a closeup of her. She blinks, still for a moment, and then reaches for the dress, staring now at him as he had at her. Then she blinks again, embarrassed; he has given her back her humanity, and now--as not before--she is naked in front of him. She becomes aware of this and turns away from him. We cut back to a medium shot of Spartacus as he sees this, and turns away from her. It is the theme of the Garden of Eden in reverse; they have recovered a humanity and an innocence that Rome had taken from each of them. Again, as with Draba, Spartacus asks her name. But his rebellion and his actions have created in the cell a place where they can exist as humans, where names can be given. "Varinia."[22]

They had thought themselves alone, but, it seems, Batiatus and Marcellus have moved from watching at the roof-grate to listening at the door. We cut from a closeup of Varinia to a medium shot of Spartacus as the cell door bursts open, and Marcellus and Batiatus enter. "You'll have to take her out of here, Marcellus." We cut to a closeup of Varinia, who stares at them with slightly widened eyes and then drops them, again an object.[23] "You may not be an animal, Spartacus, but this sorry show gives me very little hope that you'll ever be a man. mmmm." On "hope," we cut to a medium shot of Spartacus and his

overseer and owner. Batiatus plays--subtly done by Ustinov--at being regretful as he says this, smiling slightly as he turns and moves out of Spartacus's sight. He is still manipulating his trainee, goading him now that he might modify his behavior later. Varinia starts to walk out of the cell, pauses, and looks at Spartacus. Marcellus behind her pushes her forward, and she drops her eyes and exits, and the door closes.

From Varinia's theme, we cut to gladiator training, and the discordant woodwind and harsh brass-dominated tones of epic stress. The montage of training is mostly done with long-shots punctuated by close-ups of characters. Marcellus continues to focus on Spartacus. One training tool is a device which turns blades around; it teaches the trainees to dodge blows. Three men at a time jump or duck to avoid the blades, covered with leather sheaths, and one is hit. He is knocked off the platform. We cut to Draba and another gladiator, shot from a low angle. He reacts with distaste at the process he himself underwent. Marcellus then has the sheaths removed, and Spartacus alone on the platform, shot at low angle, jumping and ducking rapidly to avoid being killed or crippled; again, camera angle unites Spartacus and Draba. We cut to a closeup of Marcellus smiling. We cut to a scene in which Marcellus uses Spartacus to teach the other trainees how to kill with a sword.[24]

In the midst of this, Spartacus and Varinia exchange covert glances through the bars that separate the women in the kitchen area from the gladiator training area that adjoins it. Marcellus uses Spartacus's body to paint on the

areas to strike, part of his series of symbolic attacks on Spartacus. Spartacus endures this quietly. Then, as Marcellus has turned to lecture the others on the finer points of an entertaining kill, Spartacus's attention is drawn to Varinia. Marcellus turns again to face Spartacus and sees this. He is surprised, and then laughs to himself. Varinia tries to rush away, but he orders her to stand still. Then, dipping his brush-tipped sword in red, the color of a kill, he turns Spartacus's head with the tip. "Since all you can do is look at girls--all right slave, go ahead and look." We see a closeup of his face, resisting the order, and at hers--the pleasure at this secret shared humanity now replaced with empathy, as she drops her eyes. "I said look!" What Marcellus had not seen before, he now uses as part of his means to break Spartacus. We cut again to Spartacus's cell as women arrive. The door opens, and some unknown attendant starts to lead in Varinia. We cut from her recognition of him to Spartacus's--he walks forward into the frame, as she moved forward in her frame; where some directors might zoom the camera in to indicate a strong emotion, Kubrick has the characters each move toward a stable camera. Then we cut back to Varinia. Marcellus moves beside Varinia and stops her. "No, this one goes to the Spaniard." Varinia stares at Spartacus as long as she can, as she is pulled away. The doorframe is emptied now except for Marcellus. "Have a good night's rest, Spartacus." He smiles and shuts the door. We cut to a low angle full shot of Spartacus, and hear with him a cell door open. "In

there," Marcellus says, and laughs. The camera zooms up and in on Spartacus, and fades to black.[25]

The next three scenes contrast the kitchen, where Varinia and Spartacus can covertly gaze and touch each other as she gives him food to the strains of Varinia's theme, to gladiator training under Marcellus's eye in sun and rain, and artful kills with wooden swords.[26] In each area, as a killing beast and as a human, Spartacus grows. This training ends with the following scene, the arrival of Crassus and his friends. Trumbo indicates Crassus's status by Batiatus's casual reaction to the news that Romans are approaching, and his frantic behavior when he discover's it's Crassus. Gracchus--in the form of a bust--is also introduced, as Crassus's enemy. The Romans enter to a brass-dominated march, and spread themselves in front of the screen as Varinia pours them wine, and Batiatus hovers unctuously, identifying them for us.

The purpose of this visit is in celebration of an impending wedding, a "mating of eagles" between Claudia and Glabrus, as Batiatus exclaims. In honor of this they would like to see two pairs of gladiators fight to the death. Batiatus protests this. They might see here the finest sword-fighting, much better than anything they would see at Rome. Once they are sold, owners may do as they please, but he never would fight his trainees at Capua, because of the "ill feeling it would spread through the whole school." His carefully nurtured illusion of the school as a place of dignity, and of himself as a benefactor to his students, however imperfectly maintained it has been hitherto, would be lost. It

breaks his promise to the trainees in the arrival speech he gives them.[27] Batiatus names an unthinkable price--which Crassus accepts. Batiatus can be bought, we are shown, and Crassus is someone who is used to buying people.

We cut from this to a shot in the column-set of the tepidarium, the bench room above it, and the stairway to the training area. One of the gladiators runs up to the tepidarium area, ascends to the bench room area as the camera tracks with him, and runs over to Spartacus. "Spartacus, there's going to be a fight to the death." He runs off. Another gladiator facing Spartacus, Gallino, reacts to this.

> Gallino: "To the death. What if they matched you and me?"
> Spartacus: "They won't."
> Gallino: "Would you try to kill me?"
> Spartacus: "Yes, I'd kill. I'd try to stay alive, and so would you."

There is little to this scene except exposition. Gallino will be killed by Crixus in the first matched pair fight. Gallino and Spartacus are friends, apparently, and now they face the conflict Draba knew was coming. It reminds us of Draba's speech, and it establishes a context for what will come.

More interesting is what follows, the selection of gladiators. This is done by the bride-to-be, Claudia, whose last husband's execution "touched us so deeply," as Batiatus says, yet which left her so fortuitously available to be wed, and lady Helena, brother of the groom, and paramour of Crassus.[28] Batiatus seems to want to direct them to choose (insofar as one can judge from his reactions) not the best gladiators, but those that might not bring the highest price when it would come time for him to sell them separately. He has sold

gladiators for this fight by lot, not as individuals. The women seem to make their selections on the basis of which of the men seem most sexually desirable. They gaze at those who are about to die for them in a medium tracking shot, and speak about them as though they were things. We cut between a medium tracking shot of them, and then of the objects of their gaze. Batiatus, in this case, is the intermediary between the masters and the things to whom one does not speak. He points out potential selections to him, but they make their own choices. "I'll take him," Claudia says, looking at Draba. "Draba? Oh, no, for you I want only the best. (He looks over to the other woman in appeal) Now, lady Helena--"I want the most beautiful," Claudia interrupts. "Draba," Batiatus says resignedly.

He then tries to direct them to the "one man" in the school who might be a match for Draba with the Thracian knife. In mid-career, the lady Helena stops him and selects Spartacus because "he's impertinent." In contrast to the other medium shots of trainees, we see a close-up of Spartacus's disapproving stare at her. We cut back to the standard medium shot as Marcellus, smiling and nodding with more than usual enthusiasm pulls Spartacus forward. "Impertinent, yes, and he's a coward to boot." We cut back to the medium shot of a desperate Batiatus and leering Helena. "I'll have him--have him flogged! Now, over here, the beast of Libya..." he chortles nervously. "I prefer the coward," Helena says. Batiatus shrugs with his thumbs. "Spartacus," he says, and bows his head. We cut again to a closeup of Spartacus's stare as Helena

continues. "If both men are down and refuse to continue to fight..." we cut to the medium shot, bringing a happy Marcellus into view "...your trainer will slit their throats like chickens. We want no tricks." "`Tricks,' Madame-lady, the school of Batiatus? You heard the instruction, Marcellus? Remember it." Marcellus turns and smiles at Spartacus, who lowers his eyes. We return to the medium shot. "I feel so sorry for the poor things in all this heat," Claudia says. "don't put them in those suffocating tunics. Let them wear just (pause) enough for modesty."[29]

The film returns to the Romans in the viewing box. Here we are introduced again to the bust of Gracchus, for whom "hatred of the patrician class is a profession," as Crassus complains when he discovers it. We will not see Gracchus for some time, yet as the patricians we see behave so hatefully, and loathe him so much, that the film prejudices the audience to Gracchus's character long before we see him. This is apt; as the novel describes him, he has "a peculiar, inverted honesty." But his "pattern of thinking" at times was supposed to be similar to Spartacus's--something of which in the extant film we see only fragments.[30] As it is, the film teaches its audience to see him as in some way a just man more than would otherwise have been the case without such scenes as this. He shines by contrast, not by what he does. Gracchus is the "master of the mob, and first senator of Rome," as Crassus says, which provides us with the first hint--and again, in the extant film, nearly the only hint--of the degree of Gracchus's power.

Crassus and Glabrus match their partner's powers of degrading objectification, at Varinia's expense. On the Romans' entry to the Foyer, Crassus stared at Varinia. Now, as she pours wine for them prior to the gladiator fight, and as Crassus continues to stare, the Romans comment about her as she passes them. Claudia says that Varinia "smells of perfume," and Glabrus, leering at her, replies that she smells delectable. Helena suggests that she probably stole the perfume--"you can't keep slaves from stealing these days unless you chain them." Claudia replies that as she is pretty, she no doubt prostituted herself in return for perfume. As Varinia tries to leave, Glabrus grabs her dress hem and yanks it up. "If her ankles are good, you can be sure an arrangement was made!" Varinia pours wine over him, pretends it was an accident and tries to rush out. Crassus finds this sign of resistance attractive. As the women accuse her of spilling wine over Glabrus on purpose--their responses to her in general are hostile, suggesting their sense of competition with female slaves for the men's attention, something which will be confirmed during the gladiator fight--Crassus calls her back. He deflects punishment by interpreting her action as an accident, grills her on her background, and then--at his usual lavish, unthinkable price, buys her, and requests she be sent in a cart. "I don't want her feet spoiled by walking," he says, as Helena, with hooded eyes, gazes at nothing in particular.

Kubrick chose, when he moved in for closeups on Crassus, to include Helena in the frame. Thus, as he looks over what by every visual indication we

have been given he intends to be his new slave concubine, Helena, who (again by every sign of acting and scene construction) seems to be his wife, must watch and pretend she doesn't know what is going on.[31] It is an interesting scene, in that it deflects the some of the perversity of the two Roman women's behavior in selecting attractive men to kill onto Crassus and Glabrus. The Roman women have no power over their mates' fidelity, but they may kill male slaves to sate their anger. Trumbo mentions in his comments on the film his familiarity with slave memoirs of the American South, and presumably this scene employs some of that familiarity.[32]

Helena's next line, "You provoke me, Crassus, I shan't be nice to you anymore" seems to be in response to his purchase. This turns out to be the start of a complaint that he hasn't given her brother Glabrus a wedding present. Crassus does, giving Glabrus the command of the city garrison of Rome. This confusion created by the shot irritated Trumbo, because he wanted the stress in the scene at this point not to be on a conflict between Varinia and Helena, but rather on the political basis of this marriage. Crassus was to have explained that Gracchus had made Julius Caesar, a patrician class-traitor, First Tribune. This extended Gracchus's control over Rome. To counterbalance this, he now was giving Glabrus the command of the troops stationed in Rome. Together they speak of using the troops to suppress the mob and "destroy" Gracchus and Caesar. Crassus apparently also spoke of his philosophy of "brutality as an

instrument of power," and drew some parallel to the impending gladiatorial fight.[33]

The only part which remains of the scene as Trumbo describes it is Crassus's gift of the emblem of command for the city garrison to Glabrus, his response "I don't know how I shall ever repay you," Crassus's meaningful counter, "time will solve that mystery" (now meaningless as it is not elaborated); Crassus's comment that the garrison is the "only power in Rome strong enough to checkmate Gracchus and his Senate"; and Crassus's explanation that he "fought fire with oil" by bribing the Senate to obtain Glabrus's appointment. Some of the missing dialogue was to have been intercut with the gladiator fight. The "fire with oil" comment is the only line of consequence during the fight in the final cut. As the gladiators await the call to fight, we hear further about slave concubines and attractive litterbearers--again, a theme, but not Trumbo's key plot theme. In his "Notes," he suggests some retakes, and discusses editing strategy for the scene, but was not appalled at what he saw. Trumbo's final comment on the scene is, "Are we quite certain, camera-wise and speech-wise, that we have explained the significance, power and purpose of the Garrison of Rome clearly enough, or with enough emphasis, to make sure the audience will remember it? I don't know." Given his extensive protests about comparatively minor alterations, the final cut appears to be a change that was made after Trumbo's part in the production was finished. Had Trumbo seen it, he might well have written some of his most blistering comments.

Without this commentary, Gracchus's clever outmaneuvering of Crassus's plan by having Glabrus's city legion into fighting Spartacus later in the film is much less motivated. Julius Caesar was to have been structurally an important character in the film. To eliminate mention of him here is to excise the identification of him as Gracchus's equivalent of Glabrus. Yet it is crucial to indicate that he has learned Gracchus's use of popularity with the "mob" so that, as he returns to Crassus's patrician faith in elite rule and military power at the end of the film, there is some motivation for Crassus to say to Caesar that he fears Spartacus dead, as an inspirational figure, "even more than I fear you." For it is Caesar in the end who will combine both Gracchus's demagoguery and Crassus's oligarchy to bring down the Republic and establish the Roman imperium. This is one of the crucial spots where Caesar's role was defined, and for some mysterious reason someone decided to rip out the information that made him a dramatic character, as well as much of the foundation that dramatized the conflict between Gracchus and Crassus, the political groups each represented, and information that established aspects of Crassus's character.[34]

Duncan Cooper has written extensively in Cineaste of the slave narrative's diminution by persons unknown. The Roman narrative however has almost equally been diminished, particularly in the critical area of Caesar's development. Trumbo wrote a detailed critique of how the film was crippled by script rewrites and edits in his "Report on Spartacus." He alleged that

individuals or combinations of individuals involved with the film had transformed his "Large Spartacus," an epic, self-sacrificing hero with a cause, who began as an animal and ended as the beloved leader of an army that defeated the full power of Rome for over a year, and brought about the downfall of the Roman Republic, into a "Small Spartacus." The "Small Spartacus" was a confused, selfish antihero accidentally at the head of a bunch of thieves, against whom Rome finally sent an army to punish, and who began as a feeling man and ended as an animal. In many other spots, Trumbo noted, for reasons which to him were inexplicable, scenes had been rewritten or simply not shot. Stanley Kubrick was Trumbo's primary suspect for this sabotage.[35]

Kubrick unquestionably did alter the script considerably, without consultation with Trumbo, perhaps in accordance with his alleged statement to Trumbo "that the words don't matter anyhow so long as they're simple, and that any attempt with speech to provoke thought or illuminate intellectual, political, or moral concepts simply confuses the audience...."[36] Kubrick himself has said that he thought that he had been "up against a pretty dumb script which was rarely faithful to what is known about Spartacus,"[37] Yet Kubrick's rough cut apparently contained this footage, or Trumbo would have responded to its absence. Trumbo often noted Kubrick's indifference to the slave revolt, but he never faulted him for his lack of interest in the Roman section.

Universal Studios production head Edward Muhl told Duncan Cooper in an interview that he was, in Cooper's words, "fascinated by the struggles

between the liberal and conservative Roman senate factions, transparent analogues to contemporary American politics, which the writer had injected in the script."[38] Thus, while Duncan Cooper argues that some of the "small Spartacus" cuts which occur later in the film were due to Muhl's preference to emphasize the Roman story over the Slave story, the last thing he would have wanted to do would be to cut the very material in which he was most interested, and indeed, the type of material that had been the subject of the Rome articles in Saturday Review and other publications in the 50's that may well have piqued Muhl's interest. Nevertheless, the cuts were made. Why?

As the most disastrous cuts apparently came very late indeed, and protests from the American Legion and the Catholic League of Decency over the novel began prior to Walter Winchell's announcement in January 1960 that Trumbo had written the screenplay for Spartacus,[39] perhaps Rome was already too closely associated to the United States to be regarded as neutral territory. Rome itself was uncontroversial when Quo Vadis was made, but particularly with ex-communist novelists and a blacklisted screenwriter, Spartacus was to be extended no such trust. Who precisely ordered the cuts has not been publicized, but it may be deduced.[40] Douglas suggests in his biography that as MCA owner Lew Wasserman "bought" Universal, the "studio" decisions would have been his. In fact, MCA bought Universal's studio property for cash--but then rented the property back to Universal. MCA eventually bought the production company as well, but that was not until 1964.[41]

Douglas may have wanted to find a scapegoat for Ed Muhl, whose daringness in changing Universal's films from "Monster" films to such socially concerned films as Spartacus and To Kill a Mockingbird he respected.[42] But Muhl was only indirectly responsible. In an unpublished interview with Duncan Cooper, Muhl describes concern from the "money boys from New York," the publicity department and the financial managers of Universal, over the controversy the film would engender.[43] Muhl had tried and failed to have Trumbo write a letter stating that he was not a communist.[44] With the extra scrutiny the film would receive because of its subject and Trumbo, even if Trumbo was not credited on the film,[45] the New York corporate officers apparently felt that the very elements of Rome which made the film interesting to begin with had become too controversial to keep in the film. Significantly, the final cuts were made just prior to the press showing on July 26, 1960.[46] This perhaps is one of the reasons why, just as the Roman films' meaning as epics to the United States were becoming overt, filmmakers in the United States stopped making them.[47]

The fight scene, in Trumbo's words, was "exquisitely conceived, directed, and photographed."[48] There is little that can be written about what, in its execution, is inescapably visual; it is the activity itself, a Léon Gérôme painting come to life, and the implications of that action that is the culmination of careful character-building, that are compelling. Spartacus and Draba have been linked by camera angles, by script, by behavior. Now Kubrick links them in the ring

with interchangeable full shot unstable diagonals in their fight, contrasted with the stable, compositionally balanced shots of the Romans who intermittently watch and gossip above. Prior to the Draba-Spartacus fight, Draba initially stares off into space, silent. We see Spartacus in close-up, staring out at the first pair, watching his friend Gallino fight. We cut to Draba in closeup, who turns to look at Spartacus. He watches Spartacus watching the fight, and smiles slightly--almost smugly. If the others are in shock at this, he is not. He and Spartacus are not friends--in spite of all of the linkages subtly drawn between them--because he knew of this moment. We cut to Spartacus's point of view as Crixus kills Gallino. We cut from this to a medium shot as Spartacus turns and looks at Draba. We cut to a closeup of Draba. Draba still has the shadow of a smile, but the look has changed; he sees, perhaps, in Spartacus's face the sorrow that he himself had tried to avoid, and now, through Spartacus, he is made to feel it after all his care.

At the end of their fight, Draba and Spartacus look at each other again in closeup shots. They have fought hard, and both are breathing heavily. Draba has disarmed and penned Spartacus, and now he turns to look to the Roman box for the mercy that such a fight might be expected to receive. We cut to a medium close-up of Helena in the left side of the frame, and behind her and to the right, Crassus, who looks down at the gladiators, then up at her. He upstages her subtly, parting his lips slightly in surprise as she raises her arm and turns thumb down, scowling--perhaps thinking of Crassus's new purchase.

We cut back to Draba, who looks down at Spartacus, and we cut to his oblique point of view as Spartacus, who shuts his eyes, clinches his teeth, and remains still for the killing blow. Draba's eyes open slightly wider, then he drops them, looking into himself rather than at Spartacus. We cut to his oblique point of view as he pulls the trident back from Spartacus's throat. Spartacus opens his eyes, confused. We then cut to the stable Roman box shot looking down into the ring, where now the Romans face the ring rather than each other. They angrily shout at him to kill Spartacus. Instead, he flings his broken trident at the camera.

We cut to a full shot of the box from a low angle, as Glabrus and the women flee out the back entrance, and Crassus reaches for his dagger. We cut to a full shot from above of Draba, running and then leaping up toward the camera. As Draba leaps up, we cut to a full shot of a Roman guard leaping down into the ring with a javelin. We cut to a medium shot ascending diagonal composition, with the Guard in the depth of field frame left, Draba in the center, and Crassus just visible to the right. The guard's javelin strikes Draba in the upper back, and we cut to a medium shot of Draba at Crassus's feet. He clutches Crassus's leg, and Crassus pushes his head down and stabs Draba through the back of the neck. In his "Notes on Spartacus," Trumbo says he wrote these elements of the scene as "an ironic jab at the idiotic, mock-poetic idealizations of bullfight fans." Crassus tells Helena at the beginning of the Crixus-Gallino fight that she had the honor of signaling "the start of this poetic drama." Now at the end of the fight, in what Trumbo says was "probably the first

scene ever filmed in which a man is killed like a bull," Crassus himself is made to experience--as we see from his point of view--the reality of fear and the messiness of blood and death in the afternoon. I would note again in closing that the guard jumping down into the ring, and Draba jumping up into the box, repeats again the spatial pattern Anthony Mann established.[49]

Draba's body is displayed in the gladiator cells, and the shot also follows Mann's pattern of downward camera tracks and movements in the frame for scenes of Roman rule, juxtaposed against upward camera tracks and movements in the frame for figures or scenes of resistance to Rome.[50] In the center-right of the frame, the gladiators are marched down steps, and the camera tracks down with them, to view Draba's body, center screen. At the left the end of the frame, they move up a stairway. In the next shot we track up with a Roman guard who walks up the stairway, and paces over the gladiator cells. We cut to individual close-ups of gladiators in cells, each quietly thinking, and looking up as the guard passes; and then to Spartacus. Like Draba, they do not look so much outward as inward. Spartacus pauses to look long at Draba. In the novel, Spartacus from the beginning to end is a hero. But as Trumbo states in his "Report on Spartacus," it was crucial for Spartacus to develop into a hero.[51] Thus first Draba undergoes a sequence of identity with Spartacus as they await their fight, and now--in this pause to look at Draba's body--Spartacus, and to a lesser extent the other gladiators, identify with Draba.

Through him and his personal affirmation of humanity they are able to discover a common identity.

This establishes the context for the next scene, the rebellion. When Spartacus attacks Marcellus the next day in the kitchen, as he taunts Spartacus for staring after Varinia, on her way to her new master Crassus, all the slaves rise up against their handlers. Douglas came up with the idea of drowning Marcellus in a pot of soup, much to the horror (in one of their few moments of agreement about the film) both of Howard Fast and Dalton Trumbo.[52] Kubrick shot quite realistic scenes of the rebellion itself, culminating in the whole of the gladiator school climbing up and over the viewing stand, continuing to its conclusion the upward movement that Draba was not able to complete.

Another scene which was shot, existed in the June 1960 premiere showing, and was cut, restoration producer Robert Harris theorizes, to save time--part of five minutes of film removed prior to the October premiere--was yet another crucial Roman sequence. Julius Caesar tracks down Gracchus in a public house, where Gracchus is facilitating permits and granting favors to constituents in return for votes. Caesar observes the process with distaste. As they leave and walk to the Senate through the streets, Gracchus advises Caesar to overcome this distaste, as the sickly smell of the poverty-ridden tenements is the "smell of power." "I love this street," he tells Caesar. "I might even be willing to die for it." It has given him power, and it could be the source of power for Caesar. "If I were an ambitious young aristocrat," Gracchus says,

"I'd take a house in this ward. Cultivate these people. Learn from them. They can lift you higher than you think."[53] Muhl, for whom scenes like this would have been the reason for making the film, complained to Duncan Cooper that Universal insisted on "42 cuts and trims...`for content, not length."[54] As Crassus was to have advised Glabrus on the uses of military power to control Rome, Gracchus was to have advised his protege Caesar on the uses of vote-purchasing and ward politics to control Rome. Both forms of subversion of the republic were to be established as separate poles at the beginning of the film, each holding the other in check. At the end of the film, as a result of the Servile revolt catalyst, they are unbalanced, and shortly to be united in one person, Caesar. This is one of the cuts which obscures Caesar's importance. Gracchus of course is also diminished. We see Crassus's power; we only receive hints of Gracchus's. Military takeover of Crassus's sort is an abstract idea in the United States. Political corruption is quite a bit less abstract. Caesar even could have been taken as an image of Kennedy. At the least, in a Rome associated with the United States, it might have drawn charges of un-Americanism. The studio cut it.

Instead, we now fade up to an overview of Rome, and then see Gracchus enter the Senate with Caesar, to the backdrop of speeches on the depredations of the Servile revolt. They sit down next to each other, in front of Glabrus and an empty chair. Unidentified as yet, Gracchus greets Glabrus. "Where is the noble Crassus?" Out of the city, he is told. A senator rises and calls for immediate

recall of Pompey and the Spanish legions to stop the rebellion. Julius Caesar--unidentified, unexplained--whispers to Gracchus that he could raise 500 men himself and put down the revolt. Most audience members likely miss the line, or discount its significance. "Don't make a fool of yourself," Gracchus says, and then rises and addresses the Senate. "Why call back the legions when the garrison of Rome has nothing to do but to defend us from sausage-makers?" The Senate laughs at this image of the powerless poor that, before the Public House scene with just such sausage-makers was cut, would have seemed more than a little disingenuous. "Let's send Glabrus against these scoundrels, give them a taste of steel." An old patrician rises. "I protest...there are more slaves in Rome than Romans; with the garrison absent, what is to prevent them from rising too?" Gracchus sighs, and looks over unwillingly as though to address a particularly slow student. "Well, I did not say the whole garrison. Six cohorts will more than do the job. The rest can stay in Rome to save you from your (pause) housemaids." This riposte silences further discussion. Military positions are the mark of honor for the best of the Patrician class, and Glabrus, flattered by Gracchus, accepts the charge. The remaining cohorts in Rome to guard against the housemaids are put in temporary charge of Gracchus's protege, the "Patrician-traitor" Julius Caesar.

Gracchus and Caesar provide a small echo of the missing Public House scene, as Gracchus explains his strategy for what just happened in the Senate to Caesar. Gracchus seduces and flatters the public, exchanging favors and

flattery for power. But for his efforts to make sense, he must have something against which he uses his position, if he is to be seen as in some way equal to Crassus. Caesar--as is the case with the audience--requires an explanation of what Gracchus fears from Crassus.

> Gracchus: You don't look very happy over the new job.
> Caesar: It's not a serious disturbance, Glabrus will be back.
> Gracchus: Maybe. But at least it gives me a chance to separate Glabrus from Crassus for awhile. You know, this republic of ours is something like a rich widow. Most Romans love her as their mother, but Crassus dreams of marrying the old girl, to put it politely.

This establishes an important theme for Crassus's character--that of the attainment and use of power as a substitute for love. He is particularly monstrous to Gracchus because his desire for power is in service of an inhuman passion, a desire to, in effect, become a god--to be the more-than-human consort of Rome. Gracchus defines his role as the dutiful son defending his mother from incest.

After telling us this, Gracchus then displays the one remaining example of his own power. They pause to shout "hail" to Glabrus, on his way, and to wish that the gods might be with him. Then they stroll over to a nearby poultry merchant. "Ho! One fat one, Thimbria," Gracchus says. As Caesar hangs back a step and watches, Gracchus gives the merchant a large coin. The merchant fishes in his tunic for change, but Gracchus waves him off.

> Gracchus: "No, no, no, no. Keep the change. Give it to your wife.
> Thimbria: "May the gods adore you!"
> Gracchus: "Only through your prayers, Thimbria."

Gracchus thumps the merchant on the back avuncularly, and he and Caesar walk toward the camera, as the camera tracks back to keep their aspect in the frame stationary.

> Gracchus: "Let's make an old-fashioned sacrifice for Glabrus's success, hmm?
> Caesar: I thought you had reservations about the gods.
> Gracchus: Privately, I believe in none of them. Neither do you. Publicly, I believe in them all. (Loudly) Greetings, Marcus Claudius Flavius! (fade to black)

Trumbo thought these lines "of no great importance," as so much material had already established Caesar and Gracchus. He thought "the Public House, the Street Scene, and the Senate scene, and the Senate steps scenes are all brilliantly done--a beautiful sequence of film." What is left is just adequate, but deliberately obscure.[55]

The next scene opens on the apropos exterior and Roman pool section of Hearst castle, which serves suitably enough as the set for Crassus's villa, the home of the richest man of the ancient world, and the apparent head of the Patrician class in the Senate. Howard Fast suggested that they use that location.[56] Hearst himself would have been one of the turn-of-the-century "economic types" of humanity favored by the security of the state that the Adams brothers saw as turning the American republic into a plutocracy--which indeed was the Patrician class's aim in the last years of the Roman Republic. Crassus returns from a hunt and, like an ancient Hearst, strides through his property, to the silent obeisance of his slaves. In his lavish atrium, he finds nine more slaves, a "gift from the governor of Sicily," he is told. Among them is Antoninus,

a Sicilian, enslaved in his own country, a "singer of songs" and a tutor of the classics. He muses aloud as to what proper use a boy with such talents could be put, and then orders him to be instructed as his body servant.

After this slight enjoyment of his arbitrary power over lives, the camera tracks with Crassus as he strides past the atrium pool and up a short flight of stairs to a salon room, to Glabrus, and more important matters. When Crassus calls to him, Glabrus enters from an exterior porch, and tells him that they are both to be congratulated for the honor he is about to earn; he is on his way to Vesuvius to crush the slave revolt. Crassus shouts a curse.

> Crassus: Great merciful bloodstained gods! Your pardon. I always address heaven in moments of "triumph." (sharply) Did Gracchus have something to do with this brilliant affair?
> Glabrus: (puzzled) Yes. He even proposed it. Rather decently too--
> Crassus: And you! Do you think I made you Commander of the Garrison to control some rock-patch on Vesuvius? It was to control the streets of Rome!
> Glabrus: I only take six cohorts. The rest of the garrison remains--
> Crassus: Under whose command?.
> Glabrus: Under...Caesar's...
> Crassus: Oh! Excellent, excellent! (Crassus walks across the camera and out of the frame, leaving Glabrus in MS) Finding Gracchus in control of the mob and the Senate, you felt impelled to hand over the garrison to him also!
> Glabrus: I see. (cut to midshot on Crassus and track out and right. Glabrus crosses downscreen to left and sits across from Crassus) I'll refuse. I'll withdraw from the expedition.
> Crassus: One of the disadvantages of being a Patrician is that occasionally you are obliged to act as one. You pledged the Senate to go, and go you must.
> Glabrus: If Gracchus should decide to move against you...
> Crassus: He won't! He has no need to! He has, with your assistance, immobilized me altogether.

The Senate and Crassus's conversation with Glabrus are the two scenes in the film in which we see from Gracchus's methods, and Crassus's anger and analysis of them, how Roman politics in normal times have operated. As the camera moves to separate Crassus and Glabrus in this scene, so Gracchus divides the Patrician power by flattery, by appeals to honor, and by craft. The Patricians claim right to rule not by popularity, but by nobility and honor, and their military skills which defend Rome. Yet they need popularity to consolidate their rule, and to justify their power. To use their position to take control against the popular will would be to sacrifice honor, to sacrifice their identity as Patricians. Glabrus tells Crassus to do just that, and Crassus explains why he cannot.

> Crassus: Are you not aware of Rome's most ancient law, that no general may enter the city at the head of his armed legions?
> Glabrus: Sulla did.
> Crassus: (Angrily) Sulla! To the infamy of his name; to the utter damnation of his line! (More calmly) No, my young friend. One day I will cleanse this Rome which my fathers bequeathed me. I will restore all the traditions that made her great. It follows that I cannot come to power or even defend myself by an act which betrays the most sacred tradition of them all. (He gazes off as if picturing something in his mind) I shall not bring my legions within these walls; I shall not violate Rome at the moment of possessing her.

This is the Crassus Gracchus fears. He cannot rape Rome and become the consort-god. He must seduce Rome by the purity of his idealism, and by the sacredness of his use of power. Caesar, as the elected Pontifix Maximus, as the reformist Consul of the <u>populares</u>, and as Rome's greatest military

commander, would eventually cross the Rubicon and enter Rome at the head of his troops. As a Patrician acting for the people of Rome, Caesar will become the consort-god which Crassus aspires to be, and in the process destroy the Republic. That is what the film prepares us to see. But none of these plottings included the slaves, which Crassus now sends Glabrus off to conquer. He must "sneak out" of Rome for the sake of underplaying this insufficiently honorable task, "and for heaven's sake, my young friend, try to see to it that you don't have to sneak back again."

We cut from Crassus's inhuman passions to a villa being looted at Capua, then to Spartacus, who rides in alone to the deserted gladiator school, and into the cell area. Varinia's theme plays as he looks in to his own cell where he first met her. Spartacus is distracted from his human passions by the sound of shouting outside. We cut to the gladiator ring, to a pair of Patricians, being goaded by spear and fire to fight each other. Spartacus enters the ring and stops it. At this point, he assumes the leadership of the revolt.

This scene was one of the more bloody battlefields in the war over making Spartacus, carried on by the various creative and authoritative powers involved with the film. The studio was worried over an excessively political Spartacus, but the final cuts Universal imposed were the last blows, done while no one else was looking, in an ongoing battle over Spartacus's identity throughout the film. Howard Fast frequently describes the "sheep-like" face of Spartacus in his novel, and his treatment is generally that of Jesus in most bible

films: Rarely seen, often remembered with emotion. Howard Fast's Spartacus was a Christ-figure, and his novel was very much a secular relative to Lloyd Douglas's books like The Robe. Fast complained throughout the making of Spartacus, and continues to complain 30 years later on the Criterion Videodisc of the film, that he cannot recognize his Spartacus. Fast wrote the first screenplay draft, which Kirk Douglas judged "a disaster, unusable."[57] Fast was quite embittered when Douglas gave the screenplay to Dalton Trumbo to write, and as a continuing advisor to Douglas and Kubrick, inserted rewrites regularly during filming, much to the deep irritation of Trumbo.

Dalton Trumbo wanted to write a heroic romance in an ironic mode. The revolt Spartacus leads fails, but it brings about the destruction of the Roman Republic. A republic which enslaved the world while proclaiming it was a free state would eventually enslave itself, and the revolt brought this contradiction to a head. Spartacus's revolt failed but in the struggle he and those who fought with him began as beasts and became more human than the Romans who defeated them. His final victory was not in overthrowing Rome, but in providing an example which would inspire future generations to complete the overthrow of tyranny which he had begun.[58] This would have placed the film in the general pattern of what I have called "Arthurian" stories, with an implicit critical warning for the United States's own behavior insofar as it resembled Rome.

Trumbo wrote "six or eight scenes" of Spartacus's speech to the gladiators, attempting to please Douglas, Kubrick and others, with, eventually,

lengthy explanations of what he sought to have the scene establish and what role it played in the film. What needed to be established was Spartacus as the leader, and as a strategic planner; as the Roman plot had been established, now a slave-plot needed to be clearly outlined. But Trumbo's Romance was not what other members of the production wanted. "All of those scenes and all the arguments which supported them have been brushed aside," he complained after the rough cut, in favor of what was likely a Fast-Kubrick rewrite.[59]

Fast had lost control of the script, but he continued to wage guerilla war on Trumbo's script, when given the opportunity by Douglas and Kubrick. Fast did not want a Spartacus that sought leadership, but rather received leadership by the other slaves' recognition of his spiritual uniqueness. "When he spoke to them in his soft, curiously-accented Latin, they accepted his words. He spoke to them and they were comforted. He seemed to be a happy man.... His contentment singled him out, and he walked that way in this unholy company of trained killers and lost men," Fast said of Spartacus in his novel.[60] Fast's Spartacus is more of an inspiration than an agent of the revolt. In the book, he states what he believes they should do, but then leaves everyone else to discuss what should be done; "You make the law. I will not make it."[61] In the rewritten rough cut scene, Spartacus does not give orders, but rather asks questions to inspire thought and discussion. "Here we have the great moral speech of Spartacus in this scene--and it begins with six rhetorical questions! What is this Spartacus--a debater on points?... This man is a hero, and the

method of his speech is important. Basically a question is negative and a statement is positive," Trumbo complained.[62]

But Fast's rewrites with Kubrick served another interpretation of Spartacus of which Fast was unaware, and surely would have opposed had he noticed. After a few weeks of filming, Stanley Kubrick developed his own idea on Spartacus, derived from his reading of Arthur Koestler's 1939 book, The Gladiators, and Plutarch's "Life of Crassus." Koestler's Spartacus was the commander of a slave army that weakened itself by failing to follow their leaders, and by breaking off on occasion from the main force to loot--a problem that indeed did cause the real Spartacus's defeat. Koestler, however, in an allegory of the U.S.S.R., had Spartacus and the gladiators establish an egalitarian community, the "City of the Sun." For practical reasons, Spartacus is gradually forced (in Koestler's words) "to strip himself of every scruple in the name of a higher scrupulousness," reproducing in the end a society little better than the one against which they rebelled.[63] Fast mystifies just what inspired him to write his own book, but Koestler was too well known for him to be ignorant of it. He may well have written his book in response to Koestler's. United Artists had optioned Koestler's book, and it was in pre-production at the time Spartacus was begun. The United Artists production had problems, and Douglas's production, which had been rushed so that it could be released first, became the only Spartacus film. Kubrick apparently felt free because of this to incorporate Koestlerian elements into the Spartacus script.

Kubrick at the least must have been aware that Koestler was hardly a neutral figure. Koestler was more famous for his contribution to the "Anti-Communist Communist" book, The God That Failed (1950), and his historical fiction novel about the 1936-37 Moscow Show Trials, Darkness at Noon (1941) than The Gladiators. George Orwell, not an entirely unsympathetic reviewer, thought Koestler's shattered faith in the Soviet revolution "has driven him back into a position not far removed from pessimistic Conservativism."[64] Orwell noted that the implication of Darkness at Noon was that "revolutions are of their nature bad," and of his later novel Arrival and Departure that "in effect it is a tract purporting to show that revolutionary creeds are rationalizations of neurotic impulses."[65] Trumbo disliked Fast, but perhaps held Koestler in even less regard. Kubrick discussed with Trumbo his desire to introduce some new ideas in the script. Varinia disrobing in Spartacus's cell was one of them, and on the basis of how well that scene worked, Trumbo initially was receptive to Kubrick's suggestions.[66] But in the process of justifying his "historical" approach to the film, Kubrick, who was either insensitive to or ignorant of Trumbo's feelings about Koestler, told Trumbo that he had read Koestler's The Gladiators. Trumbo's enthusiasm for Kubrick evaporated.

Stanley Kubrick is a director with a distinct narrative point of view. If Fast wanted Spartacus as a secular Christ, and Trumbo a Romance hero, Kubrick wanted a Spartacus as Ironic antihero.[67] I will not here take up Kubrick's work extensively, but it is not controversial to say that Kubrick's preferred mode is

irony; his natural narrative style is the morality tale, in which the varied vices of society are exhibited in the unselfconscious actions of the narrative's agents. His tendency in filmmaking is not to show the development of heroes, but rather to present the remorseless playing out of characters' fixed drives. In Kubrick's second film, Paths of Glory (1957), which Kirk Douglas had produced, Douglas's character was heroic in tone, but that heroism was directly in proportion to his character's powerlessness. Kubrick had read that twice Spartacus had led his army to the Northern passes, but instead of breaking through to freedom, "instead he lead his army back to pillage Roman cities." Kubrick wanted to explore why the army turned back: "Did the intentions of the rebellion change? Did Spartacus lose control of his leaders who by now may have been more interested in the spoils of war than in freedom?"[68] Koestler's narrative suggested the latter. Orwell noted of Koestler's Spartacus that "he is an almost passive figure, acted upon rather than acting...."[69] Barry Lyndon (1975) probably is a fair indication of how Kubrick might have developed Spartacus, had he had control of the film.

Kubrick continued to make suggestions, and became part of what Trumbo called the "committee" in his notes, which required of him multiple rewrites of scenes. Kirk Douglas, who wanted a tougher, grittier Spartacus that incorporated elements of another of Fast's characters, David the Jew (who is, in the novel, the last surviving gladiator),[70] requested that Kubrick and Fast also rewrite scenes.[71] Trumbo was not told about this, and consequently became

infuriated about the Kubrick-Fast scenes, angry at Douglas, and increasingly suspicious of Kubrick and his influence. He had fought in the early script drafts against (one must assume, as no one else seems to have fought for this) the desire of Ed Muhl, head of Universal Studios, to reduce the scale of the slave revolt in favor of the Roman story. He recalled that fight in a lengthy memo he wrote to the director and producers: "You cannot have a Roman story in which Spartacus motivates the actions of the most powerful men in Rome and shakes Roman society to its very foundations, and then go to a Spartacus story in which Spartacus is merely the head of a gang of runaway convicts."[72] Now, he saw:

> ...a second campaign to diminish the character get under way, directed, my dear Stanley Kubrick, by you. Stanley read Koestler. Koestler is a man who was for years bewitched by the idea that he was going to make a revolution, that he was going to lead the dear people in a vast freedom movement. But the revolution didn't come off because the people, in their immense stupidity, didn't see fit to follow Mr. Koestler. Koestler has spent all the years of his life since that fatal moment of rejection by the people in denouncing the common herd which had so little comprehension of his excellence as a leader. His thesis is simple: the people are stupid, corrupt and altogether responsible for their own miseries.[73]

Duncan Cooper has documented this conflict elsewhere about as completely as it can be done at this late date.[74] I would only add to it that to both Koestler and Trumbo, leaders are heroic. In Koestler's version, the hero is visionary yet broken by the expediencies of leadership, and in Trumbo's the hero is an idealist broken by the power of Rome. In Kubrick's preferred narrative, by contrast, there are no heroes to begin with. Kubrick may have been the one production principal without an ideological sense of the film. Trumbo, who

referred to Kubrick in his notes as "Stanley K. K[o]estler Kubrick"[75] and "Stanley K. Junior Kubrick,"[76] thus was fighting a straw-man, although he was not mistaken in Kubrick's preference for what Trumbo entitled in his "Report" the "small Spartacus."

Kirk Douglas wanted a fourth kind of Spartacus, the low mimetic epic hero, the figure of Dionysian rebirth from below of a civilization excessively rationalized and articulated, and abstracted from emotion. In time this would prove to be Trumbo's leverage point to displace Kubrick's reinterpretation of the film. For both Trumbo and Douglas, Spartacus was a redeeming human leader, the image in the present of what Rome had lost. Both Gracchus, who flatters the people of Rome, and Crassus, who wants to bedazzle and dominate Rome, have their passions displaced onto the city, and their ideals wrapped up in a particular place.[77] Spartacus is by contrast direct in his love, and his passions are tied not to a material place, but to Varinia and the pragmatic concept of freedom.

Kirk Douglas's idea of Spartacus was not Fast's saint nor Trumbo's charismatic crafty laborer, but rather an average person who leads because, in the press of activity, he feels what the correct action should be. Trumbo complained that "I have been instructed to make certain throughout the characterization of Spartacus that whenever he is called upon to make a decision or take a decisive action, the scene must be played in such a way that no one suspects what his decision will be until the scene has reached its climax

and the decision is finally made."[78] Trumbo disliked this because it diminished Spartacus's ability as a planner relative to Crassus. But this was central to Douglas's combination of the novel's Spartacus with David the Jew. David is the best fighter. Fast's Spartacus was "without hate and without envy,"[79] and has moments of doubt and fear. Fast's David is implacable in his hate of Rome, and direct in speech. He acts intuitively. This was Douglas's idea of how the hero should be. Fast's Spartacus becomes a leader because of his compassion and idealism. Trumbo's Spartacus would have become a leader by the force of his reason and blunt eloquence. Kubrick's Spartacus would have become a leader by accident of fate. Douglas's Spartacus--which is the one that was filmed--becomes a leader because he feels what should be done, and knows what to say when it must be said. "I wasn't thinking of being a hero and breaking the blacklist," he said of naming Trumbo as the screenwriter. "It wasn't later until I realized the significance of that impulsive gesture."[80].

Douglas was unhappy with Kubrick's rough cut of the film. Trumbo's "Report on Spartacus" revealed to Douglas how Kubrick had undercut his character with his Koestler-inspired interpretation. He had sponsored Kubrick's career, and when he was dissatisfied with Trumbo's script, he trusted Kubrick to work with Fast to write the scenes he wanted. Spartacus was Douglas's personal film, and Kubrick had deceived him in order to make his own version of it, betraying Douglas both personally and as Spartacus. Judging from his comments in his book, his comments on the Criterion Videodisc, and his actions

afterward, he never forgave Kubrick.[81] He subsequently developed, as he put it, a "love affair" with Trumbo,[82] who fought his fights openly and knew who was boss. "I'm terribly fond of Kirk and he's terribly fond of me, and the reason is that I'm not afraid of him and he's not afraid of me," Trumbo said in an interview after the preview. "So we can exchange ideas and battle in a way that it should be done.... When you find in him a vein of resistance that comes up again and again, it's pretty wise to pay some attention to it."[83] The result of this new partnership was that the retakes scheduled for late 1959 are predominantly in accordance with Trumbo's strategy for the film.[84]

In the final cut, when Spartacus addresses the gladiators and becomes the leader, the resulting speech is a combination of Trumbo and Douglas's Spartacus. Kubrick plot themes also emerge, as the retakes were done to "cure," to use Trumbo's word, the footage already shot. More could not be budgeted; indeed, Douglas would have to request money from Universal to do any reshooting.[85] Also, while Trumbo rewrote scenes to make Spartacus more articulate and commanding, Douglas still wanted to emphasize his interpretation of Spartacus as a spontaneous, physical leader. This is the first of many contested scenes in the film that show fissures of varying narrative interpretations. Spartacus breaks up a "matched pair" fight staged with two captured patricians. There is general uproar. Crixus stands up in the viewing stand to speak for the spectators; he seems to be the unofficial leader.

> Crixus: (Full shot, low angle, shouting) I want to see their blood, right over here where Draba died! (he jumps down to the ring--

> Long Shot--to low angle CU) When I fight matched pairs, they fight to the death! (he pulls his sword)
> Spartacus: (eye level medium shot. He speaks quietly): I made myself a promise, Crixus. I swore that if I ever got out of this place, I'd die before I watched two men fight to the death again. (he steps forward to CU) Draba made that promise, too. He kept it. So will I.
> Crixus: (low angle medium shot, right profile. He looks uncertainly at Spartacus, then throws down sword)

This is more or less Trumbo's revised scene as first written for retakes after the Kubrick rough cut. But the next lines combine Trumbo's revision with the Fast/Kubrick rewrite, in part because it would have been expensive to reshoot the whole scene. Kubrick, who wanted Crixus to beguile the gladiators with visions of looting instead of freedom, succeeded in keeping this idea as an implication.

> Spartacus: (Full Shot, with Crixus. Spartacus first addresses him, then the surrounding gladiators, intercut with full shots of questioners and medium shot reactions of Spartacus.) What are we, Crixus? What are be becoming? Romans? Have we learned nothing? What's happening to us? (more quietly) We look for wine when we should be hunting bread.
> Unidentified Gladiator in viewing stand: When you've got wine, you don't need bread! (general laughter)
> Spartacus: (medium shot, looking up, from stand point of view) We can't just be a gang of drunken raiders.
> Unidentified Gladiator: What else can we be?
> Spartacus: Gladiators. An army of gladiators. There's never been an army like that. One gladiator's worth any two Roman soldiers that ever lived.

Now Kubrick quite effectively has Spartacus "step up" to leadership in the frame. What is missing is Trumbo's more reasoned, rationalized plan. What is

gained is a visually dynamic representation of Spartacus becoming their leader by defeating Crixus's argument and dominating his position in the frame.

> Crixus: We beat the Roman guards here, but a Roman army is a different thing. They fight differently than we do, too.
> Spartacus: We can beat anything they send against us, if we really want to.
> Crixus: (Full shot, Crixus downscreen from Spartacus) It takes a big army for that, Spartacus.
> Spartacus: (Spartacus walks forward, and camera tilts up to look at him from below as he fills the center-right side of the frame) We'll <u>have</u> a big army! Once we're on the march, we'll free every slave in every town and village. Can anybody get a bigger army than that?
> Unidentified gladiator: (eagerly) That's right! Once we cross the Alps, we're safe!
> Crixus: Nobody can cross the Alps! every pass is defended by its own Legion!
> Spartacus: (looking over his shoulder at Crixus) There's only one way to get out of this country. (looks up at viewing stand) The sea.

Now that Spartacus has become leader by virtue of his superior morality and vision--Fast's ideal of Spartacus, not Kubrick's--the script returns to Trumbo's rewrite. The one significant difference is that, in Trumbo's script, Spartacus calls on Lucaso to support his plan, as he was a galley slave with the Cilicians. Douglas's modification was to make Spartacus know, apparently without preplanning and knowledge discussed with others, what needs to be done.

> Dionysus: What good is the sea if you have no ships?
> Spartacus: (again, Full shot with Crixus. Spartacus walks forward in the frame as he speaks, growing larger) The Cilician pirates have ships. They're at war with Rome. Every Roman galley that sails out of Brundusium pays tribute to them.

> Lucaso: They've got the biggest fleet in the world. I was a galley slave with them. Give them enough gold, and they'll take you anywhere in the world.

In the preview cut, this scene continued with Spartacus telling the gladiators that they need to have a commander, with "the power of life and death--over everybody." Crixus asks Spartacus who he thinks should be commander, and Spartacus answers "Me." Trumbo had fought for this scene and gotten it shot, but this is one cut that Trumbo agreed was necessary, as it got a "bad laugh" at an Oakland, California preview.[86] As it was recut, it ends with a general acclamation for Spartacus's plan, and implicitly the elevation of him as leader, something which the succeeding shots, with him at the head of a column of gladiators, confirm. Unfortunately, this cut out one of Trumbo's strategic plot statements, which gives Spartacus an ideal larger than himself.[87] "Most of you became slaves. I was born a slave." Spartacus has ho home, no country. "Somewhere in the world each of you has something to love. All I have is something to hate--Rome." For their commander, "hate must be a god."[88] This blurs Trumbo's narrative strategy of a Spartacus who "began as an animal and became a man," who learned from Draba to identify with all slaves. Varinia will be one more step in his transformation.

We cut from the gladiator school to a shot smoke on the horizon--a burning villa, presumably, and the gladiators, now on horses, with weapons. The there is a succession of travel shots and recruitment of more slaves. Then Spartacus calls to some slaves with bundles, who run up to join them. The last

of them is Varinia. The Martial music theme on the soundtrack is interwoven with Varinia's theme. We cut from a long shot of her to a long shot of Spartacus. He turns around and sees her. We cut to a closeup of her, then return to the long shot on Spartacus as Crixus shouts "Back to Vesuvius." The gladiators ride off, leaving Varinia and Spartacus alone. Spartacus rides over to her; we cut to a longshot of them together, as Varinia's theme takes over completely, then intercut between closeups of them.

> Spartacus: Varinia... I thought I'd never see you again.
> Varinia: Oh. Everything's so different. The last time I saw you, you...you were...waiting in the arena, I-- (she cries. Spartacus enters the frame and takes her arms. We cut to a full shot, trucking down as the characters sink to their knees, then to medium-close over-the-shoulder shots)

Varinia tells Spartacus that she jumped out of Batiatus's cart, and he was too fat to catch her. Spartacus laughs, and she begins to laugh too; no one can ever order them around or sell them again. This scene was Kubrick's idea, and Trumbo liked it. He added in his scene by scene breakdown in his "Report" the last lines:

> Varinia: (seriously) forbid me ever to leave you.
> Spartacus: I <u>do</u> forbid you. I forbid you

He repeats the line, and both start laughing again. Trumbo had a line in which she forbid <u>him</u> as well, but apparently Douglas or others saw no necessity to include this. The language is nevertheless that of a marriage vow, and thus the implications of a honeymoon as we cut away a long shot. They stand, jump on

the horse, and then, in profile, extreme long shot, ride along the crest of a hill at a particularly colorful sunset.

The film next contrasts this near-marriage--there was a more formalized marriage scene later that was cut--with scenes of the two forms of decadent Roman antimarriage, in Gracchus's dinner with Batiatus among Gracchus's harem of servants, and in the now infamous "oysters and snails scene" in Crassus's bath which was cut from the final release, but is present in the 1991 restoration. The emphasis the extant Gracchus scene has on the harem was not Trumbo's idea--he wrote three pages of single-spaced protest on the degree to which Gracchus was turned into a "vulgar leerer" in this scene--so this presumably was Douglas's concept, through which Spartacus's heterosexual monogamy elevates him by contrast to Gracchus's heterosexual polygamy and Crassus's bisexual sadism. Trumbo wanted in this scene to further define Gracchus in relation to Crassus and Spartacus. He intended to contrast Gracchus's attitude toward his slaves with Crassus's toward Antininus--"to show exactly what his position on the slavery business is," in contrast to Crassus; "attitudes about slaves are what our story is about." This was to be done through a statement of philosophy, "what Laughton correctly calls a `religion' for Gracchus, ie., a moral basis of his life which explains all of his later actions."[89] He was to have said of slaves:

> Gracchus: Whether they <u>should</u> be slaves is a question for fanatics. I'm not like Crassus who lives in the past and can't imagine a world without slavery--or this murdering Spartacus who demands an impossible future with no slavery at all. I'm a

> politician. I exist in that most difficult of all tenses--the simple present. And it's my job to make the present work. To make it tolerable.[90]

This was perhaps the single most important character speech for Gracchus. Most of it apparently was never filmed. Peter Ustinov (whom Trumbo says gave him a cartoon he drew with a naked Charles Laughton, from the rear, with a knife in his back!)[91] rewrote the scene to take out the political reference with the use of language tense as a metaphor for each character's beliefs in relation to history. Edward Lewis, Douglas's intermediary with Muhl, asked Ustinov to rewrite the Gracchus scenes, possibly because of Charles Laughton's dissatisfaction with them. Douglas also feared that Laughton's character would detract from Spartacus, and he wanted a less sympathetic character than Trumbo had written.[92] Instead of strengthening Gracchus, Ustinov placed the emphasis on Gracchus's slave harem. His intention, he says on the Criterion videodisc, was to convey a sense of "warmth and humanity" between the characters.[93] This he accomplished, but combined with the lavish table of viands before them, the effect is to emphasize, to the exclusion of his political function, Gracchus as a man who indulges his appetites. Gracchus defends his harem as a sign of his respect for the Roman institution of marriage. "I happen to like women. I have a promiscuous nature, and unlike these aristocrats I will <u>not</u> take a marriage vow which I know that my nature will prevent me from keeping." Batiatus complains of Crassus, and of the gladiator-fight Crassus insisted he stage, which has cost him his property. He

would like revenge. He tells Gracchus of Varinia, and that Crassus purchased her and, now that she has run off, will not pay for her. Gracchus decides that he will buy Varinia when recaptured, "to annoy Crassus and to help you." This was not the end of the scene even with the rewrite. Apparently there were a few lines of Trumbo's scene as written above in the rough cut, as Trumbo mentions them, but even those seem to have been removed between the preview and the final release cut, perhaps by the studio.

The second scene was to have been the "oysters and snails" scene, now restored. The release cut eliminated the bath scene but left the conclusion of it, its context deliberately blurred, on Crassus's balcony.[94] The intent of the scene was to establish Crassus's complete identification of himself with Rome. Antoninus bathes Crassus as Crassus discusses oysters and snails. Crassus does not indulge his appetites, but rather his taste: Sex for Crassus is not an act of love, but rather an act of power. The two leave the bath room, and on his balcony, Crassus draws his servant's attention to a Century of troops marching past.

> Crassus: There, boy, is Rome--the might, the majesty, the terror of Rome. There is the power that bestrides the known world like a colossus. No man can withstand Rome. No nation can withstand her. How much less a boy, hmm? There's only one way to deal with Rome, Antoninus. You must serve her. You must abases yourself before her. You must grovel at her feet. You must (pause) love her. Isn't that so, Antoninus?

On the line "You must serve her," Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Crassus, who looks dreamily into the camera. Crassus loves this image of the colossus of

Rome--so much so that he identifies himself as Rome, a colossus of polymorphous terror. He turns to see the effect this has had on his slave, and finds him gone. This does not irritate him; he turns, in a full shot, and smiles to himself at the effect he has produced.

On the Criterion videodisc, Fast takes Trumbo to task for this narrative strategy. "This is what Hollywood people feel is decadent. It's a kind of very limited and personal understanding of decadence. Decadence is a switch-hitter, a relationship between two men who also have relationships with women. The real decadence, the decadence of starvation, the decadence of destroying the dignity of people and turning them into slaves, and all that, that kind of decadence is a very theoretical quality in Hollywood. This is a decadence they understand, either because they indulge in it, or they know people who have indulged in it." Fast himself specified in his novel that Crassus was bisexual, so this is not quite the total "Hollywood" invention Fast implies.[95] If the bisexuality itself were represented as the decadence, he would have more of a point. But Fast wilfully ignores the fact that the real decadence of the "oysters and snails" scene as written is not the bisexuality, but rather the displaced imposition of power through a sexual act on the body of Antoninus. What Crassus proposes is something akin to rape on a bound person, except that Crassus explains to Antoninus that he is bound, not by rope, but rather by the inescapable world power of Rome. He will submit, Crassus implies, because the whole world has submitted to Rome. Resistance is futile. Antoninus runs away to Spartacus,

because only in that world is he safe from what is not truly a private act at all, but an extension of Rome's social power.[96] Crassus smiles at the end of the scene, because he, personally, has not been rejected; he himself as a person was never revealed. Fast seems to have blinded himself to the intent of the scene in order to take an opportunity to smear Trumbo, who certainly had some concept of the social decadence he alleges Trumbo was incapable of understanding.[97]

The next scene is of the gladiator's camp on Vesuvius. It begins with a characteristically Kubrickian tracking shot, in which Spartacus rides along on his horse past gladiator training, butchering, and various other activities of the camp. As originally edited, the tracking shot cut directly to a scene in which Spartacus looked at new arrivals, and then at gladiator training. Trumbo was astonished at the brevity of the shot's presentation of the slave camp, and regarded this darkly as another sign of Kubrick's distaste for the slave story, and his desire to have a "small Spartacus:"

> This big and beautifully photographed opening master scene of the camp does not give us any clear idea of the slaves themselves.... There is no genuine sense of slave organization.... [I]n the Roman shots we get a great deal of the particular, of the loving investigation of the people.... But go to the slaves--the other half of our story--and we have practically no detail.... To write each detail of activity as a separate SHOT would never have occurred to the writer, who assumes that from a description of the master scene the director himself will take care to go in for an abundance of detail--not only that indicated in the script, but other and more significant detail which he himself has invented and created. A second thing that troubles me... is that the part of the slave women from this time forward is so completely ignored.... In all future retakes we must pick up as many details of slave life and activity, of slave women and children, as possible.... I have taken great

> pains...to describe the slave army as a community. Without emphasizing detail of the women, the community ceases to be a community; it becomes an army with campfollowers.[98]

If Mann's storyboards restricted Kubrick at the beginning of the film, Trumbo, through such detailed critiques, would be Kubrick's nemesis for the rest of the film.[99] In the retakes in Spain, a shot of Varinia bathing two children was shot, and added in the final edit along with other assorted shots of camp activity.

Trumbo's notes on scenes in his "Report" were well larded with shot instructions:

> We should go in on Spartacus when he has fine lines and gentle, revealing, powerful emotions on his face. We should get in close and see his face, see his tenderness.... We go in on Olivier to catch every movement of his eyes, every emotion in his face, every intonation of his voice. Let's go in on Spartacus too. Let's make him the Large Spartacus, equal to Crassus in every way; not the Small Spartacus, seen in the general from the outside, rather than detail and from the inside.[100]

Kubrick, Trumbo had concluded, for all his talent could not be trusted to put on film the script concept without close watching.

By contrast, Trumbo thought Kubrick's scene of new arrivals, which "jiggered around" with Trumbo's lines, "an improvement over the script." In a long shot, Spartacus rides up as Crixus addresses them, telling them (and the audience) of the gladiator's plans: To train, and then to go to Brundusium, where they will sail away from Italy on the Cilician pirate fleet. Spartacus rides up and says that there are too many women. An old woman steps out of the group and approaches Spartacus. Kubrick cuts to a point of view among the arrivees. "What's wrong with women? Where would you be now, you lout, if

some woman hadn't fought all the pains of hell to get you into this accursed world? I can handle a knife in the dark as well as anyone! I can cast a spell and brew poisons! (Spartacus laughs and says "All right!" as she continues) I have made the death shroud for seven Roman masters--you, you lout, I want to see Spartacus! "All right, grandmother, I'm Spartacus. Stay with us. We'll need a million Roman shrouds before we're through."

Spartacus then asks what the others can contribute to the army. One is a carpenter--a needed trade. One is a household Steward; Crixus sends him to their person in charge of food supplies. Spartacus looks next at Antoninus, and fingers his elaborate tunic. "What kind of work did you do?" He is surprised to find out that Antoninus's work was as a "singer of songs" and a juggler, and can do feats of magic. "Magic? " Spartacus says. He turns to Crixus. "Maybe he can make the Romans disappear." All laugh, except for Antoninus. Spartacus slaps him on the shoulder, to show that he means no harm. Kubrick matches their good-natured laughter to a medium shot of Glabrus and a cohort commander drinking wine and laughing harshly, as a line of troops pass behind them. He cuts to look at a long line of troops descending from a hilltop, then to a tracking shot that follows cavalry, who ride up the road. The final Vesuvius shots before the fade to black that ends the scene are a montage sequence of training shots,[101] intercut with some of the shots of camp life Trumbo demanded--mostly women, weaving and making candles, baking bread and pumping a bellows for a forge to make weapons.

Kubrick fades up on the slave camp at night, and cuts to Antoninus entertaining the gladiators with a magic trick: He pulls eggs out of the air which contain sparrows. "Hey poet, I haven't had an egg in days," Spartacus says. Antoninus hands him an egg. "I'm not going to let mine get away," he tells everyone, and squeezes. Out comes not a sparrow, but egg yolk, which covers his face. He turns to look at Varinia next to him; they laugh, and everyone else laughs as well. Here is something neither Roman leader, each of whom manufacture their leadership by tricks, could afford to suffer. But Spartacus can.

Spartacus walks over to a nearby pool to wash his face. As he does, Antoninus reads a poem--a "song." Kubrick cuts from a long-shot of Antoninus and the gathering, with Spartacus in the far right edge of the frame, to a medium long-shot of Spartacus at the pool, washing, who stops to listen. Kubrick cuts back to the long shot:

> When the blazing sun hangs low in the Western sky,
> When the wind dies away on the mountain,
> When the song of the meadowlark turns still,
> When the field locust clicks no more in the field,
> And the seafoam sleeps like a maiden at rest,
> And the twilight touches the shape of the wondering earth,
> I turn home.
> Through blue shadows and purple woods, I turn home.
> I turn to the place that I was born,
> To the mother who bore me, and the father who taught me,
> Long ago, long ago, long ago.
> Alone am I now, and lost and alone in a far wide wondering world.
> Yet still when the blazing sun hangs low,
> When the wind dies away and the seafoam sleeps,
> And twilight touches the wondering earth, I turn home.

At the end of this sequence, Spartacus, moved, asks where Antoninus learned the song. "I was wrong about you, poet. You won't learn to kill, you'll teach us songs." Antoninus does not like this. "I joined to fight." "There's a time for fighting and a time for singing. Now you teach us to sing. Sing, Antoninus."

Apparently in the first version of this scene, it was done almost exclusively as a long shot--something again that troubled Trumbo: "Why could we have not gone from face to face in this scene, while the poetry was read...? I want to see dreams on their faces, the dream of home, mother and father.... The general is well done (the reading of the poem itself) but we have tragic need for the specific, the punctuation of our fluid film, the reaction to the poem's action. Otherwise, we have only half a scene."

When retakes were done in Spain, Kubrick obtained footage under Trumbo's retake list of 9/18/59 to intercut during the poem.[102] On the line "when the seafoam sleeps..." Kubrick cuts to a medium full-shot of Spartacus and Varinia, then cuts on "twilight touches the shape..." to a mother and her six children, a visual echo of the poem's recollection of infancy. On "Through blue shadows and purple woods I turn home" he cuts to a longshot elsewhere in the camp, where other entertainers are performing. This camp, the linkage, implies, is "Home" for these people. On "I turn to the place where I was born," Kubrick cuts to two Little People--their size distinguishing them from any Romans we have seen, but at home, "born" in this camp. On "I turn to the place where I was born, to the mother who bore me and the father who taught me," Kubrick cuts to

two men, perhaps older brothers, framing a father speaking to his young son as he feeds him. On "Long ago.... Alone am I now...," evoking again the nostalgia of an adult looking back at childhood, Kubrick cuts again to a family with an infant, and returns at last to Varinia and Spartacus. The effect of the montage is to establish a linkage between Spartacus and the children; to this camp for his nonexistent home; and to the future, when these children we see will have grown up, for this moment embodying Home. Here--and really, for the first time--Kubrick conveys successfully not just what the slaves revolt against, but what they revolt for; here is an image of the nascent new society, the society of the future.[103] This is the image of themselves that Antoninus teaches them, the image that so deeply moves Spartacus.

Spartacus and Varinia go off alone--Kubrick's camera tracking with them--to a clearing. "Who wants to fight? An animal can learn to fight. But to say beautiful things, to make people believe them..." They stop in the clearing. The shots which follow were subject to several different interpretations of Spartacus. Trumbo apparently wanted a scene in which Spartacus asked Varinia, the beneficiary of some education, to teach him to read, and to understand the world, as part of a love scene. Kubrick apparently wanted to do a physical love scene, just within the boundaries of censorship for the time. On Kubrick's insistence, and presumably with Douglas's support, Trumbo apparently started to rewrite the scene. But as Trumbo became more aware of Kubrick's "Koestlerian" tendencies, he dug in his heels and insisted on writing the scene

in accordance with his original strategy.[104] In the actual shooting of the scene, Kubrick (perhaps with Fast, or perhaps on his own) convinced Douglas to allow him to rewrite the scene. He combined and cut Trumbo's lines. The result of this was to blur Trumbo's intent to have Spartacus show his love for Varinia by seeking to become a more complete person--something which she herself can help to do--while emphasizing the commercially marketable love scene. For whatever reason, the scene was not reshot.[105]

Nonetheless, certain key aspects of Trumbo's idea remain, following naturally from Antoninus's poem that has opened up a new way of seeing for him. "I'm free. But what do I know?" Spartacus says to Varinia, in a medium long-shot of the pair. "Nothing. I don't even know how to read." He wants to know all the things about the world that, as a slave, he never had permission or the time to think of--"why a star falls and a bird doesn't; where the sun goes at night; why the moon changes shape. I want to know where the wind comes from." Kubrick cuts to a medium shot as they lie down in opposite directions, facing each other, and Spartacus says that he would like to know her as well--an equal mystery.

From this Kubrick fades up to a rainy night in the camp. Kubrick moves his camera to keep Spartacus framed in a medium shot, as Antoninus--apparently in the capacity of a secretary--reads to Spartacus about the two-legion garrison in the city of Metapontum the slave army will later fight. This addresses one of Trumbo's concerns in the "Report on Spartacus," that

Spartacus was never seen "discussing destinations or planning strategy in Kubrick's rough cut. Outside are sounds of a litter arriving--that of the Cilician pirate agent, Tigranes. Spartacus walks to the tent entrance, the camera tracking with him past a map of Italy. As Trumbo comments, Spartacus needed some scenes in which he was shown as an intellectual leader--some small equivalent of the conflicts between Gracchus and Crassus. Trumbo wanted Orson Welles to play the agent of the Cilician pirates, as he would have the authority as an actor to strengthen Spartacus by his reactions to Douglas.[106]

Welles was not obtained. Instead, Kubrick shot the scene subtly to elevate Spartacus by cutting to point of view shots within the master scene. When Tigranes first enters, Kubrick uses oblique point of view shots to establish that Spartacus looks down at Tigranes. Kubrick however cuts from his master shot of the room to Tigranes, shot from a low angle from Antoninus's point of view. This seems to represent Tigranes' opinion of his status relative to Spartacus; Tigranes tells him in this shot angle that "no deal is too small" for the Cilicians to consider. Tigranes thus is shocked to find that Spartacus wants all 500 of the pirates' ships. "For 500 ships that would be 50 million Sesterces. Do you have such a sum?" "We will have," Spartacus replies. Kubrick cuts back to the master shot as Spartacus stands and opens up a chest full of treasure. From that point on, Kubrick shoots Tigranes either in full shots emphasizing Spartacus's height relative to Tigranes, or (in one shot which returns to the shot of him sitting from Antoninus's point of view) clearly looking up offscreen at

Spartacus. Thus Antoninus, a witness of this negotiation of powers, looks up at the Cilician Pirate agent, who himself looks up at Antoninus's leader.

Trumbo's intention with the Tigranes scene was to raise "Spartacus's comprehension of Crassus as the enemy, just as previously we have shown Crassus's comprehension of Spartacus as the enemy," and "lift Spartacus to the intellectual level of Crassus."[107] Douglas, probably working through Fast and Kubrick, still had cut out lines which emphasized Spartacus's planning here, and eliminated Spartacus's inquisition of Tigranes' ties to Rome. Tigranes was to have said:

> Tigranes: The party of Gracchus is in difficulty because the senate can find no one to defeat you. Therefore the party of Crassus delights in every victory you win.

This apparently was eliminated when they shifted this first meeting from its original place after several battles to a placement prior to the Roman Garrison battle which follows this scene. Instead, Tigranes simply says, "Of course, it pleases Roman vanity to think of you as noble. They shrink from the idea of fighting mere slaves--especially Crassus." This allows Spartacus to say that he knows him. Tigranes then tells Spartacus that the Roman garrison cohorts are on the march to fight the slave army. "What are you going to do?" "We'll decide that when they get here," Douglas's Spartacus says. Douglas kept however Trumbo's strong conclusion. Tigranes asks him if he "saw your army destroyed and yourself dead," would he continue to fight?

> Spartacus: Yes.
> Tigranes (astonished) Knowing that you must lose?

> Spartacus: Knowing that we can't. All men lose when they die, and all men die. But a slave and a free man lose different things.
> Tigranes: They both lose life.
> Spartacus: When a free man dies he loses the pleasure of life; a slave loses his pain. Death is the only freedom a slave knows. That's why he's not afraid of it. That's why we'll win.

This is a philosophical analysis of the slave army's situation that easily surpasses Crassus's "submit to the terror of Rome" speech to Antoninus. Spartacus the planner remained obscured even after the retakes, but Spartacus the philosopher of freedom was clearly defined.

From this Kubrick cuts to different cavalry scouts arriving to report of the Roman camp, and from that to the aftermath of the battle. In the camp with a backdrop of moving horses and men, Spartacus spontaneously plans his attack. His scouts tell him that the Roman garrison troops have not prepared a stockade to protect their camp. Spartacus immediately orders an attack, commenting to Dionysus that they will be able to acquire arms for their troops. Then Varinia hands him his cloak, and Spartacus joins the troops. Trumbo was annoyed to see that the women were not marching off with the men, as seems to have been the case historically. "I have taken great pains to describe the slave army as a community. Without emphasized detail of the women, the community ceases to become a community. it becomes an army with camp-followers.[108] When Spartacus leaves, he says to Varinia, "Crixus always wanted to march on Rome. Now he doesn't have to. Rome's come to us." This was a holdover from an earlier conception of the story, where Crixus would

continue to struggle against Spartacus for leadership of the slave army as a parallel to the Crassus-Gracchus Rome conflict.

The Roman Garrison battle takes place off camera. Kubrick closes the slave camp scene with an ascending trucking shot which begins as a medium long shot of Varinia watching Spartacus mounting his horse and ends with him riding off to join the army. Kubrick then dissolves from this to a tracking shot left, showing a last few Romans being chased into a fire of eagle standards, and the camp already aflame. Spartacus rides through the carnage with his commanders, dispensing a last order or two. Once the garrison was defeated, Crixus was supposed again to appeal to the army to march on Rome. Spartacus was to make a counterspeech to defend his plan to sail away from Italy, and then to tell Glabrus, Crassus's agent and commander of the Garrison, to return to Rome and tell the Senate that the slaves would remain free. Douglas and Kubrick had combined the two speeches after it was decided to eliminate the Crixus conflict. Trumbo complained in his "Report" that the result was an illogical speech, in which Spartacus suddenly, "for no reason at all, must turn from Glabrus and begin to harrangue (sic) his followers."[109] Trumbo noted as well that due to this rewrite, in the following scene where Glabrus reports to the senate, "Glabrus, in his opening speech, tells the senate a good many things that the audience knows Spartacus did not say."[110] In the preview print, the film's intermission came when the slave army arrived at the beach near Brundusium. This problem with Glabrus's speech was concealed

somewhat when the intermission was moved to this point in the film; the differences between what Spartacus says and what Glabrus says he said became harder to spot.

Kubrick shoots down on Glabrus in a master long shot at about a 20 degree angle from the point of view of the Senate seats, showing both Crassus and Gracchus, and then cuts to medium shots at about a 30 degree angle up of Crassus and his supporters, and Gracchus and his party, as each responds to Glabrus's report. The difference in size, and the fact that Glabrus in the master shot stands on a floor that is laid out in checkerboard in the background and an extended half circle where Glabrus stands, patterns evocative of games, evokes a context of contest, and of the degree to which Crassus and Gracchus's contest is a game. Here, Crassus' pawn stands captured, on the side of the board, as he reports the failure of his mission to suppress the slaves. Gracchus sits quietly, eyes down, as if bored. Crassus and his supporters ask questions of Glabrus. Kubrick cuts to a medium shot of Glabrus, so framed as to show in the background on his right a statue of the wolf which nursed Romulus and Remus, mounted on a pedestal inscribed "S.P.Q.R.," the Senate and people of Rome; here is the image of maternal Rome. Standing on either side, two soldiers each hold a fasces, the bundle of sticks and ax that is the emblem of the Senate in session. Surrounded by these symbols, Glabrus tells Crassus the name of the leader--meaningless to him, but Crassus recognizes Spartacus's name, and reacts strongly enough to suggest that he has some inkling that the objects of

his gladiator contest have struck back at him, personally, through the instruments of his power in Rome.

Kubrick returns to Glabrus as he explains that he was captured in his tent. This is a discrepancy again from Trumbo's original script and the camp scene as shot by Kubrick, though in the context of the scene it passes unnoticed. That he is "captured," as opposed to "taken prisoner" again reinforces the game motif. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Gracchus, whose mouth twitches slightly in a smile at this, and a closeup of Crassus--anxious, as shown by his tense, furrowed brow, yet speaking in a quiet, controlled voice as he asks the crucial question: "Did you (pause) surround your camp with moat and stockade"--the standard procedure for a Roman army in the vicinity of the enemy--"No," Glabrus admits after a long pause. Kubrick cuts to the long shot as Glabrus provides some extenuating circumstances and the Senate murmurs, then to the medium shot as Glabrus adds "Then again, well, they--" and pauses, and looks down. Kubrick cuts then to a low-angle closeup of Crassus, who stares intently, lowers his head almost imperceptibly and says "continue." Kubrick returns to Glabrus. "They were only slaves." Kubrick cuts back to Crassus. The old patrician next to Crassus turns from Glabrus to stare sternly at Crassus; this man was his instrument. Crassus slumps in his chair. "I see," he says softly. Kubrick returns to the long shot as Crassus rises and raises his voice, still speaking calmly. "I submit that Publius Marcus Glabrus has disgraced the arms of Rome; that the punishment of the Senate be pronounced.

At this, in a 20 degree low angle medium shot, Gracchus rises. Caesar, quiet and serious, watches him. "If we punished every commander who made a fool of himself, we wouldn't have anyone left above the rank of Centurion." Kubrick cuts from this, to a glancing medium shot of Glabrus as the Senate laughs, and then to a medium shot just above head level of Crassus and the old patrician next to him. The old patrician is outraged. "But this is a case of criminal carelessness," he shouts at Gracchus, as Crassus looks off at the floor. Kubrick returns to his shot of Gracchus, with a slight sardonic smile as the Patrician continues: "Six cohorts have been slaughtered!" This is exactly what he wants. "Crassus sponsored this young man; let him pronounce the sentence." This is the next trap; he has captured Crassus's pawn, and now he is trying to weaken fatally the position of his opponent's king. Gracchus's comment about all commanders being fools is an attack on Patrician honor. If Crassus shows any mercy to his instrument, he attacks the honor on which his party and he himself claim ascendancy in Rome. He must pronounce the maximum sentence. But he advanced Glabrus, and Glabrus's dishonor reflects on him. If he pronounces the sentence, he punishes the person who failed, but he extenuates his own failure of judgment. If the Senate as a body speaks the judgment without mention of him, implicitly he would be judged innocent of Glabrus's error. Gracchus has just reminded the Senate of the link between the two men; now Crassus's honor is on trial as well.

Kubrick cuts to the low angle closeup of Crassus--one of the shots which perhaps caused Trumbo to wonder whom Kubrick saw as the film's protagonist; it is a heroic angle--though it is the same one that has been used throughout. Either Kubrick did not use another setup because he saw no need to respond to the emotional dynamic of the scene, or he intends not to show a Crassus dominated by Gracchus, as each of them have looked down upon Glabrus. The old patrician looks in shock at Gracchus, then turns quickly to look at Crassus; Crassus turns his head slightly toward Gracchus. Then Kubrick returns to the master shot as Crassus rises. "The punishment is well known--!" Crassus momentarily loses his self-control under the strain. Kubrick does not cut in to see this, but cuts away to a distant shot, and then to a new angle--a medium shot, at waist level looking up as Crassus, now calmly, pronounces Glabrus's banishment from the city and region of Rome. Interestingly, as he does this, the Senators of his party look at him, but at Gracchus. Kubrick cuts to a forlorn Glabrus reaction shot, then back to Crassus, as he turns and looks contemptuously at Gracchus. Kubrick cuts to a waist-level medium closeup of Gracchus. He almost smiles; not as big a win as if Crassus pronounced a lesser punishment, but he has weakened Crassus's position nonetheless. Then Kubrick returns to Crassus. "One thing more. Glabrus is my friend..." Kubrick cuts to Glabrus "...and I will not disassociate myself from his disgrace. I now lay down the command of my legions, and retire to public life. Kubrick

returns to the master shot as both Crassus and Glabrus stride from the senate, tilting slightly to keep them framed in the center.

Kubrick cuts from this to the only tight closeup in the entire sequence, a closeup of Gracchus alone as his eyes turn back and forth, and he listens to the muttering of the Senate. Crassus has gone one step further than Gracchus anticipated. Rather than live on, his honor wounded, in the Senate, he has immolated himself. His eyes open wide as he realizes the implications of this; by an excessive display of honor, he has turned his disgrace into a display of superior grace. And as he is well aware, Crassus's power does not lie in the Senate, but in his aura of honor; this is the action of someone who intends to rise again, like a phoenix, renewed from the flames. Kubrick cuts from Gracchus to a reverse medium tracking shot as Crassus and Gracchus exit the Senate chamber. "Goodbye, Crassus," Glabrus says stolidly, and walks out of the frame. The camera lingers on Crassus as he watches his pawn exit, and moves over toward a cloak cubby-bin.

Kubrick cuts to a medium tracking shot of Gracchus, who has risen now rapidly strides toward the retreating camera, in the most active movement he makes in the whole film. He shouts angrily after Crassus: "I suggest that this is no time for a man of honor to withdraw from public affairs!" Kubrick cuts to a medium eye-level shot of Crassus as he turns, surprised; like Gracchus, he thought his manoeuver unanswerable--yet his enemy responds. We watch him as Gracchus continues. "Ah, this sort of heroic public behavior is nothing new.

I've seen it before--we all have--and I know the meaning of it," he declaims. Kubrick cuts back to the master shot as one of Crassus' patricians rises. "Crassus acted on a point of honor!" "Patrician honor," Gracchus replies. "No matter how noble this looks from the outside, I don't like the color of it." The old patrician--the old Roman who sits next to Crassus as Caesar, the Young Roman, sits next to Gracchus--rises and shouts at Gracchus "Crassus is the only man in Rome who hasn't yielded to republican corruptions--and never will!" Kubrick cuts to a waist level shot of Gracchus--behind him now are the wolf-mother of Rome, the fasciae, the braziers; he is defending Mother Rome. "I'll take a little republican corruption, along with a little republican freedom, but I won't take the dictatorship of Crassus! And no freedom at all!" The Senate applauds, as Gracchus drives home his point. "That's what he's out for, and that's why he'll be back." Kubrick cuts to a low-level closeup of Crassus, as he furrows his brow and his mouth parts; he has now much the same look on his face as when Draba jumped up to the pavilion at Batiatus's gladiator school, as he listens to the Senate applaud Gracchus.

The film returns to the slave army. Kubrick dissolves from Crassus to an extreme long panning shot of the slave army on the march. This is followed by a series of vignettes of the slave army traveling, and in camp. Shots which Trumbo had written to be inserted at the Vesuvius camp and were not found a place here--butchers cutting up animals; and old woman squirting goat milk at a child. Other shots--a baby burial; marches in rain and across snowy mountains;

and one of Trumbo's perennial concerns, a shot of Spartacus and other slave army leaders discussing plans over a map. Two-thirds of this material was cut in the final release print. Among these travel shots is a scene at a pool, where Varinia tells Spartacus that she is pregnant. This was another of the many scenes that were re-written without Trumbo's knowledge. Seeing it in the rough cut was not a happy discovery for him. "I am inhibited from saying what I truly think of this scene lest I turn personally offensive in the course of saying it."[111]

As it stands in the film, Varinia tells Spartacus that she is pregnant in the midst of a somewhat rough-and-tumble playful romance scene, which the censors chopped up prior to the film's release because it was too racy.[112] Trumbo wrote a ten-page analysis of the scene as shot, and compared it line-by-line with his own script. He argued that it simplified his complex, sensitive emotional scene, and cheapened the characters by flattening their fears and joys over the pregnancy and each other. He had written a bathing scene, but with the instruction to shoot it with a long shot. He thought that repeating a scene with Varinia unclothed in closeups was vulgar sensationalism, and that on top of emotionally crude dialogue was disastrous. "I would cut this entire scene from the film and burn it. It is not just the Small View of Spartacus--it is the Pygmy view.... It undermines Spartacus completely"[113] As it happens, this was one of the scenes Howard Fast wrote at Douglas's request. But even he does not seem to be happy about it. "Kirk kept insisting that we had to have a naked scene. He said, `if you're going to sell a picture, you've got to have a

naked scene in it.' So this is one of the scenes that I was responsible for to a certain extent. It was a naked scene, someone had to give him a naked scene."[114] But Trumbo had given Douglas a "naked" scene--his lines as written could have been shot the same way, something that Fast does not mention. And ironically, given Fast's complaints about Kirk Douglas's "stunt-man" version of Spartacus and Trumbo's insensitivity, Fast's scene is brusquer; "what kind of neb is he," Trumbo sarcastically said of his scripted Spartacus, compared to Fast's rewrite.[115] Trumbo exaggerates the effect of the Fast-Kubrick scene--I think it likely from the extent and the emotion of his comments in the "Report" that he had identified himself too much with Spartacus to be objective--but it is at least uninteresting. The actress's skin is revealed, but little of the character she plays.

The film returns to a shot of the travelling slave army, and then cuts to an exterior shot of the Roman Forum, and then to the Senate's debate over what is to be done about the army. Here at one time was to be a montage of slave army victories. As Duncan Cooper has noted, Trumbo's first scene with Tigranes establishes a problem to be resolved: Can the slave army fight its way through the many garrison towns that lie between them and the port city of Brundusium, "fighting a major battle in every town"? Without the battles, the slave army is reduced. It does not "defeat the best Rome had to offer," but rather makes a quick "simple dash to the sea."[116] After Trumbo's report, the slave victory scenes were scheduled to be shot during retakes and location shooting in

Spain in late 1959, but then budgeted out of shooting. Additional battle footage was available for creating the slave victory montage, but according to the film editor Robert Lawrence, "some people wanted it in the picture and some people didn't." The montage sequence went in and out of the film several times, and a final re-edited version was in the film preview print in June 1960. After it was decided that the film would be released with Trumbo's name as screenwriter, however, Universal's New York corporate officers insisted that the montage sequence be cut. It contained a map showing the slave army's progress, battle by battle, intercut with footage of the fighting, as Gracchus recounted their victories to the Senate. This was one of the cuts which Head of Production Ed Muhl says were made "for content, not for length."[117] Again Trumbo--and I think to a lesser extent, Duncan Cooper--exaggerate the effect of this cut, at least for audiences today. In 1960, however, this cut at least blurred the linear development of the slave army's accomplishment, and continues to deprive the film of any opportunity for illustrating Spartacus as a military tactician.

The burden that the montage was partly to carry instead now rests entirely on the Roman reaction to the slave army. In the Senate, one of Crassus's patricians rises. Spartacus's army has cost an enormous amount of money to fight, he says; he leaves unspoken the fact that fighting them has weakened and embarrassed the Patrician class. "If now they want to relieve us of their unwelcome presence, by all the gods, let them go!" This would relieve the Patrician class of further embarrassment and loss of life. But this is not

Gracchus's plan. As soon as the Patrician makes his proposal, Caesar speaks impassionedly in a medium close shot, paired with an impassive Gracchus. "Impossible! They have already infected half of Italy with this uprising. If we permit them to escape now, this condition will spread throughout the entire empire." The Patrician party thesis has been countered with the Plebeian party antithesis. Now Gracchus rises to provide a compromise solution which will cement his ascendancy. The camera tracks out with him in a medium shot as he strides to the front of the Senate, and cuts to a 180 degree reverse long shot as he turns to face the Senate. The Republic is weakened by the aftereffects of civil strife, of two ongoing border wars, and of Spartacus's effect on commerce. Half of Rome is without bread. "The city's close to panic." Here, in the preview print, Gracchus next must have recounted the specific reasons for the city's panic: The failure of the Patrician-led city garrisons to stop Spartacus, in battle after battle. Now, from the long shot, we cut to a medium shot of Gracchus. "There are two things we must do immediately," he says. "Confirm Caesar as permanent commander of the [Rome] Garrison--"thus consolidating his hold through Caesar on Rome, as Crassus intended to do with Glabrus--"and assign two legions to intercept and destroy Spartacus at the city of Metapontum!" Spartacus has done his part for the plebs, due to the Patrician's fatal pride. Now, Gracchus thinks, is the time to end this convenient threat with a massive show of force.

But unfortunately for Gracchus, he too has underestimated the slaves. And unfortunately for Gracchus, he has misunderstood Caesar.[118] In illustration of the first mistake, we see the slave army march into Metapontum, and see Spartacus and his commanders drinking wine in their tent, with a map of Italy behind them.[119] The second mistake is revealed more subtly. We cut from Spartacus to a medium shot of Caesar, climbing up out of a Roman bath of epic grandeur that even Howard Fast admitted Hollywood did so well. As he rises and is wrapped in a towel by a slave, another patrician walks around the edge of the bath and passes him. Kubrick tracks the camera back with this new patrician to keep him framed in a full shot, and stops with him at a bench where two other half-clothed patricians play some sort of board game. "Are there any reports on Metapontum," one asks. "The heralds are crying the news now," the newcomer replies. "We lost 19,000 men, including Commodus and all of his officers. The patrician who asked after the battle rises, silenced, as the other exclaims in shock. Caesar, who has walked over in the background to join them, asks the patrician who has risen, "have you estates in Metapontum?" "No. A son with Commodus." One of the officers whom we have just heard were killed. "With your permission, good day." He walks off into the shadows. "We take five years to train a legion," the seated patrician says angrily. " How can this, this Spartacus train an army in seven months? There's something wrong--very wrong."[120] Spartacus and his army are simply beyond all reckoning.

From another part of the bath Crassus approaches, to attack Gracchus on his flank. "I need a few moments of the commander's time. Will you excuse us?" He brings Caesar over to a bench for a chat, and Kubrick cuts to a medium two-shot isolating them as Crassus speaks softly.

> Crassus: (in tone of levity) I hear that you've, ah, taken a house in the fourth ward.
> Caesar: (smiles) Not a very splendid house, either.
> Crassus: (appreciative chuckle) And that you've feasted 11,000 plebeians on the Field of Mars.
> Caesar: It scarcely could have been called a feast.
> Crassus: (several chiding "tsks," shaking his head, then speaks with more force and serious face) For two hundred years your family and mine have been members of the equestrian order and the Patrician party: Servants and rulers of Rome. Why have you left us for Gracchus and the mob?
> Caesar: I've left no one--least of all Rome. This much I've learned from Gracchus: Rome <u>is</u> the mob.

These few words would have recalled the lost scenes of ward-politicking that were cut earlier. As they stand, they still tell us that Caesar is learning a skill Crassus never could bring himself to learn.[121] Crassus finds this cynical pandering to the mob dishonorable. Caesar has learned that it is pragmatic. But Gracchus, for all of his cynicism about the beliefs of his constituents and his personal rejection of their values, nevertheless identifies Rome's fate with the plebeians rather than the patricians. Caesar, on the other hand, has no sense of alienation from his class, and no feeling for the plebeians. He is after power. He is Gracchus's student, but he still sees himself as one of the "servants and rulers of Rome." Unlike either Gracchus or Crassus, he has no fixed ideal of Rome.

Kubrick underscores the difference between them by cutting to a low-angle, "under-the-shoulder" shot of Crassus as, almost involuntarily he sternly says "No!" More quietly, he continues: "Rome is an eternal thought in the mind of God." Kubrick stays on Crassus as Caesar laughs cynically. "I had no idea you've grown religious." Crassus smiles and laughs quietly, softening after the fact his impolitic outburst. "It doesn't matter. If there were no Gods at all I'd revere them. If there were no Rome at all, I'd dream of her." A revealing speech indeed. Rome is an eternal thought in the mind of God, and if it did not exist, Crassus would dream of it. Gracchus's image of Rome is of the city of people, half-aware, whose collective power he is able to direct by seeing to their needs. Crassus's conception of Rome is more that of a living prosthesis, requiring a directing intelligence to give it purpose. Gracchus seeks to focus the common needs of the people of Rome through himself; Crassus seeks to magnify his conception of himself through joining himself to Rome.

But this is a hidden selfish aim to which Crassus, the representative of a recently disgraced class, cannot yet aspire. Kubrick returns Crassus to human dimensions again by returning to the eye-level two-shot of him, as he grabs Caesar's arm and links him to his dreaming of Rome; "as I want you to do. I want you to come back to your own kind. I beg you to." Caesar looks at the hand on his arm. "Is it me you want, or is it the garrison?" Kubrick returns to the low-angle close-up again of Crassus; he chuckles again. "Both." Then Crassus seeks to implicate Caesar's conception of Rome with his own through a socratic

dialogue. Kubrick remains on Crassus's face through this dialogue. "Tell me frankly, if you were I, would you take the field against Spartacus?" "Of course," Caesar replies immediately. "Why?" "Because we have no other choice if we are to save Rome." "Ah, Caesar," Crassus says, rolling his head to the side at this imprecise thinking. "Which Rome? Theirs, or ours?" If Caesar answers this question he must choose sides. Caesar grabs Crassus's arm--an echo of Crassus's earlier movement toward him--but contradicts his body language with his words: "You know Gracchus is my friend. I won't betray him." Caesar rises, and Kubrick cuts to a long shot as he starts to exit the frame. Crassus rises before Caesar escapes the frame, calling "Caesar!" The camera dollies in to a medium shot as it tracks with Crassus's movement, and the two men--never out of the frame--are brought close together again. Crassus again reaches out to Caesar--this time, jabbing him with his index finger; less friendly, slightly threatening. "Which is worse? To betray a friend, or to betray Rome herself?" "I face no such choice," Caesar objects. "You will," Crassus says, jabbing his finger into Caesar's ribs. "Sooner than you think."

The camera follows Crassus as he retreats into the frame, then stops as, from a side alcove, we hear Gracchus's voice. "Good Afternoon, Crassus, I've been looking for you all day." Crassus turns to face Caesar, who has started to follow him, and says softly, "Our new master." Kubrick then cuts 180 degrees to the interior of the alcove, and tracks back to follow Crassus's entry. This reveals Gracchus, recumbent on a table. Gracchus raises himself to sit and talk to

Crassus, as Caesar seats himself on the end of the table in the background between the two men. For Gracchus to remain in power, he must accomplish what the patricians could not do when they were in charge: Crush Spartacus's army. For this purpose he has assembled eight legions--four times the number he requested to defeat it at Metapontum. Yet even with this number, he cannot find a general willing to risk life and honor to lead them. Thus he is forced in extremity to come to the one commander he least wishes to magnify, Crassus, in order to remain in power. Crassus knows this, and demands as his price for saving Gracchus the very thing he is trying to prevent. Kubrick cuts from a medium two-shot looking down at Caesar and Gracchus to another reverse-shot closeup looking up at Crassus as he speaks:

> Gracchus: We buy everything else these days, no reason why we shouldn't be charged for patriotism. What's your fee?
> Crassus: My election as first consul; command of all the legions of Italy; and the abolition of senatorial authority over the courts.
> Gracchus: (smiles) Dictatorship.
> Crassus: (shakes his head) Order. Let me know if my terms are acceptable.

Of course they are not.

But the true object of this speech--indeed, of this whole sequence--has never been Gracchus, but rather Caesar, who has also been present in the Gracchus shots, with downcast eyes. When Gracchus rejects Crassus's terms, Kubrick cuts to the medium shot which places Caesar in the middle of the two leaders. "Yes, yes, I know--for the present, perhaps, but times change," Crassus replies to Gracchus. "So does the Senate. When that day comes I shall be

ready." Then Crassus addresses himself to Caesar--grabbing his right arm again, linking them physically as his casual words link them socially: "Convey my respects to your wife." "A pleasure," Caesar replies, looking directly at Crassus for the first time.

The first part of Crassus' prescient conversation with Caesar has come true; he has been offered command, but at a price that will save his Rome, not the Rome of Gracchus' mob. Now the second part of the conversation--the inescapable necessity to choose between patrician and plebeian Rome--confronts Caesar. Significantly, Kubrick stages this as a repeat of the sequence just completed with Crassus; Caesar moves over to the space in the frame that Crassus has just vacated. In the shot sequence with follows, Caesar looks down on Gracchus, and the camera--only very obliquely from Gracchus's point of view--looks up at Caesar. "He's right, you know," Caesar says to Gracchus as he changes position, and as Gracchus lies back down, unaware of Caesar's psychological position. "If something isn't done about Spartacus, the Senate will change."

> Gracchus: (full shot, recumbent) And then Crassus will move in and save Rome from the slave army by assuming dictatorship. (closeup) But that, like everything else, depends on which way Spartacus jumps. Just now he's trying to get out of Italy. If he succeeds, the crisis is over, (closeup of Caesar, unresponsive) and Crassus may stay in retirement indefinitely. (closeup of Gracchus) I have arranged for Spartacus to escape from Italy.
> Caesar: (close-up, rapidly blinking, twists head to side) You've done what?

> Gracchus: (close-up) I have made a little deal with the Cilician pirates. I have assured them we won't interfere if they transport Spartacus's slaves out of Italy.
> Caesar: (eyes wide, then drops them and looks away) So now we (pause) deal with pirates. (looks over at Gracchus) We bargain with criminals.
> Gracchus: (close-up) Now don't you be so stiff-necked about it. Politics is a practical profession. If a criminal has what you want, you do business with him. (Gracchus shifts from his right side to his back, closes his eyes, then opens them fully to stare appraisingly at Caesar before shutting them again.

The appraising stare at the end shows how well Laughton understood this conflict in the script. Caesar is Gracchus's ally, but he is not a natural ally. Gracchus has Caesar's allegiance because of his avarice for power. Now Gracchus is, because he underestimated Spartacus, on the verge of losing his power in Rome. Politics, as he has taught it, is not an honorable profession. Because none of the qualified patrician commanders except Crassus is willing to act out of patriotism, even with eight legions, he finds himself forced to do something he knows Caesar finds disgraceful, even traitorous, in order to preserve a Rome of the people. Caesar must either accept his lead and betray the patrician ideal of Roman honor, or reject Gracchus. Gracchus thinks he offers more to Caesar's ambition, but he is by no means sure of his man.

In the meantime the slave army has passed out of Metapontum and are now just outside of Brundusium.[122] Kubrick shows us in long tracking shots the advance scouts, led by Crixus, as they arrive at the beach. Crixus orders one group to go to Brundusium and return with Tigranes and news of the ships which are to transport them. He orders another group back to the main body to

tell them that their camp will be at the sea. Kubrick fades out and up to the slave camp at night, and to a master shot with insets of celebration; they have accomplished their goal. Kubrick cuts from this to a medium-long shot of Spartacus in his tent, with his commanders, surrounded by maps. Their mood is equally happy, but they have planning to do. Antoninus determines that they should be able to load 150 ships a day. Spartacus sends Dionysus off to coordinate embarkation with the Cilician pirates. Crixus he sends to scout on Pompey, another Roman general recalled to Italy with his army in order to fight Spartacus, and to coordinate screening patrols in all directions around the camp until all are aboard ships. He sends another to take care of capturing cattle and preserving it for the trip. Trumbo provided the script strategy after Kubrick's rough cut narrative was rejected, and part of his intention was to restore images of Spartacus that would show him as a commander. Most had been lost prior to the rough cut screening; now Trumbo took the opportunity to insert this aspect in the rewrite.

One of Trumbo's concerns in the first Tigranes scene was to show that Spartacus was unusually perceptive, capable of seeing through lies and evasions, and able to elicit information from Tigranes that most people could not. The lines and actions which established that were rewritten, but Trumbo incorporates some of them in the second scene. Tigranes enters the tent. Spartacus is first cheerful, throwing open the chests of valuables to pay him. But Tigranes has bad tidings. First, that Pompey has landed in Italy from Spain

and is on the march; Spartacus knew that. Second, that a Roman fleet carrying Lucullus and his army from Thrace will land at Brundusium in one day. That is news, and Kubrick cuts to his first closeup of Spartacus, who looks up from Tigranes to Antoninus. Kubrick cuts to Antoninus, then to Tigranes. "You have no ships." Kubrick cuts to Spartacus; the eyes which had widened in surprise now are half-closed, tired. "I saw them in the harbor," he says moving forward. Kubrick cuts out to the master shot; Antoninus has pulled a knife and edges forward from behind as Spartacus approaches from the front. "The Cilician fleet, out of strategic necessity, has been obliged to withdraw." At this, Antoninus drops his knife; this seems plausible to him. "There are no ships at all?" he asks desperately. Kubrick then cuts to a medium-long shot of Spartacus, from Antoninus's point of view. Spartacus stands motionless a moment, face frozen in a haughty stare down at Tigranes, then leans back against the treasure, quietly angry. "The Cilician pirates can destroy any Roman fleet that ever sailed. If they run away now it's not because they are afraid." Spartacus pushes off from the treasure and moves toward Tigranes. "You better give me another reason." Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Tigranes, framed between Spartacus and Antoninus. "Well, I, I, I'm as desolated as you are, general--" Spartacus cuts off his speech with a knife at his throat. "On your toes," he says. Kubrick cuts to Antoninus's point of view. "Why did the Cilicians run away?" "They were paid," Tigranes admits. "And who paid? Who?" "Crassus," Tigranes says. Not quite the scene that Trumbo imagined--Fast and

Kubrick presumably rewrote it--but it conveys the strategic purpose Trumbo thought was needed.

One of Trumbo's other concerns was to show that "Spartacus is equal as a strategist to Crassus,"[123] in order to recover the "big" Spartacus a heroic film required. Kubrick had intended a relatively unmotivated march on Rome, in accordance with the Koestler theme. Trumbo argued after Douglas and Muhl rejected the Kubrick rough cut that to be heroic, Spartacus had to be shown analyzing the military situation insightful. Most of the domestic and international audience had been educated in basic military strategy by World War II; they would not accept Spartacus as a great strategist unless they saw it shown, with a map, in action. Now that Spartacus has information, he has to understand the strategy behind it. Antoninus sets the problem to him. "Spartacus, Crassus won't fight us himself. The reports (Antoninus points at Spartacus's table) say he won't take the command of an army. Why would he bribe your pirates to keep us from escaping?" Antoninus looks at Tigranes. "How can I answer when there is no answer," Tigranes says. "I've been betrayed, just as you have." Now that Spartacus knows Crassus paid the Cilicians, he turns to the map. "There is an answer. There must be an answer to everything." Spartacus traces the known course of Pompey's army and where Lucullus' army is landing. They are so placed that, if Spartacus fights one, the other will have time to march on their rear, and the slave army will be forced to fight against overwhelming odds on two fronts. "The only other army in all Italy is here:

Rome." Kubrick cuts from the map to a reaction shot of Antoninus, eyes wide in surprise, and in the background a suddenly still Tigranes, listening as Spartacus explains the reasons for what Tigranes could not or would not explain.

Now that Spartacus has analyzed the tactical purpose of the armies' position, he analyzes the strategic purpose behind the tactics. Kubrick cuts to Tigranes' medium-long shot point of view, as Tigranes's gaze follows Spartacus. "Of course! Crassus is inviting us to march on Rome, so he can take the field against us." Kubrick reverses his angle 180 degrees to show Tigranes as Spartacus responds to Antoninus's questions. "You mean, Crassus wants us to march on Rome?" "He's forcing us to," Spartacus says, impatient at the necessity of stating what is obvious to him. "He knows I won't let myself be trapped down here between two armies with my back to the sea." Tigranes begins eyeing the accumulated treasure as Spartacus continues, more quietly, following Crassus's strategic logic to its conclusion. "He knows my only other choice is Rome. Somewhere on the way we meet. Beats us. Becomes the savior of Rome, and there's his final victory over the Senate." Trumbo argued in his "Retakes" notes that Spartacus should make such a strategic analysis from the map, ahead of the audience's anticipation. The audience, like Tigranes and Antoninus, were to be awed at Spartacus's realization from evidence they had conclusions that they had not drawn. "The attempt here has been made to have Spartacus out-think Crassus, invade Crassus's mind and discover it's secrets. If

the attempt is successful, then we have done a great deal to raise the stature of Spartacus."[124] Here Spartacus grasps the tactical situation, the military strategic purpose, and the grand strategic function of this event in Roman politics.

Concomitant with this strategic conquering of Crassus however, the scene establishes just how precarious the slave army's position is. They cannot fight armies on two flanks at once, and now they are confronted with three. They must move quickly to defeat the army at Rome--and, from Spartacus's analysis and reaction at the prospect of fighting the Rome army, we know that he does not take this to be an easy task. At this point, Trumbo's strategy elevates Spartacus again. Tigranes makes an offer that, in the first script draft when they were first to meet much later in the film, he was to have made then: "General, allow me to redeem myself in your eyes. For a very small commission I can arrange for you and your family, and your leaders of course, to be smuggled out of Italy, and transported to one of the Eastern countries where men of substance like you are welcome and appreciated. You can live there like kings for the rest of your lives. What do you think, general?" Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Spartacus, who looks contemptuously over his shoulder at this distraction from the map. "Go away." Kubrick cuts back to an astonished Tigranes, to an almost impassive Antoninus, and to Tigranes again. Muttering "go away," Tigranes does so. Spartacus passes the materialist temptation; like Crassus, Spartacus lives for something greater than himself. And by his

strategic analysis, Spartacus, as Trumbo had intended, is now shown to be the intellectual equal of Crassus. "This done, there can be no question that Spartacus will rise above the purely emotional level of Crassus," Trumbo had written in explanation of his First Tigranes Scene draft, "since Crassus's emotions are evil and Spartacus's good, and the audience will understand and feel this."[125] Crassus is fighting a battle to make himself master of Rome; Spartacus is fighting not to enslave but to free a people.

The next sequence, likely a result of Fast and Kubrick's collaboration, underscores this contrast by intercutting Spartacus's speech to the slaves explaining their situation with that of Crassus upon his accession as First Consul and Commander in Chief of all the armies in Italy. The slaves are shown collectively, as a huge assembly on the beach, and in a series of close-up insets. By contrast, the only close shots of Romans are of Crassus, and two inset two-shot of Gracchus and Caesar, with Gracchus glaring balefully at Caesar. The Roman scenes are dominated by the architecture and the presence of the army, standing stiffly at attention, dividing as if by a sea Crassus from the assembled Senate. Spartacus is framed by the sky, and the slave army by the beach. By contrast, the Romans are framed by architecture, and Crassus himself is surrounded by four soldiers and a doorway. Crassus is enclosed by the building and the army; Spartacus is open to the sky. The Romans and the slaves collectively repeat this pattern. Thus Kubrick obliquely invokes a "natural law" argument; as the slaves are set in nature, so the

Romans are set in architecture. On the one hand is the natural state of humans. On the other, the constraints of a luxurious and decadent civilization. "We have no choice but to march against Rome herself and end this war the only way it could have ended: By freeing every slave in Italy," Spartacus says to the slaves. "I promise you a new Rome, a new Italy and a new empire. I promise the destruction of the slave army, and the restoration of order throughout all our territories," Crassus says. Kubrick shows parents with children as Spartacus says, "Maybe there's no peace in this world, for us or anyone else. I don't know. But I do know: As long as we live, we must stay true to ourselves. I do know that we're brothers. And I know that we're free. We march tonight!" The Roman army marches out of the city as the slave army marches toward them.

In Trumbo's script, prior to Crassus' accession to power, and after Spartacus's speech to the slaves, there were to be one scene of panic in Rome at the news that Spartacus was marching toward the city. Kubrick apparently convinced Douglas that it was unnecessary to show the panic; it is not in the film. This was an awful mistake. Certainly the montage is effective, but by eliminating the panic scene, it has the effect of making Crassus come to power because of Spartacus's threat before Spartacus actually starts to march toward Rome. This is at least inept, as it makes the logic of Crassus's whole strategic plan as Spartacus has explained it appear irrelevant. Kubrick is a competent filmmaker, and so if he was responsible, one can only conclude that this is one of the most visible examples of the director either not caring about the meaning

of the lines being filmed, or actually working against a narrative theme that was imposed on him.

Another unfortunate cut follows as Crassus and his army march out of Rome. Gracchus and Caesar watch Crassus's army march out of the city. As they march out, Gracchus was to have commented to Caesar that Spartacus has shown great skill in handling armies, and that maybe Spartacus will do them the favor of eliminating Crassus. "What, you want the slaves to win?" Caesar says, horrified. Gracchus assures him that it would be for the best, and that if it happened, power would return to him and he will make a deal to avert further war. This scene was the last of the sequence of Gracchus/Caesar cuts, and in some ways it is the worst of them. Caesar is, the film shows, Gracchus's ally. His reason for being so, his ambition, was shown in the ward scenes, but also implied in his conversation with Crassus in the baths; that idea is not lost. However, between the time that we see Caesar standing next to Gracchus with the Senate and the time that we see him arrive after the battle, in uniform, to arrest Gracchus, there is nothing. What motivates this switch? Precisely the choice that the Bath scene foreshadowed. Again, the audience is asked to infer on the basis of slight hints the existence of a dramatic idea that a few seconds of film would have shown. The balcony scene was filmed. Kubrick cut it. Trumbo argued for it, and according to Duncan Cooper (who contradicts Criterion Videodisc editor Robert Harris on this point--it does not mention the scene), it made it into the preview print of June 1960, only to be cut just prior to the July

26 press showing. The missing balcony scene shows the depths of the division in Rome itself. It suggested that Gracchus, and the common people of Rome he represents, would have in effect gone over to Spartacus's side, against the Patrician class. At this point in Roman history, then, Spartacus would not just be fighting against Rome, but also for the plebeians, themselves on the verge of enslavement by the wealthy and powerful. Both Gracchus and Spartacus, each in their way, have fought for "the common people." Their understandings of what this meant were different, but under the pressure of this final conflict, they have become the same. Caesar understands this very well--it is precisely what Crassus has warned him about in the bath--and thus it is Caesar who joins Crassus, "not for myself," as he will say as he arrests Gracchus, "but for Rome." Seen in this light, Crassus's lecture to Gracchus in the empty Senate takes on a good deal more force. Dalton Trumbo's name on Spartacus's credits broke the blacklist, but at the cost of censoring the most dramatic turning point of the Roman sequence in the film, and of eviscerating the whole meaning of Caesar's character and Rome's future.

Crassus rides into camp, and enters his tent to discuss strategy with his commanders. He first changes all battle orders he's previously issued. "Spartacus takes too keen an interest in our battle plans, I fear. New battle orders will be issued in a short while." He then walks over to his campaign table, surrounded by maps. "Spartacus has every reason to believe that he's outdistanced the armies of Pompey and Lucullus," he says. "However, there

are passes through the Apperine mountains unknown to any map. It may fortify your courage to know that Pompey is at this moment in camp some 20 miles to the West of us, and that the army of Lucullus approaches from the South, by forced night march." Crassus is on local ground; he knows the lay of the land, and because of this superior knowledge, not superior understanding, he has the advantage. Spartacus has already said that the slave army cannot be caught fighting on two fronts, and now it is certain that it will be. The Roman commanders, lined up at attention, listen to this news solemnly. Caius, the oldest, responds: "Sir, allow us to pledge you the most glorious victory of your career." This is exactly the sort of stiff, dissembling passionlessness that Crassus fears can defeat him. He pounds the table and rises, shouting, "I'm not after glory! I'm after Spartacus. And gentlemen, I mean to have him. However, this campaign is not alone to kill Spartacus; it is to kill the legend of Spartacus."

Batiatus arrives next, a more craftily dissembling, unctuous figure, ordered into Crassus's presence to describe Spartacus's appearance. When asked, Batiatus admits, with a sort of pride, that he is indeed the former owner of Spartacus. "If it isn't too subversive to say so, I made him what he is today." Crassus seems to have had some idea before that "Spartacus" was familiar, and Batiatus confirms that he is one of the gladiators he saw in the ring at Batiatus's school--and thus also helped make the enemy of his class. Crassus still needs Batiatus to identify Spartacus. In response, Ustinov wrote one of his better lines for himself: "We are both Roman patriots, sir. You're a great one; I,

of course, smaller. But we both believe in Roman fair play. You want something from me. I would be lacking, in, in respect for my own conscience if I did not say that I wish something from you," namely, the right to sell any surviving slaves. Crassus has an appreciation for this by-play, yet he also finds it impertinent; who is Batiatus to bandy words impertinently with Crassus? He treats his "guest" with mock politeness, granting him his request with the proviso that he must remain in camp, to endure the danger Crassus and his army will face of being killed should the slave army triumph. "You misunderstand me," Batiatus sputters. "I'm a civilian. I'm even more a civilian than most civilians." "Well if you wish to remain so--" Crassus drops this hint that things could be worse; he could be in the front lines--"I should strongly advise you to stay here and be our guest. Guard!" Batiatus continues to struggle for the right phrase of flattery, then turns to the truth; s the former Lanista of the core of Spartacus's army he is more hated than most Romans. "My dear, all-conquering Marcus Licinius Crassus. What if it is Spartacus who crosses the battlefield looking for you?" "In such circumstances I have no doubt you will be helping him. (To the guard) This fellow remains with us until after the battle. Make him comfortable. Don't let him feel lonely."

We cut next to Spartacus, who stands on a hillside overlooking the slave camp. He walks down among the people he has led. Kubrick's camera tracks backward with Spartacus, and Kubrick cuts from this to shows of the people from Spartacus's point of view: Worried parents with their children, hope and

fear in their eyes; sleeping people; men looking at him with respect; his commanders turning up from a map to look at him; children seeing him approach in the night and smiling as they hold dolls or even younger children. One child asks her mother, "Mommy, when do we go home?" "Go to sleep, dear," she responds. Spartacus arrives at his own tent, looks out, then enters, carrying the burden of their smiles, hopes and fears. Kubrick cuts to an establishing medium long shot of him at the entrance of the sleeping area, and Varinia, sitting, at the other end of the frame. He walks over to Varinia, pregnant with their child. "I hope he waits until we get to Rome." "Rome!" Spartacus says dully, and walks back across the tent to the entrance. Kubrick cuts to a medium shot of Spartacus, looking away; Rome is dividing them. "They've never beaten us yet," Varinia responds. "No, but no matter how many times we beat them, still they seem to have another army to send against us. And another. It just seems we've started something that has no ending." Kubrick cuts out to the medium long shot for Varinia's response. "If it ended tomorrow, it was worth it." This is what he fears, that this is their last night, and fears to say. Spartacus turns and looks at her, and as the camera dollies in to a medium shot of them together he kneels at her feet and hugs her. "Varinia, don't make me weak." "You're strong enough to be weak," she replies. Kubrick cuts to an over-the-shoulder closeup of Spartacus, released for a time of his impossible burden. "Varinia, I love you more than my life--and yet sometimes, even with you here sleeping beside me, I feel so alone. I imagine a god for slaves, and I pray." "What do you pray for?" "I

pray for a son who will be born free." "I pray for the same thing." Here they meet.

But Spartacus is almost finished. If he loses the battle, he will have done all he can. It will then be her burden to live for the future when their shared dream can come into being. Like the child Arthur never had in Camelot who, at the last battle, Arthur orders to return home and remember Arthur's dream, so their child will carry their dream into the future: "Take care of my son, Varinia--and if he never knows of me, tell him who I was and what we dreamed of. Tell him the truth. There'll be plenty of others to tell him lies." This is a transference of the dream to her, a dying request. It is Varinia's turn to be overwhelmed by the burden of the dream, and to be overcome with her emotions. Kubrick cuts to the medium shot as she reaches out and hugs him, crying, "I can't live without you, Spartacus!" "Varinia!," Spartacus says, calling her back from despair. "Varinia! Varinia!" She calms herself. "Varinia. For you and me there can be no farewells. As long as one of us lives--"he places his hand on her stomach--"we all live." It is the child, and the endless power of life that finally will defeat Rome. Spartacus looks down suddenly. "Oh, I felt it! Did you feel it?" "Yes, I did," Varinia says. "It feels so strong. Does it hurt you?" "No." "Oh, it's so strong! Oh, Varinia, Varinia, Varinia!" they hug each other, and then look tenderly into each other's eyes and kiss. The scene fades to black.[126]

Kubrick fades up to the morning, and the slave army arrayed for battle. The battle sequence followed Saul Bass's storyboards. Bass, who had been

given this assignment by Mann, had screened battle footage from dozens of films to analyze what did and did not work in battle scenes. "What I discovered was... the most significant part of the battle is the preparation for the battle, the preliminaries.... The most effective battle I found was the one in Alexander Nevsky," he says on the Criterion Videodisc. "Conceptually, it was absolutely brilliant.... The Spartacus battle was patterned after that." The resemblance is closest in the initial shots, where Kubrick shows us shots of the principals of the slave army, and distant shots of the advancing Rome army--monstrous, in Bass's conception, not because of their dehumanizing armor, as in Nevsky, but because of their massive patterned formations, with each member acting in unison. Intercut with the approach of the formations, Kubrick shows close-ups of the slave army. Kubrick shows us--as Trumbo had often insisted should be shown--that in the slave army, everyone fights. A young girl stands in the front ranks with a spear. Next to her is an old man, and a young boy. In another shot, a husband and wife who looked into Spartacus's eyes the night before as they sat with their children now stand together, each with a spear, prepared to fight. By contrast, we see no faces of Roman soldiers; only the Roman commanders, watching intently, and the checkered masses of the advancing centuries. This illusion of monstrous perfection is quickly shattered as the slaves roll fiery hay-logs into the Roman mass, and individual Romans break formation and run.

But just as the slaves break the machine and the battle is under way, Kubrick cuts to the distant Roman commanders, who all look to the hillside on their right. Kubrick cuts to what they see in extreme long shot: Another advancing Roman line. Kubrick cuts back to a medium long-shot of the Roman commanders. "Lucullus and Pompey," Caius says to Crassus. Kubrick cuts to a medium shot of Spartacus and his commanders. They look to their left at the new force approaching their flank. But both Crassus and Spartacus have told us what it means: Here is the superior force that can conquer their superior will. Spartacus raises his sword and leads a charge of his commanders and cavalry reserve into the middle of the battle. In the scenes of battle itself, Kubrick intended to insert a number of particularly brutal shots to undercut the humanizing close-ups Trumbo succeeded in having placed in the film. Kirk Douglas vetoed most of them before they were shot, however, and the rest were eliminated by the Hollywood Film Code censors.[127] What remains places the emphasis less on the savagery of the fight itself than the hopelessness for the slaves to succeed against these massed forces on two fronts, as Trumbo intended. Kubrick cuts away to show from the top of a hill in extreme long shot to show the ugly, smoking field, monstrous even without the shots he had planned, and in the foreground riderless horses running from the carnage below.[128]

Kubrick dissolves from this to a dolly across the battlefield, across some of the same faces the camera showed us together at the beginning of the battle,

now together in death. Kubrick cuts from this to a tracking shot right, as Crassus and Caius walk across the battlefield. Somewhere, a baby cries. Kubrick cuts to what seems to be Crassus's point of view as the camera shows us one of the fathers who smiled at Spartacus the night before while holding his child. He lies on the ground now, sword near one arm, his child in the other. Kubrick cuts to an eye-level medium reaction shot. In comparison to Caius, Crassus seems disturbed.[129] Kubrick cuts next to the surviving slaves, in three quick medium shots, as a Roman announces that their new owner, Crassus, will spare their lives. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Crassus, then returns to the medium shot of Spartacus, sitting next to Antoninus and Dionysus. They may live, they are told, if they identify Spartacus, living or dead. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Antoninus, next to Spartacus, who is suddenly alert, watching Spartacus. Kubrick cuts to Spartacus. He looks at the Roman, then down. Kubrick cuts away to an extreme long shot, as if it were a point of view shot; as if Spartacus now was seeing all the surviving slaves. Kubrick returns to the closeup, and Spartacus looks up, decided. He starts to rise. Kubrick cuts to a full shot of Spartacus, rising--and on one side Antoninus, and on the other Dionysus, also rise. Each of them say "I'm Spartacus!" before Spartacus can open his mouth. Then, one by one, in close-ups and then by the hundreds in extreme long shots, all the surviving army shouts "I'm Spartacus!" Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Antoninus and Spartacus; Antoninus and Spartacus look at each other, Antoninus impassioned, Spartacus stunned. Kubrick cuts to the closeup of Crassus, brow

wrinkled, mouth drooping open just slightly, also stunned at this unthinkable devotion, and then returns to Spartacus, who lowers his head again, in tears.

What follows is the beginning of Crassus's obsession with the power he has just seen, a power of command that Batiatus's arrival only underscores by contrast, mocking him with his word-stresses that imply the opposite of what he says. "Forgive me for being one of the last to congratulate you, your nobility. There's an ugly rumor going around the camp that the prisoners are to be crucified? heh heh?" "That is true," Crassus says quietly, still thinking about what he has just seen. He wanted to destroy the legend of Spartacus, and quite clearly he has not. "Perhaps this is the moment to remind your highness that yesterday you promised me that I could be the agent in their auctioning," Batiatus says, as though he were lecturing an absent-minded uncle about a doctor's appointment. Crassus, who was looking off in the distance, now snaps his eyes over in Batiatus's direction, rapidly blinking. Olivier makes him fairly crackle with outraged dignity as he shouts at Batiatus, "Last night you promised Spartacus to me! Where is he?! In return I promised you the sale of the survivors, and there will be none!" Kubrick cuts to a reaction shot, as Batiatus's mouth twitches slightly with distress and he lowers his eyes and bows his head in submission.

Having at least compelled some acknowledgement of his power if not the respect which should be due from this insulting inferior, he is about to leave the field. He hears that annoying baby cry again, however, and turns, looking.

Kubrick cuts to a long shot of the hillside. A woman covered in a red Roman cloak is in the center of the frame. Crassus walks into the frame, followed by a guard and Batiatus, stops and kneels. Batiatus kneels too. "Why--it's Varinia!" Batiatus says. "Yes--I remember," Crassus says. "You're the woman of Spartacus?" "I'm his wife," Varinia says, hair matted with mud.[130] Crassus asks her where Spartacus is. "Dead," she replies, she saw him die. Crassus knows that she is lying, however. At last, he has some prize for destroying Spartacus's army. Batiatus is thinking the same thing, however. "At least he has someone worth selling, your enormity. I'll even take the child as an investment." Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Varinia, who looks up at Crassus fearfully, then to a medium shot as he receives the count of slave women found--only 40--and delegates them to Batiatus. Varinia however he will keep. Batiatus protests, but now he is not only annoying, but unnecessary. "Flog this scoundrel out of camp," he orders. "This woman and her child are to be conveyed to my house in Rome." For Crassus, here is the promise of closure of the Spartacus aberration. The woman he purchased will now at last be delivered, but enhanced by her significance. This property, an extension of Spartacus himself, will now be converted to his use.

Kubrick dissolves to Crassus watching the captured gladiators. Antoninus and Spartacus pass by. Crassus recognizes Antoninus. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Spartacus, who looks up at Crassus and realizes who it must be. Kubrick cuts back to a closeup of Crassus, pleased at his discovery.

Kubrick cuts to Crassus's oblique point of view of Antoninus, who drops his eyes from Crassus's gaze, and then lifts them, thoughtlessly, or out of fear of Crassus, to look at Spartacus for reassurance. Kubrick cuts to Crassus following Antoninus's gaze, and then to Spartacus. Spartacus meets Antoninus's gaze, then looks up defiantly at Crassus. Kubrick cuts back to Crassus, who stares at Spartacus as he gives the order to have the surviving slaves crucified along the road to Rome--but to hold these two slaves until the last. Crassus then rides off, to leave Spartacus the task of hearing the sound of hammers, much like those in the quarry where he began, and the sight of crucified men. Slaves stop their tasks to watch the doomed procession.

We cut from this scene to another of the doomed, Gracchus, to whom Batiatus has fled. Trumbo intended that Gracchus should be quite aware of what Spartacus's defeat meant. He was to have complemented Batiatus for not betraying Spartacus to Crassus. "On the other hand, Spartacus is a great criminal. He's destroyed the Republic. The change isn't apparent yet, but the Republic is dead."[131] Instead of this, Gracchus and Batiatus discuss a little more of Batiatus's dignity and Varinia's attractions before returning to the plot theme of stealing Varinia from Crassus to satisfy their mutual desire to hurt Crassus. Ustinov eliminated all mention of Spartacus from the scene. Trumbo's analysis of what he intended and what was done is particularly pertinent:

> Having clouded the audience's full comprehension of our hero's actions, he now turns his guns upon our sub-hero. We have

> presented Gracchus as the most skilful, the most knowing, the most perspicacious politician in Rome. In the electric political climate that has prevailed in Rome since the return of Crassus, surely Gracchus would have had some intimation (if not from facts reported to him, then by sheer deductive intelligence) of the change in Roman power which was imminent. Naturally Père Ustinov denies him this knowledge, so that the first politician in Rome is completely surprised when power actually does change, and he is arrested.... I don't mean this scene is bad. They march through it as clowns, and the audience will be delighted. They may even win Oscars for such fakery. It's just that the only reason for the scene was to give the audience, through clowns, vital information about Spartacus primarily; and secondly, to arrange the Varinia plot.[132]

Ustinov did indeed win the Oscar. Ed Muhl told Duncan Cooper that Douglas feared Gracchus would become so sympathetic that it would detract from Spartacus.[133] If that is true, it would be quite an irony. Kubrick did not attempt to film any of Trumbo's lines, and by the time Trumbo wrote it was too late to retake the scene, as they could not get Laughton. What is left in the scene is the establishment of Varinia's abduction, and the culmination--now almost obscured by the cuts which came later--of the Crassus-Gracchus conflict over Caesar's loyalty. "What I do I do not for myself, but for Rome," Caesar says. He has chosen between the Rome of the Patricians or the People, unmotivated now by Gracchus's realization that the freedom of Spartacus and the slaves are intimately tied to the freedom of the common Roman citizens.

Kubrick cuts from Gracchus's light and airy house to a close-up of Crassus, surrounded by shadows, shouting at Gracchus with cool contempt. "Did you truly believe 500 years of Rome could so easily be delivered into the

clutches of a mob?!" This originally had reference to Gracchus's conversation with Caesar, in which he expressed his hope that Spartacus would defeat Crassus and he could then negotiate a mutually satisfactory arrangement for their departure. As it stands, it perhaps evokes reference to Gracchus's earlier attempt to negotiate with the Cilicians for Spartacus's departure, and to Gracchus's own position, now lost, as the defender of the Roman "mob." Kubrick cuts to a 180 degree reverse establishing shot, showing Gracchus in the enshadowed Senate, a large camp-table set up where the orators spoke. The Senate has been transformed into an enlarged version of Crassus's tent. Caesar and two of Crassus's Senators sit around the table as Crassus continues to lecture Gracchus.

> Crassus: Already the bodies of 6000 crucified slaves line the Appian way. Tomorrow the last of their companions will fight to the death in the temple of my fathers as a sacrifice to them. As those slaves have died, so will your rabble if they falter one instant in loyalty to the new order of affairs. The enemies of the state are known. Arrests are in progress. The prisons begin to fill. In every city and province lists of the disloyal have been compiled. Tomorrow they will learn the cost of their terrible folly, their treason.
> Gracchus: And where does my name appear on the list of the disloyal enemies of the state?
> Crassus: First.

This could not help but evoke the HUAC and McCarthy hearings. The scene is the direct link between Spartacus and the early 50's magazine articles that linked McCarthyism to Roman purges. It is here, in the film as it remains, that Hoberman's linkage of Crassus to Kennedy in his 1993 reappraisal of the film

appears most anachronistic, as this was precisely the Democratic left's metaphor of choice for interpreting the historical implications of McCarthyism.

In the normal order of things, Crassus would simply order Gracchus killed. But Gracchus has a purpose. As Caesar has learned from Gracchus, "Rome is the mob." As much as Crassus might wish to deny it, he knows that he must control the people of Rome. So he threatens Gracchus's rabble--he knows, or Caesar has told him, that Gracchus truly does care about them--then offers the possibility to Gracchus that he can continue his role as intermediary for the people. "Your followers are deluded enough to trust you. I intend that you should speak to them tomorrow for the sake of their own good, their peaceful and profitable future...." But Gracchus will not represent them; rather, he will represent the patricians, and Crassus in particular, to put a familiar if now powerless face between the people and their new master, "to calm the envious spirit, and the troubled mind. You will persuade them to accept destiny and order, and trust the gods." This is not a request from Crassus, but an order; he is dictating surrender terms.

Kubrick bridges this scene with a quick glance at Spartacus and Antoninus, each of whom react as they halt their march and watch a few more of their friends impaled on crosses.[134] Then Kubrick cuts from a closeup of Spartacus reacting to this standard torture to a closeup of Varinia, whom we discover is suffering another kind. Significantly, the soundtrack music is the same as that of the "oysters and snails" Antoninus scene. Kubrick cuts to a

medium shot of Crassus. He receives gold bracelets from a slave and puts them on. Kubrick tracks with him as he walks into another room, where Varinia sits, coifed and bejeweled, being attended by a matronly slave. She leaves as Crassus enters. Varinia is wearing a dress that Crassus chides her for hiding under a wrap. "That dress took some weeks of a woman's life. You above all people should respect the work of slaves and wear it proudly." He then places the Queen of Persia's gold necklace around Varinia's neck. She is not impressed. "It's heavy." "In time you will wear it lightly enough." Here is an appeal to vanity, to an image of power.

Crassus takes her hand, and when she does not move, grasps her arm with the other hand and pulls her into the next room. Kubrick cuts to a long shot and tracks in slightly to a medium long shot as Crassus takes her to a dining couch and tells her to sit down. The distance of this re-establishing shot, which encompasses the decor of the room, emphasizes the richness of the setting, and the extensive table of food which Crassus serves her. Crassus clearly is trying to ingratiate himself to her. But much as was the case with Batiatus's courting of Spartacus's loyalty in the training camp, she looks beyond the immediate offer. "Why am I here?" Crassus chortles his Sydney Greenstreet chortle. "A good question. A woman's question. I wish the answer could be as good, as straightforward."[135] He then changes the subject. "The infant, it thrives?" "He thrives." Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Varinia. At the edge of the frame, Crassus "invades" her shot. She looks over to him as he leans in. He is

irritated to find that she will not turn it over to a wetnurse; she should get on with her new life. "I don't care about my new life here." This is a blunt rejection of all of the material rewards Crassus has offered without explanation.

This rejection seems to unnerve Crassus. Fast, certainly, and probably Trumbo, Kubrick, and Olivier himself all would have been aware of Plutarch's "Life of Crassus," in which Plutarch speaks of Crassus's vice of material avarice as the fault which deformed all of his virtues. They perhaps all would have known as well of Cicero's sixth paradox of "Paradoxa Stoicorum," believed to be in reference to Crassus, in which Cicero--a character in Fast's book--observed the paradox that the richest man of the world was actually needy and poor. Kubrick cuts to a 180 degree reverse closeup of Crassus, heavily shadowed, over Varinia's shoulder. The camera tracks with him, losing Varinia from the frame as he pulls his face back, looks down and then up again at Varinia, and speaks, his voice raised. "But you care about the life of your child, don't you!" Kubrick cuts back to a closeup of Varinia, her frame free again, who seems fearful, but even more puzzled. "Why do you threaten me with my baby? I belong to you. You can take me any time you wish." Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Crassus, alone in the frame, his face divided by the lighting, and the camera tracks with him as he leans in toward Varinia again. "But I don't want to take you," he says brokenly. "I want you to give. I want your love." Kubrick cuts back to the closeup of Varinia, with Crassus on the edge of the frame. She turns and faces him, now genuinely shocked. "You think by threatening my child you

make me love you?" This provokes Crassus's strongest elliptical movement yet. His head swings down and out of the frame has he says in a choked voice "I did not threaten you through your child!" Kubrick cuts back to the medium-long establishing shot as Crassus stands up, goes to the doorway, then stops and turns around, spreading his arms wide. "I'm sorry," he says in a more composed voice. He then moves to her couch and sits down. Kubrick cuts to a two-shot closeup of them. "One shouldn't grieve forever." "I'm not grieving, I'm remembering," Varinia says. "Do I interfere with your remembering?" "Oh, no," she says. Crassus laughs joylessly, turns away, looks at her again and stands. Kubrick cuts to a medium shot and tracks with him as Crassus moves to the other couch. "You tread the ridge between truth and insult with the skill of a mountain goat!" He realizes that she is unwinnable. This is Varinia's single strongest scene; like Spartacus, she has a blunt directness which sees further into Crassus than anyone else in the film except perhaps Gracchus or Spartacus himself has.

Gracchus then turns to what truly preoccupies him, as he cannot conquer Varinia. "What do you remember when you think about Spartacus?" Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Varinia, who drops her eyes and is silent. "It doesn't distress you to talk about him," Crassus adds offscreen. Varinia looks up. "Oh, no." Kubrick cuts to a medium shot of Crassus, with Varinia in the corner of the frame. "Well, then," Crassus says, slowly, mastering every word. "What sort of a man was he? Really?" Kubrick cuts to Varinia, who looks down, and then up

directly at Crassus, challenging him with her eyes. "He was a man who began all alone, like an animal. Yet on the day he died, thousands and thousands would gladly have died in his place." Kubrick returns to the same shot of Crassus, who chuckles uncertainly. "What was he, a god?" he says loudly. Kubrick cuts back to Varinia, with the same challenging stare. "He wasn't a god. He was a simple man. A slave." Varinia's voice grows softer, and she looks down. "I loved him." Kubrick cuts then to a 45 degree angle medium shot of Varinia. Crassus, his back to the camera, rises, and the camera rises with him as he jumps up and paces, agitated. "He was an outlaw! A murderer, an enemy to everything fine and decent Rome ever built!" The camera tracks in slowly on them as he stands before Varinia and she drops her eyes, and then rushes in more quickly as he grabs her arms and pulls her up violently. The camera movements illustrate his passion, now grown so large as to suddenly break his self-control. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Crassus, over Varinia's shoulder. "Damn you, you'll tell me," he says, as his eyes lose their schooled Patrician calm. He glares at her. "Why did you love him?" Kubrick cuts to Varinia, who is calm. I can't tell you. I can't tell you things you can't understand." Kubrick cuts back to his closeup of Crassus, as he visibly masters himself and speaks slowly again, mastering every word before he speaks. "But I want to understand." He tilts his head up to look at her more directly, beseechingly, his control going again. "Don't you see, I must understand." He swallows. Kubrick cuts to Varinia, who looks at him with interest, and then sits

down, realization growing in her eyes. "You're afraid of him, aren't you?" Kubrick cuts again to Crassus, who backs up in the frame, turning his face more away from the key light and into the underlit fill light, shadowing his face. Kubrick returns to Varinia, who speaks more loudly, certain now. "That's why you want his wife." Kubrick returns to Crassus, who closes his eyes and stands motionless, stripped of his defenses, as Varinia continues to speak. "To sooth your fear by having something he had." Kubrick cuts back again to Varinia, the rapid cutting now creating tension. "When you're so afraid, nothing can help. Nothing." Kubrick cuts to Crassus, who looks up, shifts his yes, and looks to his right. He still has Spartacus; perhaps confronting him will help. Crassus looks down again at Varinia, in control of himself again. "We shall see," he says. Kubrick cuts to Varinia, obscured a moment as Crassus passes between her and the camera. She turns her head and follows him as he retreats from the room, and turns back toward the camera.

Kubrick then cuts to a long shot of a gate, outside of Rome. In the foreground, tied to the wheels of the wagon that carried the crosses on which his surviving army was crucified, Spartacus and Antoninus are tied. Kubrick cuts to a medium two-shot of them. "Could we have won, Spartacus," Antoninus asks. "Could we ever have won?" In his rough cut, Kubrick (and Fast, to whom this scene, rewritten, must be attributed) had Spartacus simply say "Just by fighting them we won something. When just one man says, `No, I won't,' Rome begins to fear. We were tens of thousands who said no. That was the wonder

of it." Then in one version, Spartacus and Antoninus talked about death, and whether or not slaves had gods. In another Fast/Kubrick scene, Spartacus asked Antoninus to sing. In both scenes, the emphasis was on grief and bitterness. In the conclusion of the "death" theme scene, Spartacus was to have complained that "the world is a pig-sty." Trumbo argued that Spartacus was too submissive in his grief, and too self-pitying. Spartacus should be more assertive of the value of the revolt, and affirm more emphatically the validity of the slave's common dream for freedom.

Trumbo's solution for this was to have Spartacus rhapsodize on what the slaves accomplished.

> Simple people, under terrible emotional stress, often lapse into pure poetry, even to the sing-song rhythms of poetry.... It seems to me that the way such lines as we have...can be made most effective is for them to be delivered haltingly, falteringly, in short phrases---while the audience watches the actor in the process of actually thinking the lines out, of composing them, so to speak, in his own mind an heart. These lines were...composed, in anguish, and with difficulty, in the mind of Spartacus. They are his definition of himself at the moment of his death.[136]

Spartacus would go beyond his own grief and fear in this scene, Trumbo thought, and when prompted by Antoninus's question, validate not only his own life, but all of the slaves, all of whom would have lost their lives in the pursuit of a heroic quest.

Again, as so frequently happened, Fast and Kubrick rewrote Trumbo's rewrite. But they followed his strategy, and kept most of his lines, presumably

on Douglas's orders. Spartacus continues to reassure Antoninus that their lives have not been in vain:

> That was the wonder of it. To have seen the slaves lift their heads from that dust; to see them rise from their knees and stand tall, the sun on their lips; to hear them storm from the mountains, shouting; to hear them sing along the plains.

"And now they're dead," Antoninus says bitterly. Trumbo's Spartacus was to have refused "even to mention or think of the possibility that Varinia and the child may be killed." He was again to have implored the aid of that unknown god who was a god for slaves, too. Fast's Spartacus "should be afraid, he should be intrigued, he should be wondering, he should be reacting." Fast complained that Kirk Douglas took his scene and kept his face rigid throughout, which "drives me crazy."[137] In keeping with Fast's interpretation, Spartacus looks out into the darkness, and says, "Dead. Varinia dead. And the baby." Spartacus looks back at the rows of crosses along the road. "All of them." Fast's preference has the effect of strengthening the impact, in the following scene, when Crassus tells Spartacus that both Varinia and the baby are alive as his slaves.

Fast then returns to Trumbo's strategy for the scene, which Trumbo described as follows:

> Although he grieves for the dead, he has utterly no fear of death for himself.... In the midst of his private grief and his complete resignation and even indifference to death, he diverts himself from his own tragedy, from his own feelings, to give comfort and understanding and strength to a young man who <u>does</u> fear death. The is still thinking of someone else, he is still beyond self.[138]

Antoninus looks at the crosses then back to Spartacus and asks him if he is afraid to die. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Spartacus. "Hmm. No more than I was to be born." Then he cuts away to the medium two-shot which has been the principle set-up for the scene. Spartacus looks over at Antoninus, concerned about what prompted the question. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Antoninus, who, seeing Spartacus looking at him, turns his face away. Kubrick cuts to Spartacus's face, showing his compassion. Kubrick then cuts to Antoninus, who still tries to hide his face from Spartacus, as we hear Spartacus's voice softly. "Are you afraid?" Kubrick cuts to the medium shot. "Yes," Antoninus says. In the extant film, they are interrupted by Crassus's arrival. But Trumbo's lines continued, again ascending into poetry. They were shot and in the preview print, and perhaps were one of the 42 cuts Universal made prior to the press showing. "Don't be," Spartacus was to have said. "When I was in the mines, death whispered to me day after night. Death doesn't hurt you. It makes the air turn soft. It puts a coolness in your eyes. The pain seeps out of your blood. You forget about life. Life was your mother, and now death is your father." Trumbo wrote to Douglas, Eddie Lewis and Kubrick, explaining the lines. "Spartacus is clearly the father in this scene. He associates death with fatherhood. And in the next scene---Spartacus, the father, will also be death, the father. Because Antoninus' last view of Spartacus as his father will be his first view of death in that moment when Spartacus drives the knife home."[139]

Crassus arrives, with the fanfare due his position. In the aftermath of his scene with Varinia, the film has shown Crassus's fear, first hinted at in the moment when the surviving slaves all claimed to be Spartacus, that all that he has accomplished is insignificant and transitory. Crassus can control the material world, but the human spirit, he has begun to realize, is beyond his understanding or control. Crassus walks over. Kubrick cuts to a medium establishing shot as he approaches the pair, looking first at Antoninus. Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Crassus. "The night passes slowly, doesn't it." Kubrick cuts to Antoninus, who glares back at Crassus. Crassus then turns to look at Spartacus. Kubrick cuts to Spartacus, who turns his head to follow Crassus, then cuts out to the medium shot. Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Crassus, who has on his face a half-smile, perhaps borrowed from the one portrait from life existing of Richard III, to which Olivier would have had reference for his film of Shakespeare's play. His voice assumes its most controlled and casual modulation. "Spartacus. Kubrick cuts to Spartacus, who looks at Crassus dispassionately. Kubrick returns to Crassus. "You <u>are</u> he. Aren't you."

In Kubrick's rough cut, Trumbo's lines for Spartacus's response to Crassus were replaced by a Fast/Kubrick rewrite that Trumbo called, among more colorful terms, an "obscene catastrophe." In order to support his judgment, Trumbo noted that, when in possession only of his own scripted lines for the scene, Olivier demanded the scene be rewritten so that he would not be made to hit Spartacus.

> You can imagine my surprise when I discovered that Larry, meek as any lamb, had gone through with the slap. I was more than curious about this. My first assumption was that he had no guts, and had slapped because he dared not slap. But on seeing the film, I realized quite the contrary. Having seen all of Spartacus's replies to him in this scene, he understood that the intellectual content, the moral content, of the scene was so heavily in favor of him (Olivier), that he could afford the slap. Not only afford it, but that he could snatch the scene by doing it. Which he did, in a most startling way.[140]

Left as shot, this scene was a disaster for the story, he emphasized. But Trumbo had always been dissatisfied with the scene, and in thinking about it, he realized that Olivier's slap was an extraordinary opportunity. His insight came from the professional conflict between Charles Laughton and Lawrence Olivier, each of whom distrusted and feared the other.

> Remember...Larry's great moment of panic about the confrontation scene in the senate with Laughton. Remember why he wanted the long first portion of his speech cut. He said, "Laughton will sit there and <u>say nothing</u>, and I will be talking. His silence will destroy me altogether, and give the entire scene to Laughton." He was right too; because that's exactly what Laughton had concluded to do. Therefore (and wisely) we have retained only that portion of the CRASSUS-GRACCHUS scene in which there is an <u>exchange</u> of lines between the two antagonists.... Because we were hell-bent on getting speeches for Spartacus to deliver to Crassus in rebuttal to Crassus, as it were. <u>Larry would never have played this scene to a silent Spartacus</u>. Because silence will give the scene to Spartacus, and Larry knew it. But, luckily, we have Sir L. trapped on film. And we can make him play the scene he feared to play with Laughton.... And this scene <u>must</u> end with the destruction of Crassus---his absolute moral defeat.[141]

The defeat is something the film has already suggested. This scene confirms it, both to the audience and to Spartacus. As Trumbo put it in his "Report," the scene shows "that Crassus is not a whole man, and can never be from the

instant of that slap forward. Because the man, in such a confrontation, who must resort to violence, is the man who has lost the intellectual and moral debate."[142]

In response to Crassus's statement, "You are he, aren't you," Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Spartacus, placid, with just a hint of a smile. Kubrick cuts back to Crassus. "Gladiator, I am Marcus Licinius Crassus." Crassus pauses, very slightly and slowly tilting his head and compressing his lips. "You must answer when I speak to you," he says quietly and slowly. . Kubrick cuts again to the same shot of Spartacus, unmoved. Kubrick returns to Crassus. His compressed lips part slightly, and then suddenly his whole head twists violently, and Crassus screams inarticulately. Kubrick cuts to a medium two-shot from the side, roughly of Antoninus's point of view, as Crassus slaps Spartacus, then to an over-the-shoulder close-up of Spartacus, who looks at him with surprise. Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Antoninus, watching this, then returns to a Spartacus close-up as he spits at Crassus.[143] Kubrick cuts to Crassus, then to Spartacus, who looks at him again, calmly, but with a sterner look than before. Kubrick cuts to Crassus, who looks at Spartacus, backs up slightly in the frame, carrying his face into shadows, and then turns away.

Kubrick tracks with Crassus from behind in a medium shot as he approaches Caesar, then turns. "Centurion!" he calls out to the man in charge of the slave detail. The Centurion approaches and salutes. "Let them fight now. Unchain them." Caesar objects. The city has been told that they will fight the

next day, in the Crassus family temple. "They will fight now. For me. Here." Crassus points to an area in front of the gate. "And to the death." This is the closure of that earlier fight, the monstrousness of which began the rebellion. "We will test this myth of slave brotherhood," he continues, as Kubrick cuts to closeups of Antoninus and Spartacus reacting to his order. Kubrick cuts away to a long shot as the Centurion carries out Crassus's order.

As the preparations for the contest are made, Kubrick inserts a close-up of Spartacus and Antoninus. "Don't give them the pleasure of a contest. Lower your guard and I'll kill you on the first rush." "No, I won't let them crucify you," Antoninus says. "I've given my last order. Obey it!" As they go into the fight, they have a real issue to resolve. Spartacus walks slowly up to Antoninus, who at first seems to be following Spartacus's order. But as Spartacus comes within sword reach, Antoninus whips his sword up, slashing at Spartacus's side. Spartacus steps back, hand to his side, and pulls it away, to look at the blood on the hand and then at Antoninus. "I won't let them crucify you," Antoninus says, and attacks as well as he can. But Spartacus is the more skilled. Spartacus disarms Antoninus, then pins his arms and rolls him on his back when he dives for his sword. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Spartacus, looking down on Antoninus. "Forgive me," he says, and we see the motions both in his body and Antoninus's as he stabs upward. Kubrick reverses 160 degrees to look down at Antoninus. "I love you, Spartacus, as I love my own father." This would have linked Spartacus to the figure of death, the reliever of pain, as Spartacus had

described it earlier to Antoninus. Holding back tears, Spartacus replies, "I love you--like my son that I'll never see. Go to sleep."

Antoninus dies, and Kubrick fades almost to black. Then he cuts away to a long shot of Caesar and Crassus, who slowly enter the circle of guards within which the slaves have fought. Kubrick reverses 180 degrees to a full shot of Spartacus, cradling Antoninus's head, and then back to Crassus and Caesar, in medium shot. Kubrick shoots them at a slightly tilted angle, the Noir technique of showing a character in a destabilized world. They look down at Spartacus glumly. Kubrick reverses 180 degrees to their oblique point of view. Trumbo wanted Spartacus to remain silent, to pick up Antoninus and drop his body at Crassus's feet. Douglas decided to keep Fast's concluding lines. "Here's your victory. He'll come back. He'll come back, and he'll be millions." Spartacus turns his back on them. Crassus has forced Spartacus to kill his friend in order to spare him the pain of crucifixion Spartacus will now suffer, and yet he still is unshaken. Crassus uses his last and cruelest tool. "I wonder what Spartacus would say if he knew that the woman Varinia and her child are slaves in my household," Kubrick says, cutting between the tilted shot of Crassus and Caesar, and Spartacus, who stands. Kubrick cuts to a close-up of Spartacus, devastated, and then back again to the tilted shot. "Yes," Crassus says, softly, with pleasure; this is the moment of dominion he has not been able to consummate with Antoninus or Varinia. "Spartacus." Kubrick cuts to the close-up of Spartacus, who had been lost in his feelings, but now looks again at

Crassus. Kubrick returns to the tilt shot. "Crucify him," Crassus orders with satisfaction, and strides off, followed by Caesar. Kubrick cuts to a long shot of Spartacus being led off, then to a medium shot of Caesar and Crassus mounting their horses. Crassus orders Caesar to make sure that all traces of Spartacus are eliminated after his death. They wheel and ride toward the gate, and Kubrick cuts ahead to see them enter. "Did you fear him, Crassus?" "Not when I fought him," Crassus replies. "I knew he could be beaten. But now I fear him. Even more than I fear you." "Me?" Caesar says, with less surprise than he might. "Yes, my dear Caesar, you." Crassus has realized that, whatever he has gained by his small revenge, it has not freed him of his fear. Moreover, he has not saved Rome. Both Spartacus's attack against Rome's injustice, as well as the combined corruption of both the plebeians and the patricians as united in Caesar, continue to exist. Rome, with Crassus in charge, is even closer to collapsing.

Kubrick cuts to Gracchus, settling his affairs. Batiatus arrives, with Varinia. This was Fast's scene, drawn from his novel. Trumbo intended that Gracchus should kill himself prior to Spartacus's arrival at Rome. This was to be shown by cutting from Gracchus's death to a day scene of crucifixion, showing that all of these events did not take place in one night, and then to Varinia's last scene with Crassus, followed by Antoninus and Spartacus's meeting with Crassus. This chronology would make it possible for him to eliminate without discussion the scene in Fast's Spartacus where Gracchus and

Varinia meet. In an interview for a book on the making of Spartacus that was never completed, Trumbo said that he was "surprised to hear that [Fast] was in hot water ten or twelve times over the ten or twelve years..." that Fast was a party member.[144] This seems disingenuous, all the more so as the scene that he went to pains to eliminate in his script was the very one that The Daily Worker attacked as a particularly noxious instance of "Goethe's idealistic vision of the Eternal Woman, leading us all, oppressor and oppressed, `upward and on'.... What we have here is a reverse from the class theme."[145] On the Criterion Videodisc during Gracchus's arrest, Fast adds that "Spartacus...was severely attacked by the...Communist party. The two who joined most viciously in the attack on the book were Dalton Trumbo and John Howard Lawson. These were the two most important people in the Left Communist cultural apparatus on the [West] Coast."

I have not found anything to confirm Trumbo's involvement with the negative criticism Fast's novel received. Trumbo's plotting certainly suggests however that it might have influenced his plotting. Fast thought the scene was vital, and his reference on the Criterion Videodisc seems directed toward linking Trumbo with the "commissars" whose ideologically determined censorship he condemned in The Naked God. It is also possible however that Trumbo simply did not like the scene, in which case Fast was fighting a straw man as Trumbo himself was with "Stanley K. Koestler Jr." Kubrick. Regarding Fast's claims of censorship in The Naked God, Trumbo said in 1960 that "[Fast] was just as bad

as anybody. He would be the first to leap into The New Masses or into The Daily Worker with a vicious condemnation of some poor bastard who wrote a book that didn't quite agree with his line of what a Marxist or a Communist should write.... This is what he forgets, you know." Regarding these kind of attacks, Trumbo added that "[y]ou cannot fight a black list for as many years as I have and retain any desire to install a new one."[146]

Crassus, of course, is in the process of implementing his own blacklist. Batiatus arrives with Varinia. "Oh, there you are," Gracchus says. "Where have you been all this time?" "The city's full of Crassus's legions," Batiatus replies. "We've been hiding. I don't know Rome as well as I know Capua. They're arresting everyone!" Batiatus is about to continue his complaints, but Gracchus reaches out his arm toward Varinia. Batiatus pulls her over. Varinia gives her right hand to Gracchus, and Kubrick cuts to a medium shot of Gracchus, who takes it gently, giving her an evaluating stare. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Varinia, who looks down at him coolly, and then returns to Gracchus. "So this is the woman it took Crassus eight Roman legions to conquer. I wish I had time to make your acquaintance, my dear. Unfortunately, we all have to make (pause) journeys, to different destinations."

Kubrick cuts to a medium two-shot of Varinia and Batiatus; Batiatus is surprised. Journey? Gracchus tells him he's going to Aquitania, with a senatorial pass, where one of Gracchus's cousins is in charge. Batiatus starts to protest, until Gracchus doubles his fee. Then he hands Batiatus articles of

freedom for Varinia and her child. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of Varinia, who is mystified, to Gracchus, who watches them, and then back to the two-shot as Batiatus starts to pull Varinia away. Varinia continues to look at Gracchus. A thought comes to Batiatus, and he pauses. "Where are you going?" Gracchus looks away and tells him "Piscenum," the place where Crassus has given him a "little farmhouse." "Piscenum? That's the dreariest place in Italy!" Batiatus thinks of this a moment, then asks Gracchus to come with them, "to see that I don't misuse the money." "Don't be ridiculous. I'm a Senator. Kubrick cuts to a medium long shot of all three. Now, please go, before the soldiers come here." Varinia runs over and kisses Gracchus on the top of the head and hugs him. "Oh. Heh. This would really make Crassus jealous." He turns around to look at her, as she straightens and smiles at him. "Go and make my joy complete. Save your tears now, save them for the journey." They leave, Batiatus looking back anxiously, as though he suspects Gracchus is not telling him something.

Trumbo wanted this scene out; Fast wanted it in. Neither could (or would) articulate their reasons for this in all of the voluminous material explaining shots and plotting. However, as an element of the Noir format which underlies both the Rome and the Bible film, the hero is confronted with the Good woman and the Noir sorceress. Fast may not have been able to articulate this structure in his defense of why the scene should be in the film, but it fits the Noir pattern of the writing of the period. The Noir male realizes in the end that the sorceress will destroy him, but it is too late for him to change. This is the scene

of that recognition. Rome throughout the film has been represented as a woman. Crassus and Gracchus each compete for her. But in Noir Sorceress fashion, the seeking of her leads to destruction, and the attainment of her also leads to destruction. In Out of the Past, for example, Jeff Bailey meets the good woman and discovers the simple life after he is enmeshed in a history which will lead to his destruction. As he is part of the corrupt community which finds him and pulls him back within its folds, he cannot continue to live in the community which, when it is too late, he realizes is truly his home. So with Gracchus. At heart, he feels a link to Spartacus and his dream--a link obscured somewhat by cuts, yet still apparent in the extant film--on which, in typical Noir male form, he cannot act except in the negative form of denying Crassus the full reach of his power.

Kubrick cuts back to Gracchus alone. He picks up a vial of poison and a knife, and puts down the poison. "Prettier," he says, and the camera rises and tracks partway with him as he walks away, then stops as Gracchus continues into a room with a stone bath, and closes the curtains. Crassus loses though his death the indirect control of the plebeian class--soon to be claimed by Caesar--and any hope of conquering, through Varinia, Spartacus and love. By this loss also, the disastrous effect on the world produced by the Sorceress Rome is restrained, and the possibility of the New Society as symbolized by Varinia and her child is free. Just as Spartacus's hamstringing the guard

foreshadows the Servile revolt, so her freedom foreshadows the freedom of all people, the realization of the slaves' dream.

Kubrick cuts to the Appian Way gate, legionnaires longing outside of it as Batiatus and Varinia emerge in a cart.[147] Three officers halt them. "Identify yourselves, please." Before Batiatus can, the officer who speaks to them tells them to climb down from the cart. "I object to that tone," Batiatus starts to protest, and the officer cuts him off again. "I've got my orders. Varinia simply looks at her child through all this. When she looks up--just as Batiatus gets off the cart, and looks up too--she sees the men on the crosses. Both of them see Spartacus. Kubrick tracks in with his camera to indicate Varinia's emotional reaction. Batiatus hands the lead officer his senatorial pass, then catches Varinia, who has climbed off the cart. "Not a word, please," he whispers. The guard catches part of this suspicious conversation and asks Batiatus about it. Kubrick cuts from this to a medium shot of Varinia walking up the road, then a long shot of her approaching Spartacus's cross. Kubrick cuts to a closeup of her, looking up. "Oh, Spartacus!" Kubrick cuts to Spartacus, from her point of view. Spartacus initially is looking at his men, but then turns to look at Varinia. Kubrick cuts back to her, then Spartacus, each looking sadly at the other. Spartacus has been told that she is Crassus's slave, and in looking down at her Spartacus reacts--tearing up, apparently, except that due to the stress of crucifixion, physiologically tears are no longer possible. Kubrick cuts to Batiatus with the officer, who looks at Varinia and mistakes her grief for curiosity at the

spectacle of a man dying. "Tell the lady no loitering is allowed." A Lanista's sister-in-law, as Batiatus has identified her to the guard, might well be expected to want to watch crucifixions.

Kubrick then cuts to an over-the-shoulder shot above Spartacus, looking down at Varinia. She has to tell him what has happened. "This is your son. He's free, Spartacus, free! Free!" Kubrick cuts to Spartacus, who reacts, eyes widening. He defeated Crassus in the present, because for all that the slaves lost the battle against Rome, they are still free. Crassus seemed to win the battle for the future, by taking control of Rome, and by winning Caesar from Gracchus. But Rome itself is dying; as Caesar's presence suggests, the republic is in its last years. Varinia and the child live; and, in the pattern of the ironic romance, the dream of the new society lives on with them, to come into being at a later time. Spartacus smiles slightly, and tries to speak, but cannot. Kubrick cuts to Varinia. "He'll remember you, Spartacus, because I'll tell him. I'll tell him who his father was, and what he dreamed of!" Batiatus whispers to her to come to the cart. She cannot; this is the man who helped her realize that she had her own life. And yet she must, or she and the child will die. There is only one answer. "Oh, my love, my life. Please die, die, please, please die, my love. Oh, god, why can't you die!" She hugs Spartacus's foot until Batiatus pulls her away, fearfully looking at the guards. Kubrick cuts to Spartacus, looking down at her, in full realization of what forces require her to leave. Kubrick cuts to a long shot as Batiatus whips the horse and pulls away, and then to a close-

up of Spartacus, turning his head painfully to watch the cart, then Varinia, looking back.

The American Legion protested Spartacus because of Trumbo in particular. Hedda Hopper told her readers that it was a "commie" film from a "commie" novel, and not to go. In spite of this, it was quite successful. It certainly helped that President Kennedy made a well-publicized trip to see it in its first few days' run in Washington, D. C.[148] It is probably the case that some of the cuts which make the film more confusing now than it needs to be helped to make it safe for 1960-61; there was little left to which the Legion could point. "Kirk makes an excellent point as a matter of fact," Trumbo told interviewer David Chandler, "that this film--saying what it does say--to be made in America by Americans, not by Russians...is a tremendous testament itself to our views [of] liberty and human dignity."[149] The Kennedy administration thought so too; at Bobby Kennedy's request, Kirk Douglas made several "good-will" trips to Third World countries as "Spartacus."[150]

ENDNOTES

1. Duncan Cooper, "Dalton Trumbo Vs. Stanley Kubrick," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), p. 34. Fast, in a letter to Duncan Cooper dated 4/22/91, page 1, claims that "the plain truth of the matter is that the screenplay for Spartacus was written by Peter Ustinov and myself," and that Trumbo "wrote what was to all effects gibberish and totally unusable." According to Fast, he was rewriting scenes from the beginning of the production, and after the rough cut fiasco--which he blames entirely on Trumbo's writing--he rewrote or discarded all of Trumbo's scenes in the film, in consultation with Kubrick. I do not doubt that, with Kubrick, Fast is responsible for much of the rewriting of scenes during the film which Trumbo found so mysterious and infuriating. But Fast exaggerates the extent of his rewriting, and his extreme personal animus against Trumbo makes him an unreliable source for credits.

2. Peter Ustinov, Dear Me (London: Heinemann, 1977), p. 217.

3. Howard Fast's anger can be heard in his references to Kirk Douglas on the second audio track of the 1992 Criterion laserdisc restored film edition. In his letter to Cooper of April 22, 1991, p. 3, he says that he and Kubrick made the film "against the ignorance, tastelessness and stupidity of Kirk Douglas." Stanley Kubrick assisted in the restoration, but continues to disavow the film. Douglas and Kubrick, who were friends, lost their friendship during the making of the film. 28 years after it was made, Douglas described Kubrick in his autobiography The Ragman's Son (New York: Pocket Books, 1988), p. 305, as "a talented shit." On page 291, Douglas mentions also that Laughton threatened him with a lawsuit during shooting. On the Criterion laserdisc, Douglas elaborates on this: Apparently, Laughton thought he had been mislead about the importance of his character in the film, and hated the script. "You know, Kirk isn't an actor," Trumbo reports Laughton saying to him, in the Chandler interview of August 2, 1960 from the Kirk Douglas Papers at the Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research. Laughton was trying to explain to Trumbo why it was wrong that Trumbo should continue to enlarge Spartacus's character. Allowing Peter Ustinov to write all of Laughton's dialogue apparently mollified him--although it infuriated Trumbo. Indeed, Trumbo complains frequently in his notes in the Douglas papers about "all the speeches here that these spontaneous geniuses on the set have loused up," and added in his "Report on Spartacus:" As far as Peter and Charles are concerned, what they have done is so calculating, so reprehensible, so contrary to the ethics of our profession, that I feel, if we can get the voices, we are morally

and artistically justified in doing any goddamned thing we wish to do with their images on screen." Ironically, according to Duncan Cooper, Douglas had producer Eddie Lewis instruct Ustinov to rewrite his scenes with Laughton in order to diminish the character of Gracchus, as he feared Laughton was becoming too heroic and would detract from his character's heroism.

Dalton Trumbo developed an even greater sense of outrage for Kubrick's behavior than for Ustinov's. According to Trumbo's 1960 interview, Fast and Trumbo disliked each other ever since an argument at a party when Trumbo got out of jail and Fast called him a "fellow convict;" Trumbo said that Fast had only been in 90 days and had no right to puff himself up. Fast then demanded to know if Trumbo had taught classes on Marxism while in prison; he had. Trumbo replied that, as Fast was teaching them, "they must have been short classes." Fast's version of this is that they had met in prison and he insulted Trumbo, but as Fast served his time in West Virginia and Trumbo in Kentucky, that hardly seems likely. This early dislike was multiplied over the course of the film; the interested student of the film can also listen to Fast's opinion of Trumbo on the Criterion laserdisc. Fast apparently was unaware that Trumbo completed the first rewrite, which was credited to Eddie Lewis; consequently, Fast also developed a strong dislike for Lewis. Trumbo's considered opinion of Fast in 1960, in reference to Fast's book The Naked God (1957) was, "well, he was our fool and now he's their fool, but he's still a fool."

4. Bosley Crowther, "Screen: `Spartacus' Enters the Arena", The New York Times, Friday, October 7, 1960, L 28.

5. Gary Crowdus, "Homevideo," Cineaste Vol. XIX, No. 4 (1993), p. 97.

6. J. Hoberman, "Giant," The Village Voice (May 7, 1991), p. 51.

7. Fast, Criterion Videodisc. This contradicts his own claim in his letter of April 22, 1991 to Duncan Cooper that "The Death Valley scene, at the very beginning, was rewritten by me in secret collusion with the first director, Anthony ----- (I have forgotten his last name)." No one else seems to agree with this--in fact, there is really precious little dialogue to change, and to the extent alterations were made, they seem to have been done by Ustinov, not Fast. Significantly, Trumbo wrote not one word of astonishment or complaint about the opening sequence in his "Notes on Spartacus."

8. Somewhat in support of this, Howard Fast claims in his letter of April 22, 1991 to Duncan Cooper that "After [the Death Valley] scene was shot, Douglas discovered that [Mann] had changed the scene to what I had written, and promptly fired him and engaged Stanley Kubrick." This seems nonsense to me,

particularly as elsewhere (as noted above), Fast has expressed his loathing for the whole sequence.

9. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son (New York: Pocket Books, 1989), p. 289.

10. Criterion Videodisc

11. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 288.

12. Howard Fast, "Spartacus and the Blacklist: An Article and Interview with Howard Fast," The Perfect Image (?, Summer 1993?), p.44. Mann himself said little about the incident. Unlike the other principals, seems to have invested less of himself in the film. Also, he was a professional who anticipated the need to work again with some of the people involved--as indeed he attempted to with Douglas in Fall of the Roman Empire, and succeeded in doing with Heroes of Telemark.

13. Ustinov, Criterion Videodisc.

14. Dalton Trumbo, "Notes To Myself on Spartacus", dated August 23, 1959, p. 13, Dalton Trumbo papers, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research. Tony Curtis told Duncan Cooper that Mann was fired because he wanted to emphasize the slave uprising more than the love story, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years", unpublished article obtained from Cooper, p. 1

15. Peter Ustinov, Dear Me (London: Heinemann, 1977), p. 217.

16. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 289, 250. Edward Lewis says on the Criterion videodisc that "Kirk really helped make Stanley, more than anybody, and it was Kirk's suggestion that Kubrick be the new director of Spartacus. That was an enormous break for a young director, so he was a tremendous champion of Stanley's." Douglas had some guilt regarding Mann. In his biography, he claims that he promised to do the next film Mann asked him to be in, and alleges that he kept his promise with The Heroes of Telemark (1965). He mentions that he turned down Fall of the Roman Empire (1964), for which he was offered 1.5 million to make, but he does not mention that the director of that film was Anthony Mann--and that by turning down Mann, he was forced to work with Stephen Boyd, who did not have the emotional intensity for which Mann needed Douglas.

17. At least according to Saul Bass, as quoted on the Criterion videodisc.

18. In one of his comments in his "Notes on Spartacus," Trumbo complains that "I congratulate you" was supposed to be linked to the idea of the gladiator's privilege of dying for ladies and gentlemen, not for their privilege of joining Batiatus's "school." But here Ustinov's ear, and perhaps Mann's sense of the scene, is superior to Trumbo's. I have been a supervisor, and I understood immediately what the purpose of the speech as filmed was. Ustinov is a supervisor who is attempting to inspire his dispirited staff to follow a common corporate goal. There is nothing in the film so far to indicate that anyone would be inspired to die for "quality," but there is quite a bit to indicate that the idea of becoming, not an animal, but a part of an elite group of men with a mission, might well have appeal. Ustinov and Mann, each with his own experience of leading actors, surely felt this. Trumbo, who had not supervised others and felt himself the requirements for leadership, saw the speech more as an opportunity for exposition of dramatic themes. He had no doubt heard such speeches, or heard of them, in studio days. Trumbo's identity in the scene is with Spartacus, who rejects Batiatus's leadership. Ustinov and Mann however, without diminishing the exposition or Spartacus's rejection of Batiates's leadership, have made a slight modification which deepens the psychological realism of the scene. This is, in passing, the only script modification of which Trumbo complains to which Mann probably acquiesced.

19. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son (New York: Pocket Books, 1989), p. 304.

20. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 289. Douglas notes on pp. 290-91 one instance in which Kubrick tried to get a set rebuilt, and Douglas vetoed him.

21. Trumbo, Criterion Videodisc.

22. Trumbo loved the way this scene was shot as he loved no other scene in the film. On the Criterion videodisc he gushes about it, from some set of notes I do not have. In his "Notes on Spartacus," he contents himself with saying, "A bow to the director for a brilliant concept; another to the actors for rendering it so tenderly, so movingly." Fast, typically, seems just to have had a complaint, as registered on the Criterion videodisc: "Why leap up there like that (at the ceiling bars) and get your hand stamped on? I mean, it makes no sense, but it's the stunt-man reaction that is a part of [Douglas's] depiction of the role."

23. Trumbo complains of Jean Simmons' failure to react strongly enough at emotional points in the film, and although Trumbo reserves his complaints for her reactions to the fight between Draba and Spartacus, she is too subtle here. Either she expects to be listened to and barged in on--which is indeed what

happens, true--or she--by which I mean the actress now--needed to react more strongly to what is for now the first time when Varinia herself, as a person, not an animal, has had her right to privacy violated. This is partly her fault, but I suspect, given Kubrick's usual tendency to focus on male characters, it is partly his fault as well for not being as aware as he might be of what her feelings might be expected to be in the scene. She looks over at Batiates, with a hurt expression, and then drops her eyes; adequate, but I would think she should have had a stronger startle response.

24. At least some of this material also was Anthony Mann's footage. "I worked nearly three weeks on what can properly be called the direction, and the entire prologue is mine: the slaves on the mountains, Peter Ustinov examining Douglas's teeth, the arrival at the school for gladiators and the antagonism with Charles McGraw.... For the rest, and up to the escape, the picture is very faithful to my direction." "'A Lesson In Cinema:' Interview with Anthony Mann," Cahiers Du Cinema In English No. 12 (December 1967), p. 50.

25. According to Trumbo's "Notes on Spartacus," originally there were sounds of Varinia's distress on the soundtrack from the adjoining cell. Trumbo thought this was too much. He wanted a wild line to be recorded that would place Varinia a distance away from Spartacus, so that the sounds Spartacus would hear would not be Varinia herself, but another woman, whose pain Spartacus could imagine was similar to Varinia's. In the editing, the compromise was to place Varinia in the cell next to Spartacus, but to eliminate the sounds of distress. Trumbo and Fast (perhaps in the only case where they agree!) both would have liked to have seen more of a reaction From Douglas when Varinia enters, according to comments in Trumbo's "Notes on Spartacus" and the Criterion videodisc. Fast thought that Douglas's "understanding of people and events is very simple, rather primitive. The complexities of a human being are never really present in his acting."

26. According to Trumbo's "Notes on Spartacus," there was a scripted fight between Spartacus and Draba with wooden swords, in which Draba "killed" Spartacus. Parts of the sequence are visible in the training montage. Trumbo was dissatisfied with the scene as shot, but I suspect the desire to reduce the amount of screentime is the reason why it was cut. On the Criterion videodisc, Douglas says that this was Kubrick's idea, to eliminate dialogue and use the images to tell the story.

27. This aspect of Batiates's character, this crafty propaganda of a false leader creating an illusory identity to control his property, is a creation of Trumbo's. In

Fast's Book Spartacus, p. 95, there is no such material on the psychological difficulties posed by fighting gladiators to the death at Capua.

28. Again, this is Trumbo's invention. In Fast's book, Crassus is not a commanding figure at this point. Crassus rapes her, but she is not so crucial a character in the book. The film does not precisely define her, but in context she seems to have a relationship with Crassus. In the book, Men, not women, do the choosing of gladiators. Batiatus selects Spartacus and Draba, he doesn't try to hide them and foist, as it were, inferior stock on his customers. Indeed, Batiatus, not Marcellus, wants Spartacus dead: "`Gladiators are animals,' Batiatus often said. `If one thinks of them as people, one loses all perspective.' The simple fact was that Spartacus refused to be an animal, and for that reason he was dangerous, and for all his skill with the dagger and for all his value for hire, Batiatus preferred him profitably dead." Fast, Spartacus, p. 110. In passing, Draba does not avoid Spartacus in the novel. "...he stands up to begin his day and force his body and mind to the task of killing Spartacus--whom he loves and values above all other white men in the place. Yet isn't it said, `Gladiator--make no friends of gladiators.'" Fast, Spartacus, pp. 105-106. What Trumbo used and what he changed is quite interesting indeed.

29. This is one of those scenes in which clearly Trumbo took pride, and in the shooting and/or editing of which some of the coherence of the scene was lost. Somehow, point of view shots of people Batiatus refers to were left out. In particular, Trumbo, in his "Notes on Spartacus," was exercised about Ustinov changing "They'll fight in loincloths and bless your name," which had reference to the mock consideration of the ladies for their gladiators, and the relief gladiators would have in dying comfortably on a hot day, to the nonsensical "whatever they wear, they'll bless your name." "It's a small thing, a small loss," Trumbo wrote. "A series of such small losses made the Grand Canyon."

30. Fast, Spartacus, p. 347.

31. In Fast's book she is not, but as she was not a particularly important character, Trumbo seems to have redefined her in order to create this conflict.

32. Criterion videodisc

33. Trumbo, "Notes on Spartacus;" Trumbo, Criterion Videodisc.

34. Trumbo is quite eloquent on the intent of the scene in his commentary on the Criterion videodisc during the fight. It is possible that this cutting was indeed all Kubrick's doing. Trumbo complains in his "Last General Notes," page one--

probably written to accompany his Spain Scene Retake list--that "An Olivier scene was deprived of its meaning by being thrown without my knowledge into the midst of another scene." So far as I am able to determine, this seems to be the only sequence where this is the case. It is possible that Trumbo thought the fight distracted from dialogue which was in the cut and was taken out; that is what I am assuming, on the basis of his relatively restrained comments.

35. Duncan Cooper has had much of Trumbo's "Report on Spartacus"'s first section published to accompany his "Who Killed Spartacus?". See Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 30-33.

36. Trumbo, "Notes on Spartacus" Also quoted in Duncan Cooper, "Who Killed Spartacus?", Cineaste Vol XVIII, No. 3 (1991), p. 20, and on the Criterion Videodisc Trumbo track during the last Varinia-Crassus scene. On the Criterion Videodisc during this scene, Trumbo has the following Kubrick-inspired comment, including Trumbo's own revamped Kulishov experiment:

> Regarding directors and their delusions, practically all of these cunning scamps truly believe that worm-eaten old chestnut which extols the effectiveness of one picture over ten thousand words. They're fanatically convinced that their silly camera angles are more interesting to the audience than the actor's spoken dialogue. They hate dialogue because it presents ideas, which directors abominate; causes a thought-reaction, which directors fear; and diverts attention from the visual composition of a scene, which to a director is the only valid reason for making the film in the first place. The result: Letting a director scissor a decent script is like turning a starved weasel loose in a henhouse: Phrases and feathers all over the place, and very little life remaining. A director-friend of mine and I once tested the value of one picture against not ten thousand words, but just three. He flashed on the screen a beautifully angled shot of a manure pile, full of emotion and beautifully lighted. The audience didn't do anything. Then I brought an actor to the scene. He pointed to the manure pile and said, "that's all horseshit." We got a hell of a reaction. Later we tried the scene without the actor, just an offscreen voice, and it still worked. I've thought about it ever since.

37. Michael Ciment, Kubrick (Paris: Calman-Levy, 1980), p. 151, quoted in Duncan Cooper, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years," author's manuscript.

38. Duncan Cooper, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years," unpublished article, p. 4. Obtained from Duncan Cooper, 2026 Peach Orchard Drive, Apt. T1, Falls Church, VA 22043.

39. Trumbo provides some background on this in Dalton Trumbo, Additional Dialogue: Letters of Dalton Trumbo, 1942-1962, pp. 490-507; pp. 534-535; 536.

40. I am reliant in this on Duncan Cooper's unpublished research entitled "Spartacus--Still Censored After All These Years," and on my conversation with him regarding this problem on July 6, 1996.

41. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 296. Regarding Universal's history, I am indebted to a conversation on July 6, 1996 with Duncan Cooper, who has spoken at length in unpublished interviews to Ed Muhl about these interesting but somewhat murky corporate maneuvers. Muhl is reluctant to discuss, or may not remember, much of the details about this final period of the film's production, but has outlined to Cooper in detail the status of Universal in the late 50's and early 60's.

42. Wasserman fired Muhl shortly after taking over Universal's production company in 1964; Duncan Cooper informs me that Muhl's impression was that his penchant for "controversial" films had something to do with this.

43. In his letter of February 24, 1959 to Michael Wilson (Additional Dialogue, p. 484), Trumbo says:

> Lew Wasserman, president of Music Corporation of America and the most powerful single person in the business, knows that I have written the screenplay, and actually has been negotiating for the moneys from UI which ultimately reached me. Others at MCA also knew the secret, if one can call it that. In fact, the only people in town who do not know the identity of the author are the two chief executives at UI.

It is possible that Trumbo meant Ed Muhl and Mel Tucker--although if this is the case, Muhl certainly knew shortly after this letter of Trumbo's authorship--but it is also possible that Trumbo intended to refer to the financial, rather than production executives of Universal.

44. Trumbo, Additional Dialogue, pp. 493-494.

45. Trumbo himself continued to use aliases after the blacklist was broken, according to the list of his scripts in the Trumbo papers at the Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research, presumably for just this reason.

46. In this again I am indebted to Duncan Cooper, who elicited this information from Ed Muhl.

47. This also is perhaps why Cleopatra became such an overstuffed nonentity of a film; to make it more meaningful would have been to make it potentially too controversial.

48. Trumbo, "Notes on Spartacus," in the "Revolt in the Kitchen" section.

49. In the release print, according to the restoration director Robert Harris, the studio substituted shots done without blood, deeming the blood to be too much for audiences. Fast claims on the Criterion Videodisc that this is "the great scene of the film...the conception was in my book. It was executed as I conceived it, and I conceived it in terms of the reality of the time. It also did not depend on foolish dialogue." Just prior to this, Fast expresses his irritation with one detail. "In the book, each would fight with a knife, which was the nature of gladiator fights at the time. They were knife fights. Now here, they arm them with the weapons that a later generation of gladiators used. That's quite all right. It satisfies the film-goers' concept, and it makes for a very exciting fight." But Trumbo has added a considerable degree of subtlety in each of the characters, which Fast does not acknowledge, and in his book (Howard Fast, Spartacus (1951), pp. 97-98, Fast himself describes both the Thracian sica and the retiarri, who fought with fish net and tridens, and were "just beginning their epoch of popularity."

50. Mann perhaps noticed this. See his comments on the direction in "'A Lesson In Cinema:' Interview with Anthony Mann," Cahiers du Cinema in English No. 12 (December, 1967), p. 50.

51. The most accessible source for this is Dalton Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), p. 32.

52. Fast recalls his initial horror the scene on the Criterion Videodisc. Trumbo devotes a page of stern lecture, avuncular suggestions, professional objections, and judicious flattery devoted to removing or diminishing the soup-drowning scene in his "Notes on Spartacus," originally intended for Kirk Douglas and Stanley Kubrick. In his original "Notes to Myself" on which the public, so to speak, "Notes on Spartacus" were based, he is a bit more direct: "When Kirk

kills Marcellus by putting him in the stew, there is far too much Marcellus, far too much stew, and far too much emphasis on straight, disgusting brutality. We had esthetic brutality in the death of Draba. This is merely pothouse brutality." Dalton Trumbo Papers, Box 38, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research.

53. Quoted from Trumbo script scene, Criterion Videodisc, chapter 50.

54. Duncan Cooper, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years," author's manuscript. Douglas, on the second audio track of the Crassus-Glabrus scene at Crassus's villa, says of cuts in general that "obviously, any cut that is made in a movie, you make thinking that that cut would help to make it a better movie. Perhaps it was something that we thought was being overstated...If you put every thought that you'd like to use, you'd have a sprawling movie." These were late cuts, but Douglas presumably could have fought against them. It is possible that he simply did not understand the critical need for the Roman plot's coherence to have Caesar properly defined.

55. Trumbo, "Notes on Spartacus," "problem of the empty forum" Trumbo has quite an interesting background comparison on Crassus and Gracchus on the Criterion videodisc.

56. Howard Fast, Criterion Videodisc.

57. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 280.

58. This is a summary of Trumbo's plot argument in his optimistically entitled "Report on Spartacus," section one: "The Two Conflicting Points of View on Spartacus." Much of this is readily available in abridged form. See Dalton Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 30-33.

59. Trumbo commented that Spartacus's speech as shot, filled with rhetorical questions, seemed to be taken from the novel. "A few of those questions may be mine, but very few; the rest are out of Fast, or written by yourselfs. I wish I could persuade you to take it almost as a rule that dialogue taken from a novel rarely translates itself into dramatic dialogue in film or theater." Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus," "The Matched Pairs".

60. Howard Fast, Spartacus, p. 109-110

61. Fast, Spartacus, p. 166.

62. Trumbo, "The Matched Pairs," "Report on Spartacus" Fast and Douglas do not have comments on this, or most other individual scenes. Kubrick's comments also tend to be general, and more directed toward the process of making the film than on the finished result. Trumbo, in his undated "Last General Notes," Box 39, Kirk Douglas Papers, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research, refers to "rhetorical speeches and character gems from the newly discovered Fast script which should have been read months and months ago." Trumbo apparently was unaware at that time that Fast had been actively involved in the production, but he had been told that some of the "rhetorical" material he disliked was Fast's.

63. Arthur Koestler, The Invisible Writing, p. 326, cited in Duncan Cooper, "Dalton Trumbo Vs. Stanley Kubrick", Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), p. 35.

64. George Orwell, "Arthur Koestler," Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol. 3 (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1968), p. 235.

65. George Orwell, "Arthur Koestler," Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol. 3, p. 240; pp. 241-242

66. Trumbo states this in his undated "The Sequence on Vesuvius: Notes," in Box 35, Folder 12, Kirk Douglas Papers, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research.

67. On the Criterion videodisc, prior to the final battle, Douglas speaks of the contrast between Fast's "Christlike" Spartacus and his interpretation of him as a man like his immigrant parents, both gentle and harsh as required.

68. Michael Ciment, Stanley Kubrick, p. 151, cited in Duncan Cooper, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years"

69. George Orwell, "Arthur Koestler," Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, p. 238.

70. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 286

71. Duncan Cooper, "Dalton Trumbo Vs. Stanley Kubrick," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), p.34.

72. Trumbo, "The Sequence on Vesuvius: Notes"

73. Trumbo, "The Sequence on Vesuvius: Notes"

74. See Duncan Cooper, "Dalton Trumbo vs. Stanley Kubrick," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 34-37.

75. Trumbo, "Notes To Myself on Spartacus," p. 13.

76. Trumbo, "Thank God He's Through Dept.," "Report on Spartacus," p. 63.

77. I will return to this point later, but I would point out that as Crassus views his sexuality as an extension of the dominating power of Rome (most notably in the restored "oysters and snails" sequence), Gracchus comments that he respects the Roman institution too much to profane it by his inability to remain true to one woman--thus justifying his harem of female slaves. Spartacus by contrast has the proper ancient Roman--and not coincidentally, modern 50's American--committed relationship to one woman.

78. Trumbo, "The Sequence on Vesuvius: Notes.

79. Fast, Spartacus, p. 286.

80. Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 296.

81. Fast offers the proposal that "it may have been" during the shooting of the battle sequences in Spain that Douglas and Kubrick's relationship was strained. Why he would honestly claim that seems inexplicable, as Saul Bass designed the battle scenes, everyone liked them, and Kubrick followed them. Douglas wasn't even in Spain for most of the filming of these scenes. I suspect that he had considerably more knowledge about what exactly the strains were between Douglas and Kubrick than he admits on the Criterion videodisc.

82. Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 307. It is interesting to note that in his book, pp. 296-297, just after he says that his relationship to Kubrick "is a strange one," and just before he describes his reaction to the rough cut and to Trumbo's "Report on Spartacus," he tells a story about Kim Novak's influence over the director of Strangers When We Meet, a film he made while Spartacus was being edited, and which he otherwise leaves unmentioned. Novak was sleeping with the director, and she "was excited about a wonderful idea she had come up with" during the film production. She tried to use her closeness to the director to make the film her way, which he--because of his superior knowledge of the film's story structure--knew was wrong. He convinced the director that

Novak's suggestions were wrong. What he seems to be suggesting indirectly is that he had a "love affair" with Kubrick--a strong identification with and attraction for Kubrick's skill and ability as a filmmaker--and Kubrick used this to betray him.

83. David Chandler, "Interview With Dalton Trumbo, August 2, 1960" (Unpublished book on Spartacus, Douglas Papers Box 34, folder 9), p.20.

84. In addition to the scheduled battle-footage, this included retakes to alter the following scenes:

1. Return to Capua: Matched Pairs (in order to show Spartacus becoming the leader
2. First Tigranes Scene (to increase Spartacus's stature as planner)
3. Spartacus "Wait for Me" Vignette (cut from release print)
4. Spartacus and Prisoners: Metapontum (cut from release print)
5. Tigranes' Betrayal: Spartacus to Slaves
6. Vignette, Eve of Silarus: "Home"
7. Spartacus-Varinia: Eve of Silarus (cut)
8. "Identify Spartacus" scene
9. Antoninus-Spartacus: Wagon Wheel scene
10. Spartacus-Crassus: Confrontation
11. Spartacus-Antoninus: to the death
12. Spartacus-Crassus: Finale, after kill
13. Spartacus-Varinia: At Cross

85. Douglas, The Ragman's Son, p. 297.

86. "Interview with Dalton Trumbo, August 2, 1960", p. 13.

87. Dalton Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus, section two: The Matched Pairs." (p. 11)

88. Most of this is read by Robert Harris on the Criterion Videodisc.

89. Criterion Videodisc.

90. Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus, section Two: First Gracchus-Batiatus Scene, p. 17.

91. Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus, Section two: First Gracchus-Batiatus Scene", p. 15. This section is also read on the Criterion Videodisc on Trumbo's

track during this scene, and Trumbo wrote of it in his February 24, 1959 letter to Michael Wilson, in Helen Manfull (ed.), Additional Dialogue: Letters of Dalton Trumbo, 1942-1962 (New York: M. Evans and Company, Inc.), p. 484.

92. Ustinov, on Criterion Videodisc during first Tigranes scene--why there, it is hard to say, unless Robert Harris determined that Ustinov rewrote Trumbo's rewrite in this scene. This is something that certainly was not impossible, as the first Tigranes scene clearly was based on Trumbo's version, but abbreviated and altered. Ustinov and Fast have both claimed that they should be given writing credit for the film (Fast had brought a case to the screenwriter's union in 1960, which he lost), and I am informed by Duncan Cooper (to whom I am indebted for knowledge of Kirk Douglas's fears regarding Gracchus) that Trumbo did no writing after his last retake scenes. Thus, while Trumbo established the strategy of the film after Douglas rejected Kubrick's "Bandit Crixus" and "The slaves destroyed themselves" version, and while all of the rewrites are based on his scenes, the final result is probably the result of the Fast-Ustinov rewrite team. I have chosen to emphasize Trumbo's contributions to the script over theirs. I think that Trumbo's complaints often are a bit overstated, yet I tend to agree cautiously with Trumbo that he had a better strategy of the character for film--Ustinov was a playwright and Fast a novelist, after all--and I find on examining the scenes that Ustinov and Fast more blurred Trumbo's themes in the script than developed ones of their own. Their rewrites tended to be more of individual scenes than of the film. Kubrick was Trumbo's most significant foe, next to those responsible for the final cuts in July 1960, and Trumbo won that battle--if not entirely the war.

93. Criterion Videodisc. Ustinov explains how he and Laughton rehearsed the Ustinov script the night before, and then would play it out before Kubrick in such an impressive fashion that Kubrick felt obliged to do the scene their way. Trumbo, in his "Last General Notes," p.1, probably written to accompany the retake scenes for Spain he had written, sums up the results as follows:

> The scene between Batiatus, Gracchus and the Girls was totally corrupted and deprived of all meaning for the sake of a fe snickers and a climax of irrelevant fuzz, while, without my knowledge, one of the best speeches I have written in the film (if I may assume that some are good to have a basis for comparison) did not even get before the camera, was not even attempted, could not even compete.

94. Douglas discusses the scene in Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, pp. 292-294.

95. Fast, Spartacus, p. 329. "I don't want to rape you, Varinia. I don't want to have you the way I have a slave. Yes--I've had the slaves here. I don't know how many women I've slept with. Women and men too. I don't want any secrets from you. I want you to know me as I am. Because if you love me, I'll be something else. Something new and fine." Surely this is what Trumbo based his scene on. I will leave it to the reader to judge between Fast and "Hollywood."

96. Given that Spartacus was to have ordered a rapist hung just prior to Tigranes's first arrival with the lines "When you rape a woman you make her your slave. Slavery is worse than death. Hang him.", this point would have come across even more forcefully, had the scene not been cut.

97. At the same time, while I have no question of the scene's function as part of the plot, I cannot rule out that Fast was speaking from some personal knowledge of Trumbo's feelings about the scene at the time that I don't have. In his "Notes to Myself on Spartacus, August 23, 1959," in the context of attempting to make sense of Kubrick's seeming preference for Crassus's character over Spartacus's while he was working on rewrites, Trumbo wrote the following amazing speculation:

Stanley Kubrick is a guy who is a Jew, and he's a man who hates Jews. He has said to me that the Jews are responsible for their own persecutions because they have separated themselves from the rest of humanity. He has said this to me in relation to the slaves and Spartacus. Yet on the other hand, Stanley, who is thirty years old, has married a German. The question in my mind is this: Did he marry her because he loved her or did he marry her to punish the Germans (through her) for what they had done to the Jews? Therefore we have the problem about Stanley which is terribly important in relation to this picture. What's he trying to prove? It may be that he is a more devoted Jew than any other. It may be that he is the essential renegade. It seems to me quite probable that he is a homosexual - but one who has managed not to be a raving one and is perhaps struggling toward not being one at all.

These allegations--the ad hominem parallel of his suspicion that Kubrick preferred Koestler's book because of ideological reasons--seem to be unguarded thoughts to himself, symptoms of his enmeshment in a homophobic and antisemitic culture, which to some extent he himself sought to change in his work, rather than anything he would state as a belief or write to be published. I take this as more of a sign of Trumbo's agitation than of anything else. I offer it here in fairness to Fast, whose accusation otherwise seems so calculatedly defamatory.

98. Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus, Section II: Encampment at Vesuvius," pp. 17-21.

99. Here, on the Criterion videodisc, they preface a reading of some of Trumbo's commentary with the following: "Unfortunately, Trumbo's following comparison with the Roman part of the film became moot when two key scenes that he mentions, the public house and the slum street scenes, were cut from the final release version." This seems to be Robert Harris's way of letting Kubrick off the hook. Trumbo does indeed cite the two scenes that were cut, but several others as well. But Trumbo's main point is that the Roman sections are made up of strongly delineated individuals, and the slave sections with an insipid Spartacus, and an unseen slave community. These critiques were valid at the time, and unfortunately still sufficiently valid enough that Duncan Cooper, in "A Second Look--Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. VI, No. 3 (1974); and "Who Killed Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), in which he revisits his argument with Trumbo's critiques, recently made available at the Wisconsin archives, has made a similar critique of the film for over twenty years. Duncan Cooper argued at the conclusion of "Who Killed Spartacus" that, if there is anyone to "blame," ultimately it must be Douglas. As I have shown above, he tried to balance the varied interpretations of Spartacus in order to create his own interpretation, and in some areas failed to cover up the contradictions of the narrative. Duncan Cooper has noted to me in private correspondence that, as a result of his interview with the film editor Robert Lawrence and producer Edward Muhl, he now thinks the studio is the key culprit in the most damaging deficits in the extant film, an argument with which I concur. My own work indicates just how dangerous a Roman narrative would appear to be, given a blacklisted screenwriter, and with Lew Wasserman's new regime at Universal, notwithstanding Wasserman having been Douglas's agent, the film was an orphan by the time it was being prepared for final prints. Kubrick and Douglas may be faulted for resisting Trumbo's pertinent suggestions, yet they followed them in many cases; had the film been released without studio intervention, its reputation would be higher today.

100. Trumbo, "Notes on Spartacus, Section Two: Spartacus and the Child", p. 22.

101. Kubrick has his gladiator cavalry train in a manner more in accordance with European cavalry tactics of the 18th and 19th centuries, striking at melons as though they had stirrups with which to brace themselves. In fact, cavalry at this period would have used spears or pikes.

102. Spartacus "Material To Be Shot In Spain" revised September 23, 1959. Bryna Productions, Inc., Kirk Douglas Papers, Box 10, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research.

103. On the Criterion videodisc, they read Trumbo's critique of the scene from his "Report." One of the points of which Trumbo complains was the rewriting of his poem's end:

> I can only assume that you view this attempt at poetry exactly as you view my attempts at dialogue: it is something that I did which now belongs to you, you know much more about it than I, and so you will do with it as you wish. You cut the heart from it without consultation or consent--and then you go on to a reprise worthy of a third-rate musical comedy.
>
> However, this poem is not your property. It is my gift to Spartacus. Either you accept that gift in the spirit which motivated it--or you must return the whole to me. Once you butcher it, you reject it. It is now mine, and I have every personal right as well as moral and professional duty, to tell you that you must use all of this poem as it is written, without changing so much as a syllable of it--you must use it full and exactly--or you may not use it at all.
>
> The missing lines are:
>
> Through blue and purple-shadowed woods I go,
> Bewitched by the distant bellowing of cows
> and the smell of pine-smoke,
> And a faraway light,
> And the voices of kinfolk
> Together at night . . .
>
> The callousness of making this cut without even the courtesy of a telephone call to the author, comprises much more than an attack on my work; it is an assault upon my personality, upon me as a human being who has done nothing to merit the offense. You would be filled with disgust for me if I did not, on this issue at least, stand firmly on my rights and demand redress or return."

Kubrick's redress was not to stage the poem again, but to keep the reprise, while intercutting the imagery of the last lines within the poem itself. The effect is more powerful than Trumbo's original poem alone would have been, even with reaction shots of the listeners, and ties the whole meaning of the poem more tightly to Spartacus than Trumbo could have originally foreseen. I have no written record of Trumbo's response, but presumably he was satisfied with the result.

104. Trumbo, "The Sequence on Vesuvius: Notes":

> In the beginning I was so delighted with Stanley's concept of the love story (which I consider the greatest single contribution to the ultimate success of our film), that I surrendered to him entirely on the scene in which Spartacus asked Varinia to teach him to read. That one line--"Teach me to read"--could have been one of the most revealing and moving lines in the whole film. (I say this defending the idea we have lost, not the specific fashion in which the scene embodying the idea was written. This scene was cut because it was asserted that once Spartacus desires Varinia he can think of nothing else, and if we showed the groping of his personality toward any aspect of intellectual beauty when he should be concerned only with the disposition of his genitalia, some buck-toothed Mississippi cretin masturbating in the darkness of the second balcony might titter. I say, let him titter. I say that Spartacus is a man rather than a dog after a bitch in heat; and that a man, unlike a dog, is quite capable of aspiring toward knowledge while simultaneously aspiring toward love. I say that being a man, a creature capable of thought, it is not at all incredible that Spartacus should aspire to two or three different things, among which love is the strongest, but only one.

105. This is one of Trumbo's most elaborate analytical breakdowns of a scene, and while part of it is on the Criterion Videodisc, if in a somewhat jumbled form, the greater part of it is not readily available. It is entitled "The Love Scene: Varinia-Spartacus", from "Report on Spartacus, Section II: Scene-by-Scene runthrough." I have abbreviated it slightly at the beginning, and by four or five paragraphs at the end:

I think the line "I know nothing--nothing. I want to know--and I want--I want to know." qualitatively inferior to the script line: "And I want you. And I want--I want to know--"

I also regret that even here, in a short scene, you have felt it necessary to combine and to cut. The scene is still good, but your fatal tendency to cut down both Spartacus and Varinia to smaller and smaller speeches, smaller and smaller proportions, has cost us something here. Beautifully acted and directed as it is--it is still not as good as it could have been if you had shot the script instead of diddling with it and diminishing it at the last moment.
From the moment Spartacus sees the wind in her hair (which I'm sure the audience will not see since the camera does not go in on her for it) and says: "I want to know where the wind comes from," my scene is far better than yours

because it allows Varinia something, too. A love scene is between two people. I had it between two people. You have chopped Varinia's lines, condensed Spartacus's, and made the balance of the scene all from him, rather than from each to the other, as a love scene should be.

Witness: THE SCRIPT

Varinia
(Etc., ending with) And the night wind stirs with his breath.

Spartacus
(he still wants to know)
I want to know why a man can love and hate at the same time.

Varinia
(She's in the scene too; she participates)
I'll teach you.

Spartacus
And I want to know you. I'll never understand enough about you. I want to know every part of you. Every curve and line. Every thought. Every beat of your heart.

Varinia
(kissing)
Learn me. Memorize me . . .

Now attend: RE-WRITE ON SET:

Varinia
(Etc., ending with:)
And the night wind stirs with his breath.

Spartacus
I want to know why a man can love so much and hate so much. I want to know all about you. I want to know every part of you. Every curve and line. Every thought. Every beat of your heart.

Bam! That's your love scene.

What compulsive instinct for destruction possesses you people to deliberately down-grade and actually destroy lovely lines, and lovely ideas? You are the worst enemies of Spartacus! And how can you, now that you have seen the

result of your work, be so extravagant as to spoil the few good scenes that remain to him?

"I want to know why a man can love so much and hate so much." What sort of idiocy is this? What he wants to know, dazzled with love for Varinia, is why he is simultaneously filled with hate. That is the question, not this "so much" business which relates in no way to the present, but to some bit of schoolboy philosophy. He says in the script exactly what he means, he brings up the thing that puzzles him, a valid thing that relates to that precise moment: "I want to know why a man can love and hate at the same time." That's the point of the line: at the same time! It's gone.

The loss of Varinia's response, "I'll teach you", cuts her out of the verbal love-play. She is not permitted to offer him anything. The loss is serious, because wherever it is possible for this young woman to do or say something that is useful or moving, she badly needs the opportunity to do it.

Next we lose the lovely line, "And (that and is important!) I want to know you. I'll never understand enough about you." This is the only graceful and poetic way to get into the various categories of what he wants to know about her. The line "I'll never understand enough about you" is a statement of her endless charm, her infinite variety, and points toward the future--a future which will never be long enough for him to learn all of her lovely qualities.

So, after beginning this poetic thought with the senseless question about why a man can love so much and hate so much, we plow instantly to: "I want to know all about you." And you've killed the magic as surely as if you'd used a club.

Let's look at it again. Forgive this time and space, but I have to look at it again. I simply must find out why you do this to yourselves, what is behind it, and what I can do to persuade you that occasionally, for the good of this film, the script should be followed.

SCRIPT	REWRITE
And I want to know you. I'll never understand enough about you.	I want to know why a man can love so much and hate so much. I want to know all about you.

Can't you see what it means when one says, "And I want to know you" and when he says "I want to know all about you?" The first line is spoken to the whole girl, her heart and soul and spirit. The second is a line you say to a pick-

up in a bar after the third drink: the man in the bar doesn't want to know her as a whole human being; he merely wants to know about her. Is she of age? a virgin? name? address? previous affairs? That's what you've reduced it to. The about should come in as it did in the script: "I'll never understand enough about you." Can't you see it? Spartacus wants to know the whole girl, since she is so wonderful that he perceives the world doesn't hold enough time for him to understand enough about her. The barfly merely wants to know all about a girl, period.

Anyhow, you've spoiled it, and you complete the desolation by ruthlessly cutting Varinia's lovely response: "Learn me."

It's beautifully shot, nicely directed, and well acted. I'm sure people will tell you it's a good scene. Good scenes aren't enough when we can have great ones. I know what this scene could have been and should have been: it could and should have been great, twice as moving as it is. In my book when a great scene becomes downgraded to a good scene, it becomes a bad scene. Neither our film nor the Spartacus-Varinia story is in good enough shape to permit incompetent dramatists the luxury of downgrading fine scenes to merely good ones.

There is something else about the staging of this scene to which I should like to direct your attention. When the words are over and the actions of love begin, it becomes a master scene without close-ups, without detail, without seeing the look on the faces of the lovers.

I yearn to see the emotion in their eyes, the tenderness of their touch, the yearning of their smiles. All of this we miss because the scene is shot as a master instead of an intimate study of emotions. What's so great about master scenes anyhow? That the actors have good memories and the camera that much film? Where is the feeling of these two people, where is the emotion of love? I see the motion of love all right, but there is not one shot of its emotion.

Let me give you a contrast. When Crassus speaks of his emotional commitment (sic), or when he even thinks of it, you go at once to a closeup of him. The man who said the eyes are a mirror of the soul wasn't talking nonsense, and you show knowledge of it. For we se Olivier's eyes, and every facial twitch the emotion in them produces, as he speaks of his love, his Rome, his dream. That's why those scenes are so great. (That, and that his lines are not altered on the set without intelligent consultation to the end of improving the scene rather than of destroying it.)

But when we go to Spartacus in the arms of Varinia, his dearest of possessions, his most exquisite emotional stimulant--do we see the mirror of his soul?--do we see his face? We do not. To be frank, we see mainly his posterior and thighs. While I'm not morally against this sort of thing--these foetal positions, these passes toward the 69 attitude which I consider dangerously sophisticated for a man of his knowledge and character, these rollings and tumblings about--while I am not, as I say, morally against them, I'm pretty sure I'm aesthetically and dramatically against them.

From the moment they go into the clinch, this scene is shot from the outside, and not once from the inside. You show us the motion of love (which is common to all animals)--and you refuse to show in close-ups the emotion of love, which is uniquely human.

Because of its purely animal aspect (and perhaps because I'm a prude), I don't like this rolling about on the ground, and I don't think many people in the audience will either. It's daring, yes. But for what do you dare? For what any amateur can show better with a pair of dogs. Many love scenes work because they excite the audience. This one is so explicit, and so utterly devoid of emotion, that I guarantee you no one will be sexually or emotionally stimulated by it, will feel empathy for it. I think it will remind them of how they would look if photographed unawares in the act of beginning coitus. And I think they would not like to be photographed in such activity, and it will make them uncomfortable, and even vaguely repel them to see Spartacus and Varinia photographed exclusively in the animal aspect of sexual love.

The result of this aftermath on the ground is to downgrade and even faintly to degrade Spartacus. We know that these movements and motions are common, therefore we are not startled by them; but we also know that they are private, and so I think that we shall be embarrassed at seeing them.

But you may counter, isn't the same rule true of a kiss? No. Custom and usage and tradition rule out that as counter-argument. If only we could show Spartacus and Varinia in these moments of tender passion at close view, which is to portray the spiritual side of love, then we might dare show them in the master view portraying the animal aspect of it.

But this scene is all animal, and never spiritual. In master scenes you show the animal in Spartacus, while in closeups you show the spiritual in Crassus--I am compelled to ask, why? Why are you trying to stack the cards against our hero, against the leader of our slaves? There is a point of view here that must be

explored--I don't understand it. And someone must understand it before we proceed further.

106. Trumbo's comments on this may be found during the first Tigranes scene on the Criterion Videodisc.

107. "Retakes," Douglas Papers, p. 13.

108. Criterion videodisc

109. history of the scene and quote from Trumbo, "After the Battle, Through Glabrus," "Report On Spartacus, pp. 30-31. Fast complains on the Criterion videodisc that in the book (as in Trumbo's scene) this would have been a sequence

110. Trumbo, "Glabrus Reporting to the Senate," "Report on Spartacus", p. 31.

111. Trumbo, "Pregnancy Scene by the Water," "Report on Spartacus," p. 32.

112. Robert Harris, Criterion Videodisc.

113. Trumbo, "Pregnancy Scene By the Water," "Report on Spartacus," p. 41.

114. Fast, Criterion Videodisc.

115. Trumbo, "Pregnancy Scene By the Water," "Report on Spartacus," p. 39.

116. See Duncan Cooper, "Who Killed Spartacus," pp. 22-24; Dalton Trumbo, "Report on Spartacus," Cineaste, p. 31.

117. Duncan Cooper, "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years," pp. 7-10, and personal conversation with Duncan Cooper to clear up continuities.

118. At this point on the Criterion videodisc, Trumbo on the second audio track explains Caesar's significance in the Roman narrative. This commentary is a particularly good answer to Kubrick's claim that Trumbo had relatively little knowledge of Roman history.

119. This originally was to have been a short battle montage over a map of Italy, indicating the army's progress, culminating in the march into Metapontum. That was in the previews, but was one of the "content" cuts that Muhl says the New York corporate offices of Universal ordered. It is puzzling that at no place

does the film mention that Spartacus's army defeated forces led by both sitting consuls. Cassius's Cisalpine Gaul army presumably is the one to which the Metapontum defeat refers.

120. Duncan Cooper, in his "Spartacus--Still Censored After All These Years," pp. 10-11, says that Kubrick cut this sequence out in his rough cut. This apparently was one of Trumbo's small victories after his "Report on Spartacus."

121. Perhaps this was one of those historical quibbles Kubrick had with Trumbo. According to Plutarch, Crassus "feasted the people," and even gave the entire city of Rome three months' stipend during his consulship subsequent to his defeat of Spartacus. Yet still, after all this and other such sacrifices, he remained the richest man of the ancient world, renowned for his avarice, a fault which marred all his virtues. Cicero had evidence to indicate that Crassus knew of the Catiline plot. Cicero's paradox VI, in Paradoxa Stoicorum, argues that Crassus was both the richest man in the world and the poorest, for his desires outstripped human needs, and the victor over the slave insurrection himself was a slave to material desires, causing him to practically sack Rome with his prosecutions of citizens to acquire their money. Regarding another patrician who did this, Cicero wrote "If you are a citizen what makes Spartacus an enemy?" Cicero, De Oratore in two volumes II Book III together with De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria tr. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 297, p. 281.

122. Lost somewhere--either not shot, or shot and destroyed unseen 14 years later, when Universal destroyed the Spartacus outtakes--was a scene in which Spartacus walked among the Roman prisoners, all of whom were from Gaul, and posed to them a classic stoic paradox, "That only the wise man is free, and that every foolish man is a slave." He was to have pointed out to the slave army's prisoners that the "slave" army was free, and whether they lived or died they would always be free. The Gauls had joined Rome, made themselves slaves to their officers to fight against their own people, and were now slaves of the slave army. He would now release them; they could return to their Roman masters, or join the slave army, return home, and be free.

123. Dalton Trumbo, "Retakes, First Draft," p. 36.

124. Trumbo, "Note on Tigranes-Spartacus Final Scene," "Retakes (First Draft, with Notes, and old Scenes for Comparison," p. 36.

125. Trumbo, "First Tigranes Scene," "Retakes (First Draft, With Notes, and Old Scenes for Comparison)," p. 13.

126. In his "Spartacus--Varinia, Tent--Eve of Silarus," "Retakes: First Draft," Trumbo rewrote this scene in a manner which restated most of these themes more crudely, in words. He had watched it enough times to write down the dialogue, but apparently did not analyze carefully the interaction of camera movements and actor's business to understand what was going on, and thought that it was "limp." This was one of the rare instances where Trumbo's comments on Kubrick and Fast's rewritten scenes was almost completely wrong. The two points he makes which have some purchase in the scene as it plays is that Spartacus emphasizes by his words that it is his child, rather than their child; and that Spartacus tells her to "take care of my son." "Does he think she'll throw the child away? Doesn't he think she's a woman, a mother? Does he feel it necessary to tell her to do what every mongrel bitch unfailingly does without such pretentious urgings?" It is not hard to see why Fast and Kubrick, confronted with comments like this on some of their most sensitive work, should have felt affronted. But of course, in relation to Trumbo, they had dished out far more than they had received.

127. Criterion Videodisc, 2nd audio track during the battle sequence.

128. The riderless horse idea is one that Fast had thought would be a good way to end the film.

129. According to his "Crassus Walks Through the Battlefield" in his "Report," Section Two, pp. 46-47, Trumbo wrote lines for Crassus in this scene. He was to have expressed his astonishment that the slave women fought and died with their men, and wondered about the mysterious bond the slaves seemed to have for each other. "Nothing about this battle pleases me," he was to have complained. The lines were never shot. Trumbo was outraged:

> If, after all the effort that went into writing of what could have been an absolutely superb moment---a moment essential to the intellectual and spiritual comprehension of what this film is about---if these were cut from the script before shooting, and if no one consulted me about the cut (which no one did), then I charge bad faith--bad faith in relation to me, bad faith in your obligations as artists to the medium that feeds you. And I say, you don't deserve to have a good film.
>
> For the cutting of these lines before they reach film represents a final and irrevocable step in the total elimination of women from this film; in the total downgrading of the moral and heroic quality of the slave rebellion; in the castration of Spartacus as a character of

> any consequence in the film; in an obsession for the Small View of Spartacus as almost to represent a conspiracy, a vulgar conspiracy to kill any distinction which this film might have had....
> If we do not have them---well, I become physically ill. Worse--I feel like a prisoner who wants to kill somebody, who wants to smash his fists into the face of the person responsible, who wants to yell for help--and can do nothing about it except type more words---words that have lost all meaning---words that die in the void like an idiot's dream shouted from the bottom of a cistern. I mean that.

Trumbo was overreacting to Kubrick's tendency to eliminate scripted dialogue. Yet he was right; Kubrick did not just edit the scene without dialogue, he had not even shot the scripted line. This gives a fair sense of the attitudes of both men toward each others' work on the film by the time of Kubrick's rough cut in 1959.

130. According to Trumbo's "The Discovery of Varinia," "Report," pp. 49-50, prior to retakes, Varinia was clothed in a "luxurious pink velvet wrap...disposed...gracefully upon the battlefield so that Crassus may discover her.... Oh, God, oh God, is there no way we can get away from this prettiness? Are we determined to suffocate our film in this slow-moving, merciless tide of pink marshmallow?" Trumbo thought that they were stuck with the shot, as she was supposed to be among that mass of dead on the battlefield Crassus has been observing; that is why we hear the child first on flat land, and now on a hillside: Trumbo's comments about her apparel--and the child's too, who apparently was in a white swaddling wrap--were so cutting that it seems it prompted a reshoot to show a muddied Varinia, wrapped in a cloak, with an unswaddled child:

> Nothing that has happened to the character of Varinia from Vesuvius onward is accidental. It is deliberate. Being deliberate, it springs from some intellectual attitude toward the character and the story. Before the character is changed, that intellectual attitude toward her must change. Nothing I write will help, nothing will come through, unless you think of Varinia as a woman instead of a nymphet, and unless you ponder the question of how a woman in her situation would think and act and feel. If you don't think from inside her, from her point of view, in terms of what would be natural or even possible for her to do in certain specific circumstances, then you may as well throw her character in the ashcan. Why do I say this concept of Sleeping Beauty is deliberate? I say it because there was a choice. The script

described Varinia on the battlefield thus: ". . . holding her infant (swaddled with cloth torn from her skirt)" There it was, to accept or reject. Since it was rejected, the change to velvet robe was deliberate. Just as deliberate as the decision on Vesuvius that she should not work at the ovens with the other women, and that she should not even be referred to as working.

131. Trumbo, "Second Batiatus-Gracchus Scene," "Report on Spartacus," p. 52.

132. Trumbo, "Second Batiatus-Gracchus Scene," "Report on Spartacus," p. 53. Much of this is also on the Trumbo track during the scene on the Criterion Videodisc.

133. Duncan Cooper, in our conversation of July 14, 1996, provided me with this information.

134. Trumbo intended that Gracchus should kill himself first, then cut to a day scene of crucifixion, showing that all of these events did not take place in one night, and then to Varinia's last scene with Crassus, followed by Antoninus and Spartacus's meeting with Crassus.

135. Trumbo objected to this sentence, again one of those which Fast must have rewritten. "Can we get rid of that `it's a woman's question' thing? It's anybody's question when this sonofabitch has you in charge." Trumbo, "Crassus-Varinia Scene: Crassus Palace," "Report on Spartacus," p. 67.

136. Trumbo, "Notes on the Wagon Wheel Scene," "Report on Spartacus," p. 78.

137. Criterion Videodisc, Wagon Wheel Scene. At the end of the scene, Fast claims personal authorship for the whole sequence, which he describes as a "silly scene" Kirk Douglas made him write. In fact, in comparison to Trumbo's scene and comments from "First Draft Retakes," pp. 68-79, it is quite clear that Fast is rewriting Trumbo, combining together elements of Trumbo's scenes and his own.

138. Trumbo, "Wagon Wheel Scene," "Retakes, First Draft," p. 77

139. Trumbo, "Wagon Wheel Scene," "First Draft Retakes," p. 79.

140. Trumbo, "Crassus Visits Spartacus and Antoninus," "Report on Spartacus," p. 59.

141. Trumbo, "Confrontation Scene: Crassus-Spartacus," Retakes, First Draft," p. 82.

142. Trumbo, "Crassus Visits Spartacus and Antoninus," "Report on Spartacus," p. 59.

143. This again was one of the spots where Fast and Trumbo agreed: Spartacus spitting was a mistake. Trumbo (on the Criterion Videodisc during the scene), as one might expect, was the more articulate about this. "I've always objected to this. It is false and melodramatic, and in abominable taste. It is what the caught mafia leader does. It is an action associated with the scum of the earth. It is the action of a man who cannot think, who can only spit. It is a confession of Spartacus's total inability to deal with his life and his destiny in any other way than physical, on any higher plane than a gobbet of spit. All of our efforts to make Spartacus a human being, a man of nobility, a humane leader, an indomitable leader, all of them come to naught because of this filthy, destructive, undramatic and vulgar carryover from another script. The minute Spartacus spits, his character is gone. And nothing, nothing in this world, will pull it back for the final crucifixion scene." Trumbo continues onward for some length, but I trust the general sense is clear.

144. David Chandler interview of 8/2/60, p. 43, Box 38, Folder 4, Kirk Douglas Papers.

145. Daily Worker February 17, 1952, from Howard Fast, The Naked God (New York: Praeger, 1957), p. 152. Fast discusses the party leader's reactions to Spartacus in The Naked God, pp. 150-154, and Being Red (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.), pp. 299-300.

146. Trumbo, David Chandler Interview, p. 44; pp. 45-46.

147. I write Kubrick--he designed the shots--but this is in fact Trumbo's scene. He wrote 17 pages of notes on this brief sequence, discussing earlier versions, and what the psychological requirements were for Varinia and Batiatus's characters. Apparently Fast and Kubrick had written for Spartacus a speech in which he was to say "the whole world will remember a man whose name was Spartacus. I promise you. I promise you." Trumbo thought that this was appalling, and expressed himself in his usual colorful way ("Spartacus-Varinia At Cross," "Retakes, First Draft," p. 98):

> As to the last and longest speech, my objections center about the loud reassurances that the living wife will damned well see to it that the name of the dead husband rings through the ages until at last it is immortalized in a Bryna Production of "Spartacus". Do you think that wives, lovers, mothers, at the agonized moment of eternal farewell, actually utter these pseudo-grandiloquent invocations of history? Is that what they're thinking of?---their roles in a motion picture or a novel two millennia hence? Do living people who love the dying really make such pronouncements to dying sweethearts? And just how is Varinia going to go about influencing the work of historians in favor of her husband? Just how is she going to promise him that "the whole world will know"? This is bombastic, sloganeering soap-opera. The only lines in it that have real feeling and beauty are the final ones: "I promise you. I promise you." But the rest is porridge.

Not surprisingly, Trumbo won his point. He realized in the end that Varinia could make no speeches regarding the slave revolt. Spartacus won a moral victory over Crassus. That Fast left that victory dangling somewhat did not register with him, but her presence as a free woman, with a free child, resolved that last issue. The end of the film, Trumbo argued, had to be the culmination of a personally tragic love story, encompassed in a larger story of freedom against tyranny where tyranny apparently was victorious, yet had accomplished this victory in such a way that the society which "won" crippled its own freedoms so substantially that it shortly would collapse.

148. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, pp. 305-306

149. Trumbo, David Chandler Interview, p. 57.

150. Kirk Douglas, The Ragman's Son, pp. 318-319.

CHAPTER SEVEN

> ROME FELL -- a fact of history! But WHY? The reasons have never been fully understood. The lessons have not been learned. Yet the same basic mistakes that toppled the once mighty Roman Empire are now being repeated in America....
>
> --opening prologue, "The Modern Romans" (1969)[1]

> Outwardly Rome still stood, more resplendent and apparently more unshakable than ever. Inwardly she was in a state of mental and spiritual flux. The old order was losing its hold on men's minds and the new order was yet far off.
>
> --Marcus Aurelius and His Times[2]

The Fall of the Roman Empire, directed by Anthony Mann, is the last serious Rome film, and one of two great ones; the other one is Spartacus. Of the two, The Fall of the Roman Empire is the more completely realized film. It is the culmination of the Rome metaphor I have shown in the press and the cinema of the 50's and 60's, but it is also a film by perhaps the most underappreciated director of the Hollywood Classical period, working at the height of his powers. In part because Mann has been infrequently studied, The Fall of the Roman Empire is one of the most underrated of all of his films,[3] so I will spend some time on Mann as a film auteur as well as an employer of the Rome metaphor; Anthony Mann's Rome has its own distinctive accent.

Mann directed the first two weeks of Spartacus, but Kirk Douglas believed Mann was not a director who would make the film he wanted, and had Mann fired. Spartacus was self-consciously a film of the left. The novel, self-

published by a blacklisted author, and the screenplay, written by a blacklisted screenwriter, was a cry of protest against McCarthyism. The story's theme was critical of a right-wing willing to do anything to come to power. It is not hard to guess why Douglas might have felt uncomfortable working with the director of Strategic Air Command (1955). Mann said that his dismissal had to do with his desire to make a visual picture, and to cut back on dialogue. Douglas "wanted to insist on the message angle," but Mann thought that the images would better convey messages than words. Douglas may have interpreted Mann's talk of creating visual images as a veiled attempt to separate himself from the ex-communist author Howard Fast, and the Hollywood Ten screenwriter Dalton Trumbo. For whatever reason, Douglas deemed Mann untrustworthy, and fired him. Ironically, he ended up facing a director in Stanley Kubrick who was more resistant to words than Mann would have been.[4]

Douglas's dismissal of Mann probably damaged the artistic realization of Spartacus, and if it was based on Mann's presumed politics, probably unfair. To the extent that Mann exhibits political inclinations in his films, they lean more toward reform than revolution, although the hero rebelling against an irretrievably decadent community in order to begin again, as Spartacus does, is also a recurrent figure in the Mann canon. Mann--and this may partially account for his neglect--is a director of romance stories. Mann's narratives are fundamentally cyclical narratives of redemption and rebirth, and his stories are always heroic identity searches. When the hero's search ends successfully, the

whole society becomes transformed. Mann's films, particularly his Westerns, frequently were set in pivotal moments when the future of a community was in the balance. The dangerous character for Mann is always the one who is prepared to exploit society, defy morality, and live for the present rather than the future. Where these dangerous characters are in positions of power, the whole society is bound in darkness and confusion. The Mann villain is less interested in social than personal issues; Mann's Crassus probably would have emphasized more Crassus's personal desire for power than his class sensibility. However, the villain is less a selfish figure--he[5] thinks of himself first, yet he is also quite loyal to friends--than he is fundamentally incapable of self-sacrifice. The Mann villain seeks sensation and action, and is opposed to thought about the future. He desires women, but not family; gambling, but not accumulating; journeying, but not arriving; friends, but not community.[6]

Because they have lived outside of conventional society, the villain and the hero are both aware of the whole world and its dangers in a way which innocents within society are not: in T-Men (1947), an undercover agent's wife and a neighbor woman happen to meet the agent as he is among gangsters, and the neighbor unthinkingly breaks his cover, ignoring the agent's wife's efforts to keep her quiet; in Bend in the River (1952) the hero Glyn McLintock and the villain Emerson Cole, both gunmen, listen to the "birdcalls" that they recognize as signals between Indians. Laura Baile, the woman the hero loves, admires the music of the sounds, unaware of their source. But where the hero

recognizes the world beyond society, the villain is enthralled by it. He lives for the experience of danger, the thrill of mastering the hidden world, of proving to himself and the world yet again that he exists, and that he has power. Nothing is at stake for him except his life, and his ability to experience the thrill of danger again.

The hero experiences the attraction of living on the edge, but fears giving into it. Janine Basinger, Mann's most thorough critic, argues (in accordance with Mann's other important critic, Jim Kitses) that the Mann villain is the hero's "other self," the potentially destructive and violent persona that the villain recognizes in the hero.[7] Mann frequently underlines this link by making his heroes and villains share backgrounds. Sometimes they are relatives. In Winchester 73 (1950) and in Fall of the Roman Empire, they are brothers. In The Furies (1950) they are father and daughter. The Mann hero has within him/herself the ability to go beyond the bounds of convention, like the villain, but s/he draws from this ability in order to perform the tasks of the hero. The Mann hero-type may even give in to the attraction of evil, and go through a villainous period, as is true of McLintock and the secondary romantic hero Troy Wilson in Bend of the River; Rip Darrow and Vance in The Furies; and Link Jones in Man of the West (1958). This capacity for evil acts, which separates him/her from innocents in society, haunts him/her; the Mann hero is given to brooding.[8] The villain has no such conflicts. They tend to be cheerful. Mann's villains have all the strength of the heroes, but they lack the imagination to look beyond

themselves, to see value in something which improves the world in which they live; their development is permanently arrested. This is their flaw. They exploit the world as it is for the opportunities it offers to them, heedless of the consequences. Other characters are charmed by the villain's openness; but as Janine Basinger notes of one of them, this apparent ease of manners derives from a moral vacuum.[9]

The Mann hero--and, in The Furies, heroine--is always a figure in transition, a person on a journey to the future. The hero may be dissatisfied with civilization, but more because it is complacent and irrational--as the villain is--rather than because it is too dull. Frequently a Mann hero begins the film in a depressed state because the present society has rejected him/her, or s/he has found it unworthy of defending.

Mann's The Furies is unusual in that it contains the whole cycle of a social order moving through a sequence of decline, collapse, and rebirth. Barbara Stanwyck's Vance begins as the agent of her father's will. She becomes progressively more individualistic, moody, and finally almost psychotic after she discovers her father's new fiance plans to take the ranch and use it up as security for a lavish lifestyle. The fiance intends to send Vance off to Europe, away from the land and its responsibilities, and to see the ranch dismembered. In acquiescing to this, Vance's father, T.C. Jeffords, refuses to honor his promise to turn over control of the family ranch to her. Vance strikes out against the fiance, and when her father rejects her, she goes to Juan Herrera, a friend and

possible husband, whose family has an old claim to part of the Jeffers ranch. He has been one of her father's enemies, but he has sought to live in peace together. When the father kills Juan--an act which he knows is evil,[10] but cannot resist--he defies the principles he has taught her. Vance becomes the romance hero, without an identity, in search of the path that will destroy her father's hold on the land, and restore the land and herself to wholeness.

In Devil's Doorway (1950), we find another Mann hero betrayed by a decadent community in defiance of its own principles. Lance Poole, an Indian who fought in the Civil War for his adoptive society and was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, returns to find his community stealing his land. He tries to explain that the community is breaking its own laws, and fails. When he knows all is lost, he says to his female attorney--herself a victim of community prejudice, and someone with whom he could have become romantically involved--"One hundred years from now it might have worked." People of the future, they are not strong enough yet to lead their community forward to its better self.

Once the hero is rejected by the complacent society, the journey which the hero is forced to undergo is the means by which the half-imagined sense of what the future should be becomes solidified. On the journey the hero discovers the new friends and family which will allow her or him to begin to live in civilization again, and s/he recovers a sense of place within a new community--or with a wife or husband, with whom the hero/ine will found the

new community, in accordance with classic Romance structure. The Furies shows the whole process. More commonly, as with Howard Kemp in The Naked Spur (1953), a Mann film begins somewhere in the middle, in the wilderness where the already rejected hero wanders, seeking a road to the future, a road back to himself.

The Mann romantic partner does not simply recognize and accept the hero/ine, however. Frequently, s/he is an active agent in the heroic task. Rip Darrow loans Vance the money necessary to recover the ranch in The Furies. In Bend of the River (1952), the hero, Glyn McLintock, is a former raider on the Kansas-Missouri border--an outlaw of the early battles over slavery that presaged the Civil War. By the time of this film, the hero is leading a wagon train to the Oregon country, certain in his desire that all he wants to do is settle down and farm, and forget about danger. Mann's film is an unusual story in that the hero's journey is really done already: He knows who he is, and while his heroic self-restraint may be tested, McLintock has already changed into a hero. His dramatic conflict is a desire for redemption from his past by his acceptance into a community. But the core conflict of the film is how that community changes, so that it allows the hero to perform his act of redemption. Others--particularly Laura, his wife-to-be--need to undergo their own trial before they can recognize his worth. Like Rodrigo in El Cid, McLintock is "ahead" of the community not just in his position as leader, but spiritually as well. But it is only possible for this spiritual heroism to become manifest when the community is

prepared to recognize the hero as such, and enable the hero to perform the heroic task: Laura must release a horse (although her father suffers for it) so that McLintock can keep up with the wagon train that carries food, and turn it to the settler community; Chimene in El Cid must allow her husband to lead his troops, even at the cost of his life, so that the battle may be won and Spain may live. It is the community that is judged by its recognition or rejection of the hero, the community whose prejudices and wisdom are on trial.

Mann had shown in his Westerns what communities are like which reject the future and destroy themselves. In the early 60's, he began to film nations on trial. The Spain of El Cid was a collection of nations which had to submerge prejudices and join together against a seemingly hypnotized nation whose leader, Ben Yussuf, angrily demands of the Spanish Moors: "The Prophet has commanded us to rule the world! ...[B]urn your books, make warriors of your poets, let your doctors invent new poisons for our arrows, let your scientists invent new war machines, and then kill! Burn!" The metaphor of Islam's expansion into Europe for a militaristic U.S.S.R. whose angry leader, guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, shouted "we will bury you!" at the United States and its Western European allies could hardly be missed. But the real villains in the film are the leaders of Spain. Princes Sancho and Alfonso (the latter under the influence of one of the few noir women in Mann's films, Urraca) are more concerned about preserving their own power and achieving their own clannish

desires than preserving their country. Because they are ironic leaders, incapable of leadership, evil flourishes.

El Cid's villainous leaders and monstrous foes are unusually simplistic for Mann, however, as is the Cid himself. Mann's heroes typically are conflicted heroes. Even in characters like McClintock in Bend of the River, where they have found themselves prior to the action of the film, Mann shows that they hold their capacity for evil in check: They become heroic as a matter of choice. This is not true of the Cid. Basinger says of the Cid that "...he carries not a *guilty* secret, but a *great* one--a manifest destiny."[11] He appears at the beginning of the film as a priest prays: "Send us someone who will take us to the light." The Cid takes up the stiff image of Christ on the cross, signifying his assumption of Christ's mission and foreshadowing the moment when he, too, shall be a stiff image of divinity at the end of the film. The Cid's conflict is to choose between following his human desire to live and sacrificing his life for the edification and transformation of the people. But if a hero is born a hero, that hero is not human, and that conflict is a sham. When the Cid releases captive Moors, following a moral law that, like Moses, he cannot explain but inherently intuits, he receives his annunciation from the priest: "You did take the shortest road--not to your bride, but to your destiny. God sent you to us!" The story becomes an apotheosis of the Saint, an imitation of Christ. Like Moses in The Ten Commandments, the Cid never has a choice simply to be an ordinary person. Unlike Moses, however, Rodrigo never undergoes a realization of his identity.

Others make realizations about Rodrigo--in particular Chimene--but as a character, Rodrigo never evolves.

A closer look at Chimene resolves this structural problem in El Cid. In The Ten Commandments, the women who are the object of the hero's attention, Nefreteri and Sephora, are signifiers of the hero's choice between good and evil. Moses is destined to choose one over the other, but they are even more objects of a predestined fate than he. Where Moses changes in the film, they remain the same. El Cid has a similar division, between Urraca and Chimene. Rodrigo however has no interest in Urraca. More importantly, Chimene does not willingly accept Rodrigo's destiny as the Cid; and here we discover the answer as to why Rodrigo is changeless. When Rodrigo is forced to kill her father to defend his actions and his family's honor, she interprets that act as a defense of his honor alone; she does not see that he must act always in fulfillment of others' needs, never his own. The movement of the film is Chimene's gradual evolution from a person into an equally self-sacrificing mythic figure. In accordance to her father's dying request, she tries to have him killed in ways which harm Spain, but accomplish her familial duty of revenge. Only after observing the selfish actions of Spain's leaders and the consequences which follow does she acquire something of the predestined heroic breadth of vision the Cid possesses.

Rodrigo's heroic test is at the beginning of the film when he releases his Moorish prisoners, and becomes the Cid. Chimene's heroic test comes at the

end of the film when she chooses to allow her husband to die of a wound he might have survived so that he can become the mythic Cid, and Spain can live. In doing this, she becomes the mythic Chimene--the mother of the new Spain, as Rodrigo is its father. In other words, Rodrigo cannot be the hero that he is destined to be without Chimene.[12] Only when she rises to his level of self-sacrifice is Rodrigo able to become completely the Cid, forsaking his human existence entirely in order to fill the inhuman dimensions of heroism. The Cid, and the Spain which comes into being with his Assumption, is, in effect, Rodrigo and Chemene's spiritual child. More so than the structurally similar but less developed Laura Baile in Bend of the River, Chimene herself learns to be heroic so that she can enable the hero to carry out his role.[13] If Rodrigo is the Christ of the film, Chimene is the cross--which, as in the Old English poem, "Dream of the Rood," has to learn to suffer itself not to bend or break, in spite of its horror at what it must do, so that the world might be saved.

Given the broader canvas epic films provided, Mann began to develop in his films this more complex multiple-heroism that he had been content to suggest in his earlier films. This subtle interdependency is a profound innovation of the epic genre, yet paradoxically its complexity actually undercut his final epic, Fall of the Roman Empire. Mann's heroes and villains in his epics are splintered into more than one role, and they cannot be understood properly except in concert with their coordinating structural elements. Critics tend to undervalue these films, so it is hardly surprising that actors did not understand

Mann's intentions. Mann--in my opinion the greatest director of epic genre films--had great difficulty in casting his male protagonist of Fall of the Roman Empire. When he screened El Cid, Charlton Heston was disappointed in the film. From his point of view, the film was "too long." Every fight was one minute too long, and every close-up of Sophia Loren as Chimene was "10 seconds too long." Just after El Cid was completed, Mann and producer Samuel Bronston offered Heston the role of Livius in Fall of the Roman Empire, matching him again with Sophia Loren. Heston refused.[14] As his odd comment about the length of Loren's close-ups suggests, perhaps he had a sense that El Cid was less his drama than hers. Ironically, the next film would have reversed these roles.

The Fall of the Roman Empire fades up to show a forested hillside, gray in the predawn, and pans to show watchtowers of a shadowy fort, capped with fires. The pan continues on as a voice speaks, quoting from Will Durant's Caesar and Christ: "Two of the greatest problems of history are how to account for the rise of Rome, and how to account for her fall. We may come nearer to understand the truth if we remember that the fall of Rome, like her rise, had not one cause, but many; and was not an event, but a process spread over 300 years." The pan stops on the massive gates of the fort, shadowy, closed, mysterious--a massy image of the unknown. Mann cuts to a few soldiers some distance in away from the gates, gathered around a fire--a human image, as if to remind the viewer that Rome was a civilization of people, not just a place. As

the camera tracks up from them again to the fort, the voice continues ominously: "Some nations have not lasted as long as Rome fell."

The image establishes this fortress on a hill surrounded by a wilderness as the embodiment of the concept of Rome of which the narrator speaks. He does not explain what Rome was, or what happened after the fall; the audience is presumed to know that. Basinger notes that this fortress repeats on a grand scale the fortress that Mann used earlier to represent civilization in The Last Frontier (1955).[15] Rome is civilization, and in spite of its fortifications, civilization is about to collapse back into wilderness. The film's object then will be to show how this city on a hill fell, to paraphrase John Winthrop, and how it became a byword for civic decadence through time.

The narrator speaks again, this time to set a particular time and place of the film: "In the year 180 A.D., the Emperor Marcus Aurelius was leading his Roman legions against the Germanic tribes along the Danube frontier." Mann cuts to a long shot at the top of one of the watchtowers. In the left foreground, two men stand, one in a hooded cloak, by a brazier. In the right background, an augur (whom we will later be told is Cleander) fingers the entrails of a bird his assistant holds for him. "My lord Caesar, the omens are bad," Cleander says. The man in the cloak looks up at Cleander. "I could not find its heart." The assistant leads the augur away as Marcus Aurelius turns and speaks to his companion. "When I was a child, Timonides, I had a secret fear that night would come and it would never end--" Cut to a close-up of Marcus Aurelius. "--that we

would live out our lives in total darkness. It was a small fear, then." Cut to a close-up of Timonides: "Yet, my lord Caesar, the sun always rises, and will again." Return to the Marcus Aurelius closeup: "So you say. It is said more people die at this moment when night is about to give way to day than at any other time. It seems to me Night whispers, `come away with me to the west." Cut to a medium tracking shot of Aurelius, walking up to the augury altar, followed by Timonides: "`Sleep forever. What has another day to offer you?' (Aurelius stops, turns and faces Timonides.) What has another day to offer you, Timonides?" Timonides steps around behind Aurelius to his left, and pours wine on the altar, washing off the blood. "Warmth, life, color, people." Timonides looks up. Cut to a medium close-up over-the-shoulder shot behind Timonides and Aurelius of the sun rising. Timonides: "My lord Caesar, the sun." Aurelius looks up, then looks at Timonides. "As you predicted. I congratulate you, Timonides."

This is an extremely dense scene, operating on several different levels. The characters of Timonides and Aurelius are nicely defined: Timonides the phlegmatic optimist, practical and unaffected; Marcus Aurelius the poetic pessimist with a dry sense of humor. More subtly, the scene foreshadows the film's central conflict--a Mann trademark, one which Spartacus also exemplifies. Mann had learned in his early low-budget days to overcome script limitations through adding depth of character in the mise-en-scene. "The least shot had to

contribute to the significance of the whole, the least gesture typed a character."[16]

Cleander is a character particularly defined by the way he is presented and the qualities he is given. Cleander will become a councillor of Commodus, Aurelius' son, whom Cleander will make the emperor by poisoning Aurelius. He divines the fate of the empire with his augury--soon it will have no heart, no center--and that he does this through blood rather than by reading a flight of birds, as an augur might have done, foreshadows both his murder of Aurelius and his role as a promoter of bloodshed. Mann's Cleander is blind, and this is a character attribute with symbolic overtones. As is the case with Alec Waggoman in The Man from Laramie (1955), Cleander's blindness represents a spiritual blindness as well. The augury scene emphasizes that he feels, but does not see; he lives in the world of darkness that Aurelius fears. On the level of cultural associations, feeling is a term associated with emotions, while seeing is associated with understanding.[17] Cleander will become Commodus' principle minister (historically as well as in the film[18]), and under his apparent guidance, Commodus will commit the acts which will begin the fall of Rome. As his name suggests, Cleander is not Roman. The historic Cleander was an ex-slave from Phrygia, one of the small Greek city-states in Asia minor Rome conquered about 300 years prior to the time of the film, "a nation, over whose stubborn but servile temper blows only could prevail," as Gibbon describes it.[19]

This history of brutal slavery is a narrative theme which the film will develop later.

Timonides is the apparent principle advisor of Aurelius. The film will define him as a philosopher, although his lines in the scene already suggest this. In the following scene, Aurelius remarks that "[the soldiers] say, `ask Timonides what day it is; he'll lecture you about the history of the calendar,'" suggesting (as Timonides himself confirms later) that he is by habit a teacher. He also divines a future to Aurelius in his lines, with reason rather than mysticism: darkness does not last forever, and the day will come again. Where Cleander felt the lack of a heart in the bird, Timonides sees the sun, underlining the link of the reasoning spirit with sight (light is conceptually associated in English with both reasoning and hope[20]). And of course, Mann and the screenwriters deliberately evoke our knowledge that Aurelius's fear will come to pass, and that the Dark Ages will come before a new Enlightenment restores humanity to the civilized height from which it is shortly to fall.

Timonides also is not a Roman name. Later in the film we will be told that Timonides was born a Greek slave, but freed and made a Roman citizen. This scene initiates the development of parallels between Timonides and Cleander, as Mann had so often done between his heroes and villains. They derive their power in the film less out of their own actions, however, than they do in their role as manifestations of spirit: They are diametrically opposed philosophical ideals.

Over the course of the film, the influence each has on events are the mark of Rome's fate.

Mann moves from the two old men who define Rome's past to the couple who defines its possible future. A brass fanfare arises on the soundtrack, and the sound of hooves. Aurelius and Timonides turn to face the camera, and Mann cuts to the top of the fort's gate, to show the brass instrument players that are the on-screen source of the soundtrack. Mann then tracks down as the gate opens to reveal Livius, arriving with troops. Mann cuts away to two extreme long shots to show Livius's army stretched out across the screen as they ride across the gate bridge to the fort proper, and to a long shot as Livius rides up the ramp which leads to the interior of the fort. He greets Timonides and asks about Marcus Aurelius's health.

Marcus Aurelius and Livius are both heroes of the film, but of different types initially. Aurelius is seen in the film only at rest, looking out into forests from his protective fortress, or enclosed in his chambers. At his most active, he paces within his room. Livius rides in his chariot out of the forests into the fort. The camera presents Aurelius in a series of establishing shots, close-ups, and tracking medium shots, of which the opening scene I have detailed above is typical. Livius, by contrast, moves in and out of frames more often, and the camera tends to cut from one activity area to the next in order to follow him. The film music changes in accordance to this activity, from melodic woodwind (a melody which becomes a lietmotiv of Timonides) to harsh brass and percussion

instruments. Where the camera shows Aurelius as a man of thought, it emphasizes that Livius is a man of action. This is suggestive of an underlying metaphor which develops in the film, the necessity for a unity of mind with body. In this instance, Livius is part of the body which acts in accordance with Aurelius' mind, as we see in the following:

> (close-up Livius): You <u>are</u> well, my lord Caesar?
> (close-up Aurelius; nods, smiling slightly)
> (med. close-up Livius): It seems that every governor and every king of the whole empire is waiting in the valley below.
> (med. close-up Aurelius): I invited them here for a particular purpose. I've also asked my son, Commodus-- (pauses, looks up at Livius, smiles briefly) your great friend Commodus. Tell me of your last campaign in these barbarian forests.
> (med. close-up Livius): Two or three times we thought we had Ballomar, their leader. But each time he was able to get away. (pause) A few days longer, Caesar--we'll bring you his head.
> (med. close-up Aurelius): No, Livius, please don't bring me his head. I wouldn't know what to do with it. (earnestly) Bring him to me alive.
> (close-up Livius, puzzled look): But he is the <u>heart</u> of the Barbarians!
> (close-up Aurelius, forceful voice): Then bring me the <u>heart</u> of the barbarians; I wish to speak with him.
> (Livius, offscreen): "Speak with him?" (Aurelius): Rome has existed for a thousand years. It is time we found peaceful ways to live with those you call barbarians. So bring me this...Ballomar. Alive, and quickly.
> (med. long shot Livius and Aurelius. Aurelius claps Livius on the shoulder, turns, and walks from the porch area into his chambers....)

In concert with the augury scene, these lines establish leaders and leadership metaphorically as hearts.[21] It is not Aurelius's intent to destroy his enemy, but to induce a "change of heart."

"There was a rumor that Lucilla was here," Livius says to Timonides, descending steps to a medium two-shot after his conversation with Aurelius. "Lucilla--Caesar's daughter." "Ah, yes, Caesar's daughter," Timonides says, looking down as she walks from the interior of the fort to the augury platform. The camera tracks right, losing Timonides and Livius, and shows a long-shot from what becomes Timonides' point of view as Livius enters from the bottom of the frame to meet her. She is a figure in a hooded black robe trimmed with white, walking slowly toward the brazier and platform where her father and Timonides stood earlier, as Livius approaches her.

The camera cuts to a medium close-up of Lucilla. The nearly inaudible music changes from Timonides-woodwind to solo violin, which plays the sad melody of the credits--a melody which will henceforth be Lucilla's lietmotiv, and which invariably is played every time she and Livius meet. She looks down, plucks three white flowers from a bunch she holds and drops them into the flames as she says: "As the dove fears the eagle, as the lamb fears the wolf, so is my heart heavy with fear." The camera cuts to a close-up as Lucilla looks up, and other strings amplify the solo violin theme: "O, mother Vesta, eternal mother of Rome, help me bring back the health of my father. Protect us from the danger which hangs over the empire. Let there be peace over all Rome." She hears a noise and Mann cuts to a medium shot of her, revealing Livius in longshot to her right. They greet one another, Mann intercutting from a tracking closeup of one to the other until they are together in the frame in over-the-

shoulder shots alternating with their lines. When Livius apologizes for not seeing her earlier by explaining that "it seemed you did not really want to see anyone," Lucilla replies: "I thought by living alone, away from the world, that I could find peace. But then I found there is no real peace in being alone. There is only loneliness."

As I have noted above, one of the patterns of the Mann heroes is withdrawal from the decadent social order which rejects them. But in the expanded field of the epic film, the withdrawal of a personage who, like Rodrigo in El Cid, embodies the spirit of the future society, portends the collapse of that society. Lucilla is the Rodrigo figure in Fall of the Roman Empire. When Commodus arrives from Rome, later in the film, he will tell Marcus Aurelius, "Rome has changed since you were there." Mann will show further evidence of change over the course of the film. The degenerative change from the Aurelian Rome to that of Commodus echoes those of the court in El Cid's Spain, The Furies's Furies Ranch, Bend of the River's Portland, and Devil's Doorway's Medicine Bow. Like the Cid, and McLintock in Bend of the River, Lucilla is already heroic; her personality does not evolve in the film. She simply reacts in obedience to what she knows is correct.

Lucilla's line "...so my heart is heavy with fear" links up with the previous emphases on heart: If Aurelius is a "heart" of Rome, Lucilla functions in the film as the chorus who speaks of the state of Rome's heart. She is, symbolically, the spirit of Rome--as her connection to Vesta, the goddess whose virgin-attendants

were signs of Rome's moral state, suggests. Her leitmotif music is the one which accompanies the opening and closing credits, and in moments where the future of Rome is being determined (notably at the end), it is her leitmotif which is played. Lucilla's destiny, the film suggests, is Rome's destiny.

The following scene establishes what is at stake with the fall of Rome. The camera cuts from the quiet private scene between Lucilla and Livius to a column of troops and chariots, accompanied by the same loud brass fanfare and march, expanded, that announced Livius's arrival. The columns of riders are a procession of all the kings and proconsuls who rule over the dominions of Rome. Aurelius and Timonides tease each other about who is best able to keep track of these dominions, an ancient parallel to that modern problem Stevenson and Kennedy spoke of in reference to such places as Upper Volta and Vietnam. The scene serves also as a means of identifying Marcellus, Proconsul of Egypt, whom Timonides misidentifies as Virgillianus, Proconsul of Syria--characters who assume greater importance later in the film.

After each representative group marches by to be greeted, they all assemble into a huge gathering and shout "Hail Caesar!" The armor, weapons and chariots emphasizes Aurelius' military power, but the speech he makes to them emphasizes that he is less a military commander than a social visionary:

> (low angle medium-shot Aurelius): Commoners, Consuls, Princes: You have come from the deserts of Egypt, from the mountains of Armenia, from the forests of Gaul and the Prairies of Spain. (med. long-shot of crowd; crane down from 10 feet to eye level, then track right, showing the gathering's vast size. Aurelius voiceover): You do not resemble each other, nor do you wear the

> same clothes, nor sing the same songs, nor worship the same gods. Yet like a mighty tree, with green leaves and black roots, you are the unity which is Rome. Look about you, and look at yourselves, and see the greatness that is Rome.
> (low med. shot Aurelius, flanked on either side at waist level by the much smaller heads of Timonides and Livius): Two hundred years ago the Gauls were our fiercest enemies. Now, we greet them as friends. In the whole world, only two small frontiers are still hostile to us.... But these are not the frontiers Rome wants.
> (close-up Timonides; nods slightly on "frontiers." Aurelius voiceover): Rome wants and needs human frontiers.
> (close-up Aurelius, flanked at shoulder level by Timonides and Livius): We've had to fight long wars. Your burdens have been great. But we come now to the end of the road: Here, within our reach, golden centuries of peace, a true Pax Romana. Wherever you live, whatever the color of your skin, when peace is achieved it will bring to all--all--the supreme right of Roman citizenship.... Rome everywhere. A family of equal nations. That is what lies ahead.

This is the key thematic speech of the film. It is in accordance with the structural conclusion to a romance cycle; Northrop Frye observes that "Romance's last vision seems to be that of fraternity."[22] This is precisely the universal society toward which, Toynbee argued, all world history was intended. The phrases would have seemed familiar to most of the film's audience in 1964. They echo Franklin Roosevelt's fourth inaugural address: "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away.... We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community."[23] It also echoes Harry Truman's opening day address to the first United Nations assembly, in which he asked members to "rise above personal interests" and create a security organization that would "redeem the terrible sacrifices of the last six years."[24] When the UN

charter was signed, Truman warned that it must be used to prevent war. "Let us not fail to grasp this supreme chance to establish a world-wide rule of reason--to create an enduring peace under the guidance of God."[25] Nearer in time, speaking in Berlin, John F. Kennedy observed that "we live in an age of interdependence.... We are partners for peace--not in a narrow bilateral context but in a framework of Atlantic partnership. The ocean divides us less than the Mediterranean divided the ancient world of Greece and Rome.... Our goals are the same: peace and freedom for all men, for all time, in a world of abundance, in a world of justice."[26] Aurelius' speech invokes the postwar American internationalist vision of an empire of independent nations, whose members would collectively ensure world peace;[27] the causes of the failure of Aurelius' Pax Romana were intended to be instructive to the builders of a more enduring, true Pax Americana.

The film cuts directly from the vast assemblage cheering this vision of unity to an extreme closeup of Cleander, on the right side of the frame, and Marcus Aurelius, sitting as if imprisoned in a triangle formed by latticework in the door against which Cleander stands, leaning his head on his right hand, arm resting on his knee. If Aurelius in the open during his speech is at the apex of a supporting triangle, cheered on by the multitude, here in the center of his fortress he is enclosed within another triangle, and in this and in following scenes the script and the visuals establish the conflicts within the institutional bureaucracy which interfere with the realization of his internationalist vision.

Mann cuts to a long shot of the exterior hallway as Livius and Lucilla enter the Emperor's chambers from an internal passage. Cleander stands at the door leading to Aurelius's chamber, and Lucilla gives him a suspicious look before going in to greet her father. Aurelius tells them that he is dying. Though he does not specify the nature of his disease, the symptoms Aurelius displays (in accordance with available historical evidence) is a cancer in the abdominal region:

> (Med. shot Lucilla & Aurelius, who turns screen right and grabs his side. Camera tracks right with Aurelius, who stops, facing a map. Aurelius grabs his side): ...time is short. And there is a decision which I can no longer delay. I must sacrifice the love of my son. Commodus must never be my heir.
> (Deep focus extreme close-up Cleander, screen left, long shot Livius screen right through door screen. voiceover Aurelius): Livius, it is my wish that you should succeed me. (Cleander's eyes widen)
> (Med. shot Aurelius; camera tracks left with Aurelius, stopping on med. two-shot Livius and Aurelius): And I intend to present you to the leaders of the empire openly as my successor.
> (Close-up, Livius): But you said yourself, Caesar: It needs someone who will change, who will find new ways--a man of the 10th century of Rome.
> (Med. two-shot Livius and Aurelius) I only know the ways of war. I would not know how to make allies out of the barbarians.
> (Aurelius): You will <u>find</u> new ways. You have the <u>heart</u> for it, Livius. (Livius): But...Commodus already shares the throne with you. (Aurelius turns and walks screen right toward Lucilla. Camera tracks past Livius to keep med. shot on Aurelius): I had hoped that position and responsibility would make him grow up.
> (Aurelius turns & faces Livius) But he's interested only in games and gladiators.
> (Close-up Livius): It was you, Caesar, who brought me into your family. Commodus and I are like brothers.
> (Close-up Aurelius and Lucilla): I love Commodus, too. (looks down) But that's just a feeling.

(Med. shot Lucilla and Aurelius, who looks about awkwardly, and takes Lucilla's hand): A personal feeling.

This is another multiply-layered scene. Livius is to be Aurelius's heir. Yet he is clearly not ready for this responsibility. The relationship between Livius and Lucilla is thus not simply a romantic interest, but rather structurally significant. Livius is a Romance hero who must become transformed in order to have the "heart" required to succeed Aurelius. He must undergo what Northrop Frye describes as the romance "ritual of identity," in which his potential of becoming the hero is realized. Lucilla is both helper and object of the romance quest, which is in this case the transformation of Rome from a fragmented civilization of subjects and Romans into what Frye describes as "Kant's kingdom of ends where, as in fairy tales, we are all kings and princesses,"[28] and the spiritual and physical elements of Rome as represented by Lucilla and Livius are married.

The dialogue and the images clash in this scene. In the dialogue, Mann and his screenwriters[29] contrast Livius the soldier to Commodus the game-player. Livius makes it clear that he does not think himself capable of thinking instead of fighting. But the images direct our attention elsewhere. The deep focus shots of Cleander stand out in this sequence; there is nothing like it before or after in the film. The shot disorients the viewer both intrinsically and in its placement. The standard shot to use to offer the empire to Livius would be a close-up of Aurelius as he tells Livius that he wants him as his heir. In effect, Cleander seizes the camera from Aurelius at the moment that he makes his most important decision as emperor in the film. This dramatic shot draws our

attention to Cleander's importance, and foreshadows his definitive influence on the question of succession.

This sequence also begins to show Aurelius' weakness. As he speaks of his feelings, the camera cuts from a close-up to a medium shot of Aurelius, diminishing him in the frame. Immediately following the dialogue I have quoted, the camera cuts to a medium long shot of Cleander at the door, announcing Commodus' approach. As Basinger has noted, the barometer of a Mann character's strength is his/her ability to dominate the compositional frame of the camera.[30] Aurelius loses "control" of the camera, first in the cut to the medium shot, and then to Cleander. Confronted with the question of feelings, Aurelius loses control to the character who is the reification of irrational feeling in the film. The shot sequence suggests that Aurelius denies the importance of personal feelings not simply in accordance with his philosophy, but also because they are beyond his reason, and outside of his power of influence.

In an expository scene between Lucilla and Aurelius which follows, Mann begins to show some of the consequences of Aurelius' imbalanced personality. Aurelius is lying on his bed in a long shot as Lucilla rises from the stove in the other end of the frame and paces toward the camera. "Even though Commodus is my brother, I would have done as you did, Father," she says as she gets up. "And would you also have chosen Livius?" "Yes," she says eagerly, turning to face him, but then looks at him and censors her own emotions. "Yes," she says more flatly, and picks up an apple. "Only--why did he hesitate?" Mann cuts to a

medium shot of Aurelius in bed. "If he had not been the kind of man who hesitates when faced with such a grave responsibility, I would not have chosen him," Aurelius replies. "Come and sit by me." Mann cuts to a medium shot of Lucilla, and tracks with her as she moves to the bed and sits. Mann returns to the medium shot of Aurelius. He asks her: "Are you happy? You seem reasonably happy, and yet...." Mann cuts to the medium shot of Lucilla. "And yet?" she prompts, not answering. "A disturbing whisper reached me that you thought once of retiring to the temple of Vesta."

As a solo flute takes up her leitmotif "Rome" theme, she turns away from Aurelius. Mann cuts to a medium long shot of Aurelius and Lucilla, frame right. In the corner of the left frame, a stone female bust faces them, looking down on both of them, occupying the entire vertical space of its corner of the frame. It is the bust of Faustina, Aurelius's dead wife. Lucilla rises and walks toward the bust to a medium shot, dividing the frame between Aurelius, in his yellow-lit corner of the frame, and the more shadowy backdrop of greens, browns and greys in the bust's area of the frame. "I know that it is too simple to think of life as either beautiful or ugly," she says, staring at the stone bust, looking up at it sullenly from a child's angle. "But there was a time when life seemed very ugly to me." "It was because of your Mother," Aurelius states. "I was ashamed that she brought you such pain." Gibbon observed that "the amours of an empress, as they exact on her side the plainest advances, are seldom susceptible of much sentimental delicacy."[31]

Mann cuts to a medium close-up of Aurelius; he seizes control of the frame from the ghost of Faustina. "I knew moments of happiness with her," he says calmly, in his lighter, yellow setting. Mann cuts to a medium close-up of Lucilla, who turns and faces her father. Behind her, Faustina's bust matches her eyelevel, but now it is Lucilla the adult, not Faustina the parent, who dominates the frame with her presence. Mann cuts back to a long shot of Lucilla from a placement just behind Aurelius's bed. At this angle the room is brighter, and the yellow lighting and light grey fur covering Aurelius's bed dominates two-thirds of the horizontal space of the frame. Lucilla is still at eye-level with the Faustina bust. "And beauty. But she looked for love elsewhere, since she could not love me." Lucilla moves back to Aurelius's bed, and the camera moves with her so that Faustina almost disappears from the frame. Now she is fully part of her father's mise-en-scene. "You, the best, the greatest of men! Is that the way it must be, Father? Only moments of beauty, and then betrayal?" Lucilla has gone wholly to her father's area of the frame after this visual conflict of influence over her by motionless figures.

Mann cuts to a closeup of Aurelius; but now, Mann is close enough that the light greys and yellows of coverings are absent. Aurelius's face is bright, but it is surrounded by a darker grey-green backdrop of his pillow, at this angle, and shadows behind the bed. "We must try to understand other people more," he says laconically. Mann cuts to a closeup of Lucilla, who pulls back, a shadow literally passing across her face. "Understand cruelty and weakness?" Mann

cuts back to a medium shot of Aurelius, reflecting the increase in distance between them, and now restored to a framing with a greater preponderance of warm tones. "Even that. You have such a gift for life, Lucilla. But I think you ask too much of it." Mann cuts to a medium long shot of Lucilla, with Aurelius in the foreground. The camera tracks left as she moves right, toward Aurelius's bed, and her backdrop changes from the cold tones of the lighting around Faustina's bust to the yellower tones of the maps and columns in Aurelius's area of the room. Mann cuts to the closeup of Aurelius. "Learn to pity. Learn to have compassion--for yourself, too. (softly) Pity and compassion for yourself."

The scene suggests that Aurelius is partly to blame for what will follow. Lucilla asks her father what is possible in life. She may find her mother's behavior "ugly," but she cannot really accept her father's stoic indifference to passion, either. The warmth of his area of the frame actually becomes visually less so the closer one comes to him. Thus she is faced with a dilemma. In the mise-en-scene, she is "torn" between her mother and her father. Her question, "is that the way it must be," is a plea for him to give her another choice of living, a way in which passion and reason can be united. But this is precisely what he cannot do; indeed, his answer is another plea for reason. It is striking that he does not speak of himself having feelings. Even in the line where he speaks of being happy with Faustina, he says he knew moments of happiness. It is rather in speaking of what others have felt or should feel that we see hints of his feelings. He says that Faustina could not love him, but his pattern of denying

feeling suggests that it is at least as much true that he could not love her, or at least express his love passionately rather than rationally. He tells Lucilla to learn to have pity and compassion for others, and "for yourself too." But as his soft repetition makes clear, he is speaking of his own experience, and the means by which he has extended reason to the frontier of passion.[32]

Livius, meanwhile, has gone to meet with Commodus. As with McLintock and Cole in Bend of the River, Mann emphasizes the common qualities of the hero and villain. Kitses notes in Horizons West that the Mann hero and villain typically are virtually alter-egos of one another, so that the hero in defeating the villain must virtually destroy him/herself.[33] Mann uses this scene to establish the degree of similarity between the two men. He uses the cinemascope screen to present them riding side by side in chariots, almost identically dressed--but, in film's traditional coding of character, Commodus is dressed more in blacks, and his horses are black. Livius's horses are white. When Livius asks if Commodus is "well," Commodus answers "I'm never unwell"--an interesting double negative, given the body-metaphor Mann has begun to establish. What part of the body is never "sick?" It is a riddle that Mann leaves unanswered for the present. After meeting, both ride up to the fort in a shot sequence repeating Livius' initial arrival. The differences between them begin to show up in the following scene (shots omitted), when Commodus greets Aurelius. The endless wars have kept them apart, Aurelius says:

> (Commodus, with forced smile): "Endless because you were too gentle. I would have fought these wars differently.

> (Aurelius): There's a lot we'd do differently, Commodus. (turns to enter quarters. Commodus follows, and Aurelius turns to face him)
> (Commodus): I wish you'd have come to Rome more often. There's a whole new generation there, there's a whole new feeling.
> (Aurelius): You mean I'm getting old--senile, perhaps?
> (Commodus laughs.
> (Lucilla, offscreen): Rome has changed... (Lucilla): It's now crawling with gladiators.
> (Commodus, forced smile): Sister! I thought you'd retired as a vestal virgin.
> (Lucilla): And abandoned Rome to you and your athletes?
> (Commodus, mockingly): Female philosopher!

Unlike Livius, Commodus is not an obedient extension of Aurelius' will. Here we see the consequences of Aurelius' hostile marriage. Faustina is dead, yet her influence haunts the film; conflicts between parents tend to be fought through children, and the unresolved conflict between Aurelius and Faustina manifests itself in Lucilla and Commodus. Lucilla in the previous scene with Aurelius is torn between Faustina's image and her father, but here she is clearly her father's daughter, intellectual and bound by duty.[34] Commodus, the film suggests--and will confirm later--is Faustina's son. The parents's inability to combine their qualities of passion and reason produces the conflict in their children, but this also represents on a small scale the grand conflict of the empire.

The transitional scene which follows suggests some of the social implications of Commodus' "new Rome":

> (Commodus, tracking medium-long shot as he descends stairs and approaches Livius): Come, let's find some wine. (Livius stops Commodus with his right hand, and motions to two men standing

next to him on his left; Livius): The tribunes Polybius and Victorinus. We have fought four campaigns together.
(High angle medium-shot Commodus, motions with right hand at man on lower level; Commodus): Verulus. The greatest gladiator of all Rome, survivor of a hundred battles.
(low angle MCU Livius and tribunes, centered on Polybius, who responds angrily): Gladiators to fight as soldiers?

Commodus is only interested in Livius, but Livius insists on observing the proprieties of introductions with his officers, social equals in spite of their subordinate status. Mann underlines this by placing all of the characters in the same frame, on the same level. Commodus then introduces his gladiator, Verulus, equating gladiatorial victories with campaigns, and mercenaries with citizens. In contrast to the previous shot, Verulus is on a lower level visually, underlining his status as a social inferior. In effect, Commodus mocks the social ceremony Livius has observed. Commodus' dependence upon Verulus is as a spectator to an entertainer; Verulus' conflicts are individual fights, except as spectators' wagers are in the balance. Livius's life and honor depend on his tribunes, and Rome's peace rests on their collective efforts. Polybius and Victorinus interpret this as an insult, and angrily glance back and forth from Commodus to Livius, waiting for a response. Instead, Livius mutters roughly, "let's have some wine," and he and Commodus leave the scene.

As a matter of history, Aurelius himself had introduced the practice of making slaves, gladiators, and even Germans soldiers on the Northern frontier.[35] But Mann's intent was less to tell the precise story of this period than it is to show the type of a civilization in decline. "[T]ake [Shakespeare's] Julius

Caesar and you will find tremendous inaccuracies from a historical point of view; but these are not important," Mann wrote in defense of his film.[36] Mann juxtaposes a heroic Rome of community duty with a villainous Rome of selfishness, in accordance with his typical character patterns. What is unusual about this particular Mann story however is the scope and topicality which the Roman genre allowed him. As I have shown in my review of periodical articles, Rome was an accepted conceptual model for the United States, as Mann well knew:

> The reason for making The Fall of the Roman Empire is that it is as modern today as it was in the history that Gibbon wrote: if you read Gibbon...it is like seeing the future as well as the past. The future is the thing that interested me in the subject. The past is like a mirror; it reflects what actually happened, and in the reflexion (sic) of the fall of Rome are the same elements in what is happening today, the same things that are making our empires fall.[37]

Janine Basinger's argument about Mann's films in general is that they are "archetypal." "Because [their] nature is primarily emotional for the audience, and technical in terms of presentation, [they have] been totally overlooked by critics and scholars attuned only to intellectual, political, or sociological achievements on film.[38] But as even Basinger recognized, "[Fall of the Roman Empire] is not about the issues of the fall of the Roman Empire quite as much as it is about the issues of the 1960's."[39]

Mann's particular use of Rome seems to be in consonance with some of the later cautionary periodical articles comparing the Roman and American republics. In The Saturday Review, F.R. Cowell argued for the necessity of

"singleminded devotion to values shared in common" for the survival of nations. Rome thrived in times of self-forgetfulness and collective civic enterprise. Rome collapsed due to one of the "natural diseases" of republics (and by extension, the limited monarchy of the five Antoninian emperors), individualism. Rome began to collapse "after [the Romans] had begun to concentrate their energies upon the...principle that everyone should have a free hand to enjoy all the selfish satisfactions he could grab."[40] Arnold J. Toynbee drew a similar conclusion in The New York Times, arguing that Romans lost their sense of civic duty when the Roman peace removed the stimulus of war. "This problem, which the Romans failed to solve, is likely to be one of our worries, too, in the present chapter of the world's history."[41]

When he began making his epics, Mann modified the hero-type of his Westerns in order to emphasize the necessity of a social consciousness among citizens in order for societies to survive. "I figured out that Jimmy Stewart's character [the hero of his best Westerns] wasn't `open' enough with regard to others: I corrected that. The Cid thought only of the well-being of Spain. Livius and Timonides, that of the Roman Empire."[42] Mann said that he "likes a man who fixes on one line of conduct, respects it and makes it respected. He alone is worthy of esteem. He knows where he is, he knows where he's going...and he gets there." This certainly sounds like the Cid, assisted in his fixed task by his Moorish allies and Chimene; but that was a success, the recognition of a newborn society rising in triumph. In the case of Rome, Mann was telling a

story of a civilization which collapsed, in which heroism and effective action are disorganized--an ironic romance. He modified his epic hero-type accordingly. Mann's Livius and Commodus are the active agents for the civic and selfish versions of Rome, much as Glyn McLintock and Emerson Cole were the active agents of the differing spirits in the two versions of Portland in Bend of the River. As in his earlier Western,[43] Livius and Commodus come from the same background, but are driven apart because the hero is evolving and the villain is not. "I always tried to build my films on oppositions of characters," Mann said in an interview. "Putting the accent on common points of two characters then making them collide, the story acquires more strength and you obtain a greater intensity."[44]

We see this conflict emerge into the open in the following scene. Stephen Boyd had played Messala in Ben-Hur, the doppelgänger theme of which surely must have influenced the writing of this film. In that film, Wyler reputedly had told Boyd that the conflict between Messala and Hur was Messala's unrequited homoerotic attraction for Hur. Mann and scriptwriters used the same ploy for this film, except they suggest in this case that it is requited. In long shot, Livius and Commodus enter what seems to be Livius' quarters. The camera tracks left to follow their movement through a room filled with armor and weapons:

> (Commodus): You know, Livius, it's when I'm with you that I feel good--safe. Don't ever change.
> (Livius): Caesar was just telling me I should change.
> (Commodus): Oh, Father thinks too much.

> (Livius): There's much for a Roman to think of these days.
> (Commodus, mocking tone): Why, Livius! For a moment that honest warrior's face of yours took on the, ah, philosopher's look. Let's not think, let's drink!

Linking arms, as in a lover's toast, each drinks from a wine skin until Livius must breath. Mann cuts away to a long shot of them drinking, then cuts to a closeup as Livius collapses, on the table, and Commodus collapses on top of him.

The homoerotic suggestion indicates the conflict between the exclusive community of themselves alone, as in this room, and the inclusive community of Lucilla in the open air, and the multitudes of the empire. It casts Commodus, in effect in the role of the Noir woman, the seductive figure against whom the hero cannot bring himself to react until it is too late. And the particular demand that Commodus places on Livius is not to think. This is what Aurelius demands of him as emperor-to-be. Aurelius inspires Livius's reason. Yet this scene underscores his passionate attachment to Commodus, and the degree to which passion diametrically opposes reason.

Unlike the Cid, or McLintock, Livius is much more an incomplete hero, a nascent hero rather than one who has completed the hero's journey. He is paralleled by Vance in The Furies, who needs more experience and the correct partner to develop. Faced with the conflict between communities, as is Vance, he doesn't know what to do. As they get up laughing from the table and start to climb a stairway, Livius tries to tell Commodus of Aurelius' decision that he should be the next emperor instead of Commodus. He asks Commodus, "do you know what a dilemma is? A dilemma is when there are only two

possibilities, and both of them are impossible." He doesn't have a clear sense of which duty, comradeship or empire, is higher. He has to learn which is more important, to choose rationally between them, or to find a means of reconciling them. His function in this film is thus much more like that of Chimene in El Cid, as Lucilla's function conversely is more like the Cid's.

Because he doesn't know what to do, Livius becomes the field on which the film's conflicts are fought. Commodus sees the conflict for Livius' destiny as a game. As this scene continues to unfold, Commodus attempts to compete with Aurelius for control of Livius, on the basis of friendship over duty, and indulgence over restraint. For the time being, he seems to have succeeded; Livius seems unable to weigh abstractly the demands due to each, and he submerges himself in laughter, wine and sex. Only when Commodus, laughing, tries to force wine down a captive German woman's throat prior to raping her; only when she breaks free and cowers in front of Livius; and only when Commodus prods Livius to explain why he doesn't seem happy, does Livius finally tell Commodus that Aurelius has chosen him over his son as heir. The consequences to others of debauchery seem to return his mind to duty.

Commodus' response is revealing: He laughs, mixing anger, despair and amusement together, and when Livius asks Commodus to decide for him what to do, Commodus shouts "you will do as the gods decide!" As he had toyed with the fate of the German captive, he seems to believe, the gods toy with his fate. Rational planning is irrelevant. The role of the dice has gone against

him, and the game is up. He abandons both of his objects of seduction; he walks up to the blonde German captive, taps her on the head, and says to Livius, "She is for you. She thinks."

Commodus's words serve as a prelude to the following scene, in which the "female philosopher," Lucilla, knocks at Livius' door. Mann cuts to an exterior long shot as Lucilla--in a yellow shawl and dress--runs up stairs to knock. Mann cuts to a long shot of Livius running up stairs and to the camera to answer through the door; Mann perhaps employs here (as earlier) the Freudian interpretation linking stairs symbolically to sex. Each then, in a long shot, move down stairs in long shot to meet in the open courtyard, and Mann cuts to full shot/reverse shots as they speak. "Have you finished with Commodus and wine," she says, to the soft accompaniment of her lietmotiv. "My world has suddenly become strange. I'm not sure where I am. I'm sure of only one thing: I love you, Lucilla." This is not entirely out of the blue, but close enough. Yet the matched shots of their movements are hypnotic, almost a ritual of courtship. "If you are so sure, why did it take you so long," Lucilla asks. Mann cuts to a closeup of Livius. "I think I must have known all of these years. I must have been certain one day that this would happen. Known--yet not known." Mann moves closer to each of them separately with the camera as they approach each other with words. "There were times when I wanted to run away from life, Lucilla says, responding to his words. "I did not because I told myself that one day, you would be with me.

Lucilla and Livius each have a dilemma to resolve. Her dilemma is to combine passion with reason, to find the third path her parents could not, so that she can live in the world. Livius similarly needs to find a third path that combines passion with duty, a rational grounding for his actions that brings him out of his private world into the social world. Each recognizes in the other the resolution to their dilemma. "I want to be with you for the rest of my life, for I love you," Livius says. "Do you, Livius," Lucilla says; as she is all too aware, Commodus retains a strong seductive hold on him.

In her structural role, Lucilla is the spirit Boethius in his Consolation of Philosophy called Philosophia, the rational spirit of the ancient world,[45] in search of a link to the physical world. Livius is the practical and disciplined physical strength of Rome, in search of reason. Yet against passion, in Boethius and in Noir, all too often reason is overmatched. The combination of the two together is still new. Mann cuts to a two-shot of the new couple, together in the morning, around the augury alter. Lucilla's hair is uncovered, and Livius fondles it as Lucilla places white flowers on the alter--attempting, with her magic, to counter darker forces. "Bring him back to me safely," she prays to Vesta. "Bring him back to me quickly. Make him love me forever," she says, as the camera swings in and wraps around them, and they kiss.

Mann fades from the new couple to the philosophical couple of Aurelius and Timonides, who come out to Aurelius' balcony together. The camera cuts to their point of view: A panorama of legions assembling in the Winter

landscape, amid a scattering of snowflakes. Commodus leads his column of gladiators down through the ranks, and Mann cuts from shots of them approaching to a descending tracking shot stopping at the column head in a medium long shot of Commodus and Verulus the gladiator as Livius and his second-in-command Polybius ride up. Mann uses mirror-image reverse shots of each leader and their subordinate commander as Livius tells Commodus to remove his men. In his eyes, they are not trustworthy in battle.

Commodus informs Livius that he will lead the attack. "The men we send first into battle will be used as bait," Livius says; they intend to send a small force into the forest, and follow with a larger force once the smaller force comes under attack to overwhelm the Germans. "Many will die. It will be especially dangerous for their leader." "We will be the first into this battle. We will be your bait. And if I die, then the gods were not with me. Then Livius, my friend, my brother, will it not relieve you of a great (pause) burden?" Characteristically, Commodus chooses to respond to the succession crisis by relying on luck and his fighting skill. Livius nods to Polybius, who gives the orders: To march until they engage the barbarians, and stand and hold them for the larger force to destroy. "We <u>will</u> stand, <u>and</u> hold," Verulus answers testily. At a signal from Aurelius, passed through Livius, they march into the woods. Livius and his commanders ride to the edge of the ridge, overlooking the woods, and look down.

Mann uses a succession of slow tracking shots, following the army. As in El Cid, Commodus's army marches past a point, and behind trees (instead of stones, as in El Cid) the camera lingers to observe Germans rising from their hiding places to watch the Romans. The tracking shots have the character of point-of-view shots, alternatively of the Germans watching the Romans, and of the Romans, looking around them apprehensively at an apparently deserted forest. Mann also cuts successively to shots of Livius and his commanders, using extreme long shots that zoom into the forest (in the only zooms in the film), indicating the intensity of their focus.

When the attack comes, Mann marks it by replacing the slow track with whip pans. He cuts from the column to Germans, revealed above rocks, who throw spears. Mann tracks with the spears, showing Commodus's horse go down, then Verulus's. Mann cuts from this to a whip pan across the forest accompanied by the shouts of the Germans attacking, then to a closeup of Polybius and Victorinex shouting the attack order, and to a closeup of Livius riding forward. Mann cuts then to a long shot of the assembled Roman cavalry galloping down the hill, tracking them with a rapid pan, and uses another extreme long-shot zoom into the forest before cutting back to the battle to link again the two locations.

Mann planned out a battle shot sequence, but producer Samuel Bronston ran out of money and had an assistant put together a simpler battle sequence that is functional, but somewhat obscures one key point.[46] The small

Roman force is attacked on both sides in a small valley. The camera cuts away to show small groups of Romans breaking away from the central circle and running, pursued by Germans. This is not emphasized, unfortunately, and the effect it has on the battle is not clear. The camera shows closeups both of Verulus and Commodus, both hard-pressed, each backed up against trees. Verulus always keeps an eye on Commodus, however, and rushes up in time to parry a spear thrust at him. The Roman cavalry arrives, and after a moment of brutal fighting, the Germans run up a hill in the opposite direction. Livius and Polybius, each of whom dismounted to fight, return to their horses and ride over to Commodus and Verulus. Prior to the fight, they looked across at each other in mirror shots. Now, Livius and Polybius look down at Commodus and Verulus. "Ballomar's escaped," Polybius says to Livius, then looks down at his counterpart Verulus, "because some of your gladiators were cowards!" Mann cuts to a reaction medium shot of Commodus and Verulus, sullen. Commodus has lived, but not gained respect or honor.

Mann dissolves to Aurelius' quarters as Sohamus, King of Armenia, bows to him. Lucilla enters, calling out, "Father--Father!" then stops, seeing Sohamus. Sohamus steps toward her, and the camera tracks in slightly with him, to isolate them in a medium long shot. "It's been decided, Lucilla," Sohamus says to her. Mann cuts to an over-the-shoulder medium shot of Sohamus, obliquely Lucilla's point of view. Behind him lurks Faustina's bust in the shadows. "Armenia and Rome will become even closer," he says, smiling at

her. Mann cuts to the reverse angle to show her reaction. "A part of Rome--a lovely part--will become Armenia." Lucilla keeps her face frozen. Dmitri Tiomkin's soundtrack is of a flute playing the sort of "Levantine" flourish used, for example, with Joel Cairo's appearances in The Maltese Falcon (1941). His appearance--dandyesque, with a cloak ornamented like a Gustav Klimt backdrop and an overly tidy little goatee that gives the illusion of the cleft chin Livius actually has--marks him as the equivalent of the Western's false dandy. Like Cairo in The Maltese Falcon to Sam Spade, he is the counterfeit of the husband and leader that Livius could be.

Mann cuts to a medium long shot of Aurelius, who stops rolling up a scroll to watch his daughter's reaction. She watches him depart. Mann returns to Aurelius, who finishes rolling up his scroll, then steps forward to a closeup. "Lucilla, I want you to take care of these." Mann cuts away to a long shot of them in separate corners of the frame as Aurelius places the scroll with others in a carrier. "I want you to take care of these. I wrote them while campaigning in these forests." "I will watch over them, father," Lucilla responds. The camera tracks in slightly and to the left as Aurelius walks over, takes her hand, and leads her away from the camera, over to the map of the empire. "I have tried to convince myself that my fears for the empire are unreasonable. But my fears are reasonable. The East, Lucilla, is where our danger lies. We must make an alliance that will show the whole world what value Rome places on her Eastern frontier. An alliance with Armenia." Lucilla's theme comes up, and Lucilla turns,

facing the camera, and walks in the opposite path Aurelius followed, as the camera tracks left with her. "And so Caesar must give his daughter in marriage to the king of Armenia." She moves to the left corner of the frame to a medium long shot framing, leaving Aurelius in long shot on the right. The camera comes to rest so framed that the bust of Faustina divides them. She does not react still, but her countermovement and the camera show what she is thinking of, and in this re-establishing shot Mann tells to us how she is feeling.

"I had hoped the gods would be kind," Aurelius says. Mann cuts to a medium shot of him, on the right side of the frame, with the map of the empire on the left, illuminated by a torch. "I had hoped you would not have to make a marriage without love." Mann returns to the re-establishing shot. Lucilla turns to look up at Faustina's bust. "Father, you know better than anyone what a marriage without love can mean." "Yes, he replies. Mann cuts to a close-up and tracks with Aurelius as he comes down the stairs, away from the imagery of empire to his personal living area. "Yes, I do," he says, looking away from her. Mann returns to the re-establishing shot. "I know you love me. Therefore-- Therefore, if you ask me," she says, looking away from him, "it can only mean that you must have tried with all your strength to find another way." "Yes, I have," Aurelius says, his voice breaking, and he sits and bows, closing his emotions from her view and the camera's. Mann cuts to a closeup of Lucilla, with tears in her eyes. "And you could not?" Mann cuts to Aurelius, his face three-quarters turned away from the camera, still hiding his emotions. Hoarsely

he says, "no, I could not." Mann returns to Lucilla, who leans against a post, face despairing, body shaking with sobs, yet voice still controlled. "Therefore it must be done." Mann cuts to Aurelius, as before. he bows his head silently.

This is the consequence of Commodus's inability to sacrifice his desires for the common good--and indeed, is another consequence indirectly of Aurelius's marriage with Faustina. The emperor who succeeds him must have time to establish himself. Commodus, as co-regent, has failed to do so. As Commodus cannot sacrifice his passions in favor of his duty to the empire, he causes Aurelius to sacrifice both his children's future happiness in his settlement of affairs before his death in order to try to ensure the good of the empire. "How many pleasures have been enjoyed by robbers, patricides, tyrants!" the real Aurelius wrote. "I do my duty. Other things do not trouble me, for they are either things without life, or things without reason, or things that have wandered and know not the way."[47] In his stoic philosophy--both the real Aurelius and the film Aurelius--"Whatever happens to the individual is for the interest of the universal; this should be sufficient."[48] But it is certainly not sufficient to Mann; the America of 1964 was not prepared to accept dilemmas and to deny feelings. Mann favors Lucilla in his use of the camera, and though the scene hardly condemns Aurelius, it hints--as the rest of the movie will show--that an unbalanced denial of individual passion is in its way as dangerous as Commodus's unbalanced embracing of it, as the denial produces in others, if not in the person him/herself, a violent reaction.

Mann fades from one scene of discipline to another: A decimation, or punishment by death of one in ten, of Commodus's gladiators for their cowardice that led to Ballomar's escape.[49] Mann shows the surviving legion lined along a high bridge in a pan to the right, then he tracks in to show Livius in his chariot, and behind him his commanders. Mann cuts to another right pan to show troops assembled, watching below. Above them, Polybius speaks. "Thus does Rome punish cowards!" Mann cuts to a full shot of a portion of the line-up as one man is pushed off the bridge by spear-point. Mann cuts to a reverse tracking shot showing Polybius, Victorinex, and a man with a spear as they move along the line, past the fear-filled faces of Commodus's men. Polybius motions with his sword, and the spear-carrier pushes another man off the bridge.

Mann cuts from a long shot of the man's fall to a closeup of Livius, observing this grimly. Livius turns, hearing a noise, and Mann cuts to his point of view: a chariot and a rider. Mann pans with the rider. It is Verulus, who shouts "stop this!" at Livius's officers. Mann cuts to Commodus, who pulls his chariot next to Livius's, and to closeups as they exchange angry looks. "You call us cowards! Let twenty of your men fight twenty of ours," Verulus shouts. Mann cuts to a medium shot of him as he adds, "if they dare! And then see who are cowards!" This misses the point--that an army operates as a collective unit, not a collection of individuals, and that an individual may be a good fighter and still a bad soldier. Commodus shouts that no one shall touch Verulus, and

Livius countermands that order. Mann cuts to closeup reverse shots of Livius and Commodus. "I am the commander of the Northern Army," Livius says. "Continue the punishment." "I will not permit this," Commodus tells Livius. "Withdraw, Commodus." "I cannot." "Nor can I."

Livius and Commodus each see the punishment of Commodus's gladiator-soldiers as a matter of betrayal--a betrayal on the other's part, and also against the principle by which they guide their life. Livius's guiding value is law--not on the grounds of philosophy, as is the case of Aurelius or Timonides, but the pro-social discipline of law as the habitual response he has inculcated as a Roman. This is something he has yet to work out consciously--it is this task he has to undertake in the course of the film--but it is his encultured response to problems. Commodus's guiding value is affiliation--a "clan" defined, not by family, but by common values and feelings. Commodus values the small-scale nationalism of the gang, within which there are no laws except loyalty. When one deals with people outside the "nation"-group, there are no rules at all.[50] This defines more precisely the dilemma which Livius confronts with Commodus--and vice-versa. One value or the other must have priority. Livius need not decide; he simply follows the law of his duty to Aurelius, as he understands it, so long as he is in command. Commodus, as co-regent and gang-leader, does have a decision to make. Like Livius, he faces a dilemma. For Commodus, there is only one way to decide dilemmas. "Let the gods

decide," he says, and whips Livius. Startled, Livius and Commodus's horses bolt down the Roman road.

What follows is something of a reprise of the chariot race in Ben-Hur, courtesy of Yakima Canutt, the legendary stunt-man and second-unit director, who had designed the same sequence in the earlier film. Livius and Commodus's chariots race side by side down the narrow military road, each in imminent danger of being pushed off cliff edges or into streams. Commodus continues to whip Livius, and eventually causes Livius to drop his horse's reins. Livius leaps into Commodus's chariot just prior to his own chariot's destruction. In Ben-Hur, the trial-by-combat is assumed to be decisive; God punishes through the chariot race the Roman ideal Messalla represents, prefiguring the fate which, in the fullness of time, shall befall the evil empire itself. In The Fall of the Roman Empire, like Spartacus, goodness and evil are not presumed to follow in accordance with the will of providence. Commodus's irrational solution to his dilemma ends inconclusively, with a fistfight between the two men.

Mann cuts from this dilemma of irrational decisions to another, less philosophical rational discussion. Commodus brought his entourage with him to the Vienna fortress. Mann begins with a closeup of hands, being warmed over a fire. "Yes, the omens have been bad," a voice says. Mann tracks out and tilts up to show in the center of the frame the speaker, Cleander. He stands as others of Commodus's entourage sit or squat around the fire, at one of the

battlement watch points, the focus of the composition. "Bad for whom? For us? For Rome? At least here we can speak clearly," the man to Cleander's right says. "What would you like, Julianus?" Cleander responds. "That the gods send us written messages, advising us of each small move we make?" Mann's track out continues, revealing the full group of conspirators. "Is the murderer of an emperor a small move?" a man to the right of Julianus says archly, a man with the tidy trimmed beard and moustache stereotypical of the Hollywood villain, who will later be identified as Nigia, one of Commodus's senators. "Murder!" a man to Cleander's left says. Mann cuts back and forth between the left and right sides, as Commodus's entourage debates whether or not Marcus Aurelius should be killed.

The reason for their discussion is the news that Cleander presumably has brought them: Aurelius intends to proclaim Livius his heir. "Once he does that, publicly, what hope is there for us?" Julianus says. In the absence of any clearer indication of fate other than bad omens, Commodus's entourage is inclined to do what is required "for us:" kill the emperor. The fulcrum for this debate, visually, is Cleander. "Does Commodus know?" the uncertain man to Cleander's left asks. "Commodus does <u>not</u> know," Nigia replies, smiling. "He must <u>never</u> know." Commodus, as Mann has shown in his responses, not least in the trial-by-chariot scene immediately prior to this, depends completely on the will of the gods as made manifest in events. To admit him to the knowledge that this machiavellian plot will bring him to power would make him doubt his right to

rule--and their right to be the instruments of his rule. The question as to whether or not Commodus is capable of administrating Rome and the nations is not an issue for them.

The bearded man explains how Aurelius may be killed: With a slice of fruit, cut with a knife that, on the side with an etched snake, is poisoned. Aurelius must be made to accept the poisoned half of a fruit cut in two with the knife. Mann cuts back to the medium long shot of the group, each side balanced by Cleander in the middle. "'But who is close enough to him?" "I am," Cleander says, turning and stepping toward the plotter's side. Mann cuts to a two-shot of Julianus and Cleander, then to the closeup he has used as the bearded man explained his plot. Cleander's hand reaches into the frame from the right, and the bearded man hands the knife to him. Mann tracks with the knife as Cleander fingers it, then up to a closeup of Cleander's face, impassive. "I have only to feel the blade to know which side. And who better than a blind man?" Thunder rumbles on the soundtrack, a pathetic fallacy foreshadowing the sudden death for Aurelius they have plotted.

Mann cuts to a long shot of the subject of this plotting, Aurelius, alone in his chambers. The sequence is characterized by a sequence of movements in and out, mostly in voice-over monologue, moving screen left (to his right) when his monologue seems to suggest the uselessness of his philosophy toward life, and screen right (his left) . The points of crisis in the internal structure of the monologue are marked by moments when Aurelius speaks aloud. "Are you a

man to enjoy an irony, Marcus Aurelius?" Aurelius begins in voice-over. "Look well then, at the emperor of Rome become no better than a slave. And who or what is your master." "Slave!" he says aloud, grabbing at his belly, and continues his interior monologue. Mann tracks in and left to a medium shot. "A small point in your side, perhaps no larger than a grain of wheat." Aurelius leans over and grabs either side of a basin. Mann cuts to a closeup of Aurelius, reflected in water the basin contains. "Of what use is your wisdom now," Aurelius says aloud. In voice-over, he continues. "No answer?" Aurelius dissolves the image of himself, dipping his hands into the water. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Aurelius as he splashes the water on his face, and dries it. It is one of Mann's most poetic shots, apt in this monologue, and illustrative of Aurelius's own observation in the Meditations, "how quickly all things disappear into the universe, memories of them in time." Here is the image of death, which Aurelius must resolve.

Mann tracks with Aurelius in medium shot as he moves back to the center of his chamber, as the voice-over monologue on death continues. "Think of all you have read and pondered over the years. And the talk, Marcus Aurelius. The hours of talk with your friend Timonides. Surely it must have prepared you for this moment. But it has failed you, hasn't it. You are not prepared." "Why?" Aurelius says aloud. For a man who has lived on the basis of rationality, the inability of reason to prepare him for death is intolerable. Aurelius moves toward the camera again, which tracks left to frame him in closeup, looking up at

the bust of his dead wife and touching her lips. The words he speaks aloud are reproachful, mocking, as though she--the symbol of ungoverned passion in this film--were mocking him for his folly of reason. "In all that talk did this topic of death slip your mind?" Aurelius turns away, and Mann cuts to a low-angle medium shot as Aurelius pours incense on the fire that burns in front of his wife's bust. "Or did you know deep down that your wisdom would be helpless before this mystery of mysteries." This is in a sense her victory in an implied debate between them; his reason is, in the final analysis, useless when confronted with the elemental facts of life and death.

Mann cuts to a closeup of Aurelius. He turns to his left. "But once you admit that, all other knowledge and skill becomes trivial and meaningless. For then you would not have thought and read and talked and wondered." Mann cuts away to a low angle medium shot as Aurelius turns away from the camera and, and tracks in with him as he moves to his writing table. "So perhaps it's just as well," he says aloud. "For if men do not think, read, talk to each other," the voice-over continues. "Above all else, talk," Aurelius says aloud, turning his face to be illuminated fully by the light, "they are no longer men." Here is the dignity of knowledge: Not that it explains life, but structures it with reason, and clothes the irrationality of the individual's life and death with a collective enterprise that defines, not just the individual's life, but the lives of all who participate. "Among irrational animals one life is distributed; but among rational animals one intelligent soul is distributed," Aurelius wrote in The Meditations.

Scriptwriters Barzman, Yordan and Mann seem to be evoking the same conclusion in their Aurelius's "meditation."[51]

This conclusion is interrupted by pain, and thunder. Aurelius collapses on his desk. Mann cuts to a closeup, with a voice-over. "He's come for me--the silent boatman come to ferry me across the river." The pain ceases, and Aurelius raises himself up imperiously. "I am not ready for you," he says aloud, and then crumples again in pain. He raises himself again and leans forward, spreading his arms, staring imploringly as the voice-over continues: "I've always been willing to bargain with my enemies; can we not make a treaty? For your part I ask you to wait two years--" "One year!" he says aloud, grimacing and standing. "I cannot do it in less than a year." Mann cuts to a medium shot, positioned to Aurelius's right, and tracks with him as he strides rapidly forward. "I do not seek pleasures or friendship or love," the voice-over continues. Aurelius looks at the door, then turns to face his armor, the external shell of his imperial duty. "I speak only of Rome," he says aloud, and moves to a two-shot close-up of Aurelius and his empty armor. "And when I say Rome I mean the world--" He continues the thought in voiceover. "The future. I am prepared for my part to live on in pain." Aurelius turns to face his right, screen left. "A year. What is a year to you?" he says aloud. As if in answer, he is struck by another spasm of pain, and collapses against a post behind him; no bargains can be made.

Mann cuts to a close-up. "Coarse, vulgar, stupid thing!" he speaks, in voiceover, to Death. "Yet it was I who said--" he continues the thought aloud, "is it not in the nature of the fig tree to give figs as for the honeybee to give honey, and for the lion to fall on the lamb." Mann cuts to a medium shot and tracks with Aurelius to screen left as he goes to a door to his balcony and opens it. "So it is in the way of things that you should come to me. Forgive me, Boatman. I did not realize that you were blind and deaf." Aloud, Aurelius speaks into the dark. "Come for me when you will. My hand shall lead us." Thunder rolls again.

Mann cuts to a camera position outside, showing in medium shot Aurelius as we hear his voice-over. "But I tell you this: There is a great truth we have not yet divined." While Aurelius has come to terms with Death, its agents have arrived at the door. Behind him, in extreme long shot, the door to his chamber opens. Aurelius turns as Julianus leads in Cleander. Timonides follows. Aurelius tells them that he is in pain. "The greeks say that there is nothing better than fruit to soften pain," Cleander says. He takes an apple from a bowl on a stand. "Share this with me." Mann cuts to a closeup of the knife and the apple, as the soundtrack awakens with sinister music. Mann cuts to a two-shot closeup of Cleander and Julianus, who stares at the apple, then returns to the knife and apple. Mann tracks with the apple, cuts to a tracking closeup of Cleander's impassive face, and then returns to the apple as Cleander stands next to Aurelius, who takes the offered half. Mann tracks up as

Aurelius raises the apple to his lips and pauses, waiting in a manner that seems habitual for Cleander to taste first. Mann cuts to Cleander, who pauses, bites his half, and pauses again. Mann cuts to Aurelius, who begins eating his half, then returns to Cleander, who begins chewing at the sound, the ghost of a smile on his face.

Mann cuts to the chamber where Livius and Commodus were. Livius washes his face, then turns as Lucilla comes down the steps. They walk to each other, and Mann cuts to an over-the-shoulder close-up of Lucilla as they embrace. He then cuts to an extreme close-up of her eyes. "I've been pledged to king Sohamis," she tells him. Mann cuts to a series of shot/reverse-shots.

> Livius: But you are mine!
> Lucilla: My father gave his word.
> Livius: Come away with me.
> Lucilla: Where could we go?
> Livius: Anywhere where we could be alone.
> Lucilla: There is no such place. I'm Caesar's daughter.
> Livius: You are a woman--that is a much higher rank.
> Lucilla: I couldn't live that way. Nor could you.
> Livius: I could. If I had to choose between being Caesar's heir, or your love, I'd choose you.

Mann cuts to a medium long shot as Lucilla turns and walks diagonally to frame left, to lean against a post. "I cannot!" Livius follows, and the camera tracks in to a close-up.

> Livius: How can you do anything else? Only this is real. All else is half-life, dream. Only this.
> Lucilla: How can you ask me to forget everything I am? All that my life means?
> Livius: How can your life mean anything without love? I will not let this happen.

Here again is the dilemma they will face through the rest of the film: Because of the way Aurelius has arranged things--and in this, apparently, he has had little choice--Livius and Lucilla must stay apart as their duty to Rome. At the same time, they violate a duty to themselves. In particular for Lucilla, her identity is inseparable with Rome's, and yet she cannot really find her identity without Livius. As for Livius, he is still not clearly distinguishable from Commodus. He is habitually guided by law, but in this instance of choice between clan and society, his reaction is similar to Commodus's habitual response: "I will not let this happen."

Mann cuts from this to an extreme closeup of Marcus Aurelius, dying from his poisoned apple. Mann cuts to a profile extreme closeup of Commodus, facing screen left to right, looking down at Aurelius, then a profile extreme closeup of Timonides, facing screen right to left. Mann cuts to an extreme long establishing shot, looking from a far corner of the room through two arches at Aurelius in bed, Timonides in the background, facing away from Aurelius, and Commodus at the foot of the bed. The contextless tight closeups are disorienting, and the extreme distance in the establishing shot also serves to destabilize even as it establishes the characters in the scene. To juxtapose Commodus and Timonides' faces in opposite directions suggests that they face each other; this is usually the technique of a confrontation. Yet once Mann finally shows us their location, it is clear that they are not confronting each other after all. He has shown us in the film that they are unalterably opposed to each

other, as the characters respectively of irrational action and rational thought. But the conflict itself is still nascent.

Mann cuts from this sequence of shots to the natural followup to an establishing shot, a three-quarter angle close-up of Commodus, for once looking vulnerable, trying to bring himself to speak. "Father, why did you (pause) deny me?" Mann cuts again to the extreme close-up of Timonides, who turns to look (as Mann has now shown us in the establishing shot) at Commodus. He furrows his eyebrows in thought, then glances over in Aurelius's screen position. Mann cuts to a profile extreme closeup of Aurelius, the confrontational camera angle again, but Aurelius's eyes are closed, and he is barely breathing. Mann cuts back to the Commodus closeup, and tracks with him as he bows his head, then steps back a few steps, and looks back up with a more habitual arrogant coldness.

Mann cuts from this to a medium long shot outside the room Livius and Lucilla are in. Sentries stand still as, from either side of the frame in front and behind them, horses ride by, and men shout "Caesar is dying." Livius and Lucilla emerge into this busy frame, and the camera tracks with them in medium long shot as they run up the stairs to Aurelius's chamber. As they start up the stairs, Sehamis walks into the bottom of the frame and looks up at them--like Lucilla with the Noir pair of Commodus and Livius, he is made to look up, in this framing, as the distant angle of a triangle; as with any other Noir male, there is little he can do about it.

Mann returns again to the extreme long establishing shot, with each of the principals in the same location, as Lucilla and Livius enter the room. Mann cuts to a medium shot of them as they approach the camera, and the camera tracks down to rest, bed-level, as Lucilla kneels, in a composition of a descending diagonal from Livius in the left corner of the frame to Lucilla, centrally balanced between Livius and Aurelius, and in the top right corner, small and isolated, Timonides. She touches his forehead and he makes a noise. Mann cuts to an extreme close-up of Commodus, whose eyes widen; here is a response, to his sister, that he had begged for and not received. Mann cuts to Lucilla's point of view of Aurelius. His eyes open wide, but he does not look at her, but straight up. Mann cuts from this to the extreme long establishing shot as Commodus turns, and strides rapidly toward the camera, passing out on the left side of the frame, anguished. Here again is rejection, of a sort that, given Commodus's beliefs, he can only see as an inexplicable betrayal. His face shows the anguish of this as he passes.

Mann cuts back to a standard close-up of Lucilla, and to her point of view of Aurelius. Echoing Commodus's inability to say "Father" without several starts, Aurelius now attempts to speak. "Li, Li, Lifius." A tear rolls down his cheek. Mann returns to the Lucilla close-up as she reacts, eyes opening wide, and then turns to look at Livius. Mann cuts to a close-up of Livius, also unable to speak. Mann cuts to a close-up of Timonides, watching intently, then returns to the extreme long establishing shot. Commodus has turned away and walked

toward the camera and out of the frame; now Livius turns the opposite direction and walks to the door in the center of the frame. Timonides opens it, and both together leave Lucilla and Aurelius alone, distant figures in the large frame. Mann returns to Lucilla's point of view of Aurelius. "Liv, Liv," Mann cuts to Lucilla's closeup and tracks with her down to a tight closeup of Aurelius and Lucilla. "Liv, onh. Liv, Liv." Mann cuts back to Lucilla's point of view of Aurelius. "Livius," he says clearly, and shuts his eyes, duty completed, unaware his audience has fled.

With disordered music to accompany her, Mann shows two quick closeups, from 180 degree reverse angles, of Lucilla crying. Then Mann cuts to the bedside medium shot of Lucilla and Aurelius as she rises. The camera rises up and out to look down at her from a distance as she flings open the porch doors to be blasted by cold wind, a figure "reduced" by her grief and isolation; the shot is typical, but Mann makes in dynamic. He then cuts to a below eye level close-up as she shuts the doors, turns, looking down, then straightens and composes herself. Mann returns to the high long shot as she walks back into the room, and tracks down to below eye level as she approaches Aurelius's bed to a medium long shot. She then turns, and the camera follows her to return to the bedside position. Visually standing on Aurelius's body, she now looks at the map of the empire. Mann cuts to a medium close-up as she turns from the map to look at her father, now completely composed, a creature of stoic duty, as the soundtrack becomes calm. The camera works in concert with the actress to

define completely every nuance of her grief, her discipline, and her concern for her father's legacy, the empire.

Mann cuts to the doors leading from the chamber as Lucilla emerges in an eye-level medium shot, a calm, neutral shot, and tracks with her to an establishing shot as she turns away from the camera to face, long shot in the depth-of-frame, Timonides, Livius, and Aurelius's clerks going through papers. "You are looking for a document, Timonides. A document in which my father named his heir." "There is no such document," Timonides replies. "There must be." Timonides shakes his head. Mann cuts to a close-up of Lucilla, who has lost some of her calm assurance. Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as Livius walks over and embraces her. "His last word was Livius," she says. "I will bare witness that it was Caesar's wish that you be his heir." "If it was only your word, Lucilla, there would be doubt. Caesar must be undoubted Caesar," he replies. She pulls back from him suddenly, and looks to Timonides. The camera moves in to show Timonides and Livius on either side of her in medium shot. "Is it not possible, Lucilla, that there are other ways of becoming the real heir of Marcus Aurelius?" Up to this point, Lucilla has been the largest figure in the frame. But she has had her back to the camera, and as Livius and Timonides have moved up in the frame, her dominance of it has become weaker. Now, with this frustrating of her interpretation of duty to her father, she flees into the frame again, as on Aurelius's death, to the porch doors, herself now a small point of an isosceles triangle dominated by Livius and Timonides.

Their interpretation of duty to Aurelius and the empire will prevail; and now she is left with nothing.

Mann fades to Aurelius's funeral, one of the greatest spectacle images ever filmed. The camera tilts down the lines of soldiers beating drums and marching to look down at Aurelius as he passes, and cuts to a succession of pans as Aurelius passes down the fortress entrance to a long shot of a funeral pyre, with assembled army and principals. Mann cuts to a 180 degree reverse, medium close-up of Livius and his commanders. Mann tracks to the right and in to Lucilla, then tracks past the Proconsuls of Syria and Egypt, Virgillianus and Marcellus, to Timonides, and fades into an empty grayish-white screen. The camera tracks down to reveal that the emptiness was a snow-filled sky, a visual trope of grief and loss, and Aurelius on his bier. The soldiers baring it set it down on the pyre, to reveal, in an establishing long shot, Livius and his commanders, and Lucilla on screen left, and Commodus and his entourage on screen right, with Timonides at the fulcrum in the center of the frame, holding the torch to light the pyre. Mann cuts back to the bier as the soldiers leave, the funeral march stops, and attendants pour oil from urns on the wood. Mann then tracks in medium close-up from right to left from Commodus, as a unison of funeral wails begins, past Sehamis and his attendants, past Cleander, to rest again on Timonides. Mann then tracks across the line of soldiers wailing in unison, and back to the establishing shot. The attendants signal that their preparation is finished; the social ritual is complete.

Now the moment of decision is at hand: Who will be proclaimed the heir? Mann cuts from a closeup of Lucilla, who looks over, to Livius, who looks across, to a close-up of Commodus, tensely waiting, then back to Livius. Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as Livius faces the bier, then turns, walks to Timonides, and takes the torch. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Livius and Timonides; Timonides nods, and Livius wheels. Mann cuts to Commodus, then back to Livius as he starts forward, then to Lucilla as Livius passes in front of her. Mann returns to the establishing shot as Livius arrives at the foot of the pyre, then turns to face Commodus. Mann cuts to Commodus; he is surprised. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Livius, who holds out the torch, then to Commodus, who tentatively steps forward, and cuts out to the establishing shot. Mann then cuts to yet another triangle, a medium close-up two shot of Commodus and Livius, each gripping the torch, with Timonides at the point of the torch between them, the balancing point. Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as Commodus and Livius walk forward, and Timonides steps aside to make way for them. Facing the crowd, Livius shouts: "Hail undoubted Caesar!" Mann cuts to a close-up of Lucilla; she has not been sure, as Commodus has not, what Livius's decision would be. "Hail Commodus!" She turns her face away in sorrow. Mann cuts to Julianus, the bearded man, and others of Commodus's entourage. Julianus looks back at the bearded man, smiling openly in triumph. Mann cuts to Livius's commanders, Polybius and

Victorinus. First Polybius, then Victorinus, react with suspicious glares at Commodus's entourage.

Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as the assembled armies and representatives hail Commodus, and then to a 180 degree reverse two-shot close-up as Livius releases the torch to Commodus. Commodus smiles at him, and turns. Mann cuts to the establishing shot as Commodus walks to the pyre and shoves in the torch. Mann cuts to a close-up of Commodus, with Livius, Timonides, and Cleander behind him, slightly out of focus. Commodus smiles as the sound of flames grows. He turns to face Livius. Mann cuts to another triangle construction, as Commodus on screen right faces Livius in the center, with Lucilla, impassive, turned away from them in the left of the frame. "I will never forget what you have done today," he says quietly, then takes his hand and turns to face the assemblage, away from the camera. "Let this be heard over the four corners of the empire, that I, Commodus, now Caesar, do proclaim Gaius Metellus Livius commander in chief of all Roman armies, Proconsul of the Roman Empire--" The Proconsuls of Syria and Egypt glance over at Lucilla, who, as the only one facing the camera, draws attention to herself. Their glances further draw attention to her. Mann cuts to a close-up of her. "--second only to Caesar himself," Commodus concludes. Here is, it seems, the resolution of her attachment to Livius. As the good woman, she has been passed over for the Noir-lover; her cause is even deserted by Timonides. She can no longer control her feelings. Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as she flees the

scene, frame left, as her brother had fled from Aurelius's death-bed. The assemblage roars "hail, Caesar" at their new ruler. Aurelius on his pyre dominates the establishing shot's frame. Now, the camera cranes up, following the smoke, up into the gray, empty sky.

Mann dissolves from this empty German sky to a bronze statue of a chariot-and-four on the top of a building, amid the column-crowded sky of Rome, to the accompaniment of the blaring brass instruments that signify in films the pride and power of imperial Rome. Commodus, for some reason--here Mann is playing with history, I suspect--seems to be receiving the honors of the greater triumph ceremony. Mann tilts down and tracks back to show a column of troops, and changes angle to show soldiers playing brass instruments, the on-screen visible source for the soundtrack. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Sehamis and Lucilla, watching; she has, obedient to Aurelius wishes, married him. Mann shows Commodus arriving in long shot. Mann cuts to the medium shot of Lucilla and Sehamis, then to Lucilla's point of view as Commodus smiles and nods to them. Mann shows, in a sequence of shots, Commodus's procession through the forum through one of the massive crowd scenes that Trumbo so frequently complained Spartacus lacked.[52] At the top of the ramp to Jove's temple, Mann shows Commodus, dominating the frame, at a vast height over the tiny crowd below. Mann does a medium shot reverse angle to show the old man in his chariot, as was the rule, reminding him that he is mortal, and then tracks out and back into the crowd ad Commodus enters the temple of

Jove. In extreme long shot, to the accompaniment of tympani, Commodus walks up to the statue of Jove and takes off his gold laurel wreath. Mann cuts to a reverse angle medium shot as Commodus places the wreath on the alter and looks up at the statue, smiling. This is the point at which the film's intermission is placed.

The second half of the film opens with Lucilla and Sehamis's arrival at the Imperial throne room and archive. Rome. She leaves with the bureaucrats in charge of it the scrolls of Marcus Aurelius's Meditations. "Whatever else happens in the days to come, let not these be destroyed; for this is Rome." She is quite certain trouble is coming, and her words foreshadow the next scene. Mann cuts from the empty throne chamber in which Lucilla stands to a chamber filled with voices. Mann tilts down from the ceiling to show Commodus's arrival. The room grows silent as he sits. Mann cuts to a low angle medium shot of Commodus, with Julianus and the bearded man on screen left. Commodus stands and moves toward the camera, which tilts up and turns to camera right, creating an unbalanced framing, the sort of angular composition characteristic of the destabilized Noir world.

> Commodus: When, ah, my father was dying, I spoke to the gods, saying, I'm not like my father. And if I'm to be crowned Caesar, I will change all he did.
> (Cut to high angle long shot as Commodus moves across mosaic map of the Empire)
> Commodus: I offered them my life, and told them that if it was not for the good of rome that I be Caesar,then let me be killed.
> (Cut to eye-level medium shot)
> Commodus: (smiles) But you see: I'm alive. (He laughs; the assemblage laughs with him.) And Caesar. (same) Now!

(He claps his hands. Camera tilts down and tracks in a close-up on his feet as he dances on "Italia", then tilts back to a medium shot.
Commodus: I wish to see Rome once more the city of light, gaiety, of beauty, and strength.
(Cut to a high-angle shot, filmed with a wide-angle aspect lens so that all verticals are distorted at the edge of the frame, pointing in toward Commodus in the center, pacing around Italia.)
Commodus: We will have games; the people of the city will be fed.
(Commodus turns and faces the Proconsuls of Syria and Egypt, fortuitously standing on the areas of the mosaic representing their territories) You and your Eastern provinces will send us twice the grain they have been sending; the taxes on them will be doubled.

As he has not been killed by the gods, he has license to do anything he wishes. Commodus's belief in himself as a specially chosen person, and of Rome as the chosen city of the gods, when carried out on an international scale, can only take this form, Mann and his screenwriters suggest. Here is Mann's (and perhaps even more, Ben Barzman's) answer to the DeMille style Biblical epic as an image of international relations.

This is one of the scenes of technical virtuosity which characterizes Mann's directorial style. Christopher Plummer is an excellent actor, but this particular scene design and blocking on which he builds, which the camera lenses and angles serve to highlight, is as good as anything DeMille ever devised, with the addition of an almost Hitchcockian delight in using the technology of cinema to create an implicative image.[53] The Noir angles, with their inherent compositional tension, provide a counterpoint to Commodus's cheerful assertion first that he will change all his father did, and secondly that he will double produce and monetary taxes. His dance on Italy--and only Italy--

complements his expressed concern only for the city of Rome, and--to use a modern term--his essentially colonialist attitude toward the empire, in contrast to Aurelius's federal vision. Mann in addition subtly highlights this by using a wide-angle lens to distort the frame, visually pulling the verticals in the edges of the frame in toward Italy's lower center position.[54] By moving in slightly from the previous high angle shot, with which it contrasts, and by the magnification of the center produced by the lens, Italy is enlarged relative to the rest of the mosaic. The image is a visual trope of Commodus's attitude about the empire, and itself intrinsically disorienting due to its distortion of space.

Virgillianus and Marcellus, the proconsuls of Syria and Egypt, step forward to object to this policy. Mann cuts to a medium shot of the three of them as the proconsuls try to explain what is wrong with his policy. These provinces are suffering famine, Marcellus says, "not only in our provinces of Syria and Egypt, but also in Armenia, Capadocia, Arabia! In the whole Eastern half of the Roman Empire people are dying of hunger!" "When the word spread that you had sent for us," Virgillianus adds, "there was joy, and hope. Our people said, `Rome cannot let us die; our young Caesar will send us help.' If we carry out these orders, we risk having the entire East rise up against Rome." Mann tracks in rapidly to a medium close-up--a camera movement usually used to indicate an emotional response--as Commodus moves forward and places each hand on the proconsul's right shoulders, and smilingly tells them that they will deliver as ordered, "or I will destroy them." He taps them each softly on the shoulder to

emphasize "destroy," and steps back. The camera moves back into medium shot as he adds, more grimly, "You will also let them know that they must forget the weakness of my father." He wheels, and the camera turns screen left to follow his movement.

Mann dissolves to Livius in Germany on his horse, riding right, in contrast to Commodus's screen movement. It is notable that as a rule, movements of the rational characters--or, as with Lucilla between Aurelius and Faustina, of characters torn between reason and passion--follow this pattern of left/irrational, right/rational movements. This is one of the most obvious examples of this strategy. What Livius does visually, he is about to do conceptually. Livius and Victorinus come up on the remnants of Polybius's command, in what seems to be a less successful attempt to bait the barbarians into attacking a superior force. Polybius informs Livius that the barbarians are nearby, sacrificing Romans to their gods. Distracted with this, the sacrifice of Polybius's force finally enables Livius to trap them in the cave where their gods are kept. Livius calls out to Ballomar to stop fighting, in return for his promise that Ballomar's tribe will not be made slaves. Ballomar does not believe this, and as one of his men hefts a lance to throw at the would-be peacemaker, Roman soldiers fire arrows at him. The battle is on again. But the Romans are a superior force, and there is nowhere to run. Livius orders that the survivors be put in chains, "until we can talk to them as men."

Aurelius had said that Livius should bring Ballomar to him, not his head. A living man he could talk to, but a body divided into parts was useless. Livius sends in Timonides to talk to the

Germans, and finds philosophy cannot entirely master sensation when the captured Germans, who expect to die anyway, torture him with fire to test whether Wotan or the Roman gods are stronger. If he cries out, they will have the privilege of dying in battle. If the Roman gods are stronger, Timonides will be able to endure the flame. If not, he will touch Wotan. Protesting his weakness throughout, Timonides does not cry out, yet, dazed by pain, touches Wotan. This betrayal of the body against the mind shocks Timonides; he has failed doubly, both in his effort to reason with the Germans, and in his body's own rebellion against his stoic philosophy.

But because his body has endured the pain far beyond their expectation, if not to the level his reason requires, he wins the Germans over to Rome. He finds the loss of control over his body, as Aurelius found the mastery of the cancer over his will that interrupted his efforts to build the empire of peace, mysterious and intolerable. The Germans see only his success in resisting an impossible test so long, and how well he endured, even in failing it. "You did not even scream," Ballomar says in awe, after pushing their wooden image of Wotan into the fire and tossing the torch he has used to burn Timonides in after it. "That's no reason to take our god! That's no reason to change your ways!" Timonides' reason rebels at trial by combat--the irrational method of the

Germans, and Commodus's preferred method. "You miserable uneducated half-men! You're not at all what we fought for." But as his own failure has underscored, repeating in a different way Aurelius's failure to bargain with death, there are limits to the will. Here potentially is a part of the body of Rome, prepared to replace the license of war with the self-control of peace. "And yet--yes, we want you. We want you," Timonides says. Like Aurelius, he reconciles his reason to the world in which he finds himself.

Mann dissolves from this success on the frontier to Commodus, with his gladiators, engaging in war-play in the palace--the juxtaposition of rational endurance with physical activity underscoring by implication the contrast of the Emperor's philosophy with that of Timonides. Lucilla arrives to observe Commodus at play. Commodus uses his sister's arrival to distract Verulus, with whom he is fighting, so that he is able to put Verulus in a defenseless position. Verulus finds this amusing. "If he'd not been Caesar, he'd have been the greatest gladiator in Rome!" Mann cuts to a long shot of Commodus and Verulus, shot over Lucilla's shoulder, emphasizing in physical dimension the moral height she assumes: "Yes. You <u>do</u> belong in the arena." But Mann keeps her in the corner of the frame, not the center, and the camera moves with Commodus. He throws down his sword and runs up the steps, screen left, to her level. "You mean you came all this way to sharpen your wits," he tells her with a smile. Mann tracks with him as he recedes in the frame, moving over to a

pool. "Everything you do has a purpose, hmm? Mann reverse-cuts to a long shot as Commodus dives into a pool, down and away from her.

Lucilla walks along the edge toward screen left as he swims; she does have a purpose. "I came to tell you what your friends dared not. You're pushing our Eastern provinces to rebellion." Commodus is not interested. As he swims up to a medium shot, he tells her. "I do as I wish." "Do you? Do you?" Mann cuts to a close-up, obliquely Commodus's point of view, as she looks down at her brother. "You've only had one idea: To smash and destroy everything Father did!" Mann cuts to a close-up, looking down, at Commodus; Lucilla's reverse-shot point of view. "You've always resented me, Lucilla. Why? What have I ever done to you?" Mann pulls back to a medium close-up, as Sophia Loren allows Lucilla's confidence to waver. "It's what you're doing now." Mann cuts back to Commodus in close-up. "You're lying." He swims back into a medium shot, as the camera tracks with him. "Don't you suppose I know that it was you who poisoned Father against me?" Mann cuts back to the medium close-up of Lucilla. "I did not have to. Father knew about the cruel things you did." Mann returns to Commodus, who swims up rapidly and raises himself out of the pool slightly to a close-up, speaking angrily for the first time. "How is it he never knew of the cruel things you did? Especially to our own mother?" Mann cuts to the close-up of Lucilla. Speechless, she turns and flees the frame. To flee the camera, to desert the frame, is to admit defeat in Mann's camera language. Commodus has found her weak spot.

Mann cuts to a reverse angle in the room into which Lucilla flees. Commodus follows, and again he controls the camera; it tracks with him, not her, into another room where a full-length statue of Faustina is placed in a niche. "I was in the room when she died." In a long shot Lucilla stops in front of the statue, which, in its niche dominates the center of the frame, with Lucilla on its left, and Commodus on its right. She no longer looks down at him, but they are balanced, equally, in the frame. "When our mother died!" Commodus gestures at the statue. "Remember? I heard her beg you: `Lucilla, why do you hate me so? If I have done anything to hurt you, forgive me.' And you let her die without a word. Wasn't that cruelty?" "There was a reason," Lucilla replies, and turns away from Commodus. Mann cuts to a close-up of Commodus, and tracks with him as he comes up behind Lucilla. "Reason? What was it? Tell me!" "Nothing," she replies, and tries to flee his close-up. Commodus catches her arm, coming back into the center of the frame. "Tell me!" This is Commodus's strongest scene; for once, he is not acting to defend himself, or extensions of himself in the form of his minions. He is, like Lucilla, defending his parent. Lucilla is also at her weakest. She <u>is</u> lying, Mann suggests. There <u>is</u> a reason for her attitude toward her brother and mother, a family mystery that, between Mann's camera placements and Loren's acting, Mann flags for the audiences' attention.

Verulus calls from the door, interrupting the scene. "Caesar! You are unarmed. Even a woman with a dagger can be dangerous." "She has no

dagger. She's my (pause) sister." Commodus walks over and accepts a wrap from Verulus, then tells him to leave. Then he walks back to her and they sit down together. "So--you came to warn me. No other reason, hmm? Didn't you know Livius was on his way back to Rome?" This is another area of weakness--her weakness, and his area of strength, passion over reason. He stands, and kisses her condescendingly on the forehead. "Stay here with me, Lucilla. We'll find other ways to ensure the loyalty of Armenina." Mann tracks with Commodus as he leaves the room. Commodus has, in this sequence, always controlled the movement of the camera, but Lucilla's position relative to Commodus's has been dynamic. From the height at which Lucilla looked down on Commodus, Commodus has steadily moved up relative to Lucilla's position in the frame, touching always on questions of passion, not reason or the Empire. Now, at the conclusion of the scene, for the first time, he rises above her level in the frame and leaves her, speechless and defeated.

Mann dissolves to the gates of Rome, and Commodus' arrival to greet Livius. Mann cuts to a close-up of Livius, who salutes Commodus with a smile. Mann cuts to a reverse medium close-up of Commodus, looking down at Livius. Next to Commodus is a woman--significantly, given Commodus's identity in the film as his mother's champion, a blonde woman with grey in her hair, who looks at Commodus as he looks back at Livius. Here, Mann implies bluntly, is a man with an unresolved Oedipal complex, a bit of Freudian framing which--though almost superfluous, given the other signifiers Mann and the screenwriters have

placed in the film--serves to confirm Commodus' role as Rome's id figure to Timonides and Aurelius's superego. Livius, who must balance between them, is the unfortunate ego.

In the immediate logic of the scene, Commodus's disapproving look at Livius--his authority silently undercut by the implications of his paramour--is broken in an over-the-shoulder shot from Livius's position as he smiles, climbs off his chariot, and runs over to embrace Livius in a close-up. Mann cuts to the reverse angle as Livius smiles. "I heard a whisper that Lucilla was here in Rome." "And have you also not heard them saying that anything was possible now that Commodus has become Caesar?" Commodus puts his finger to his lips, then smiles, and flings an arm over Commodus's shoulder and runs with him back to the chariot.

Mann dissolves to the interior of the palace, by the pool in its center--a Freudian symbol of the unconscious, and thus the proper center of an id-world--as Commodus and Livius enter. "I've been hearing these wild rumors that you've come with your head full of ideas for a new Rome, hmm? The Rome of my father." Commodus laughs, and throws his wine goblet into the pool. "And that you intend to come before the Senate with these ideas, these wild schemes of yours? Hmm? What would you do if I told you, `Livius: I don't want you to do this.' Just that, nothing more?" Livius would still do "what I believe must be done." Obligation is not an id-idea; Commodus laughs, and leads Livius further into the id water-world.

Mann dissolves to another room, with a fountain. Livius and Commodus enter in long shot, and the camera tracks right and inward slightly, so that the fountain dominates the frame. On the soundtrack, a choral version of Lucilla's theme comes up. "Abandon this plan, Livius, and I will see to it that you and Lucilla can always be together. The camera tracks with Livius, who walks past the fountain, is obscured by a screen, and enters into a fairy-tale columned pavilion within the room, where Lucilla lies asleep on a bed. Mann cuts to a high-angle shot from above, to show Livius standing in the center of a mosaic, the pattern of which produces the optical illusion of a pit. Livius sits on the bed, and Mann cuts to a close-up of him, and then of Lucilla, which Livius enters as they embrace. "Livius! Oh, what will I do," Lucilla adds, speaking for both of them. "I'm not as strong as I thought I was. I have not learned to live without you." This is another betrayal of the body against the mind, no less deplorable rationally to a stoic than that which Aurelius and Timonides have suffered, if not as painful.

Mann (speaking corporately; these Freudian details are most likely Ben Barzman's conceptions) shows Livius in close-up, looking down at Lucilla. "There is no life for either of us apart, Lucilla," he says, with his balanced ego-knowledge. "I told you this before, but you would not listen." On one level, this is an image of the film's Freudian allegory, in Livius's symbolic identity, and more directly in terms of character development, resolving Lucilla's implied Antigone crisis. On the level of a romance, this is a more complete recognition

on their parts that Lucilla and Livius each need the other to combine a life of reason with passion. "I thought you had betrayed my father," Lucilla replies. "But now I know you found your own way of making the world he wanted." But this moment in the "green world", as Frye has called it, this moment in the Forest of Arden, free from their society and its burdens, cannot last. For they are in fact in an enchanted world which, while it frees them each to recognize the limits of stoicism, yet remains outside of time and space. "And yet if I try to make that world, Commodus will try to keep us apart." "Oh, make that world, Livius, and then let's see what will keep us apart.

Mann dissolves to the Roman senate, where Livius takes up his task. Mann shows a close-up of Livius, with Ballomar on his right and Timonides on his left. Livius, again the balance point in the middle, must try to bring reason and passion together in Rome. Mann cuts to Commodus, alone in his frame, looking back at Livius. He has no such divisions. Mann cuts out to a long shot as Julianus rises, and stands in front of Commodus; Julianus will speak for Commodus. Mann cuts to an eye-level floor shot, pans the camera to follow Julianus as he walks down to Livius, the German representatives, and Timonides.

> Julianus: Honorable Fathers and Senators of Rome: Have you heard what is being proposed? Gaius Metellus Livius has asked that we, the Roman senate, should give these barbarians, these savages, Roman citizenship, and settle them on Roman land.

There is a sound of angry murmuring in the Senate. Mann cuts to a medium shot as Julianus stands in front of Livius, and tracks with him as moves back and forth along the hall.

> Julianus: To treat these wandering murderers as brothers. Equals. And what of our other provinces? What of Gaul--so loyal to us? Or of Syria? Or of Egypt, which sends us our grain? If we make Romans of these barbarians, can we withhold Roman citizenship from them? (Cries of No!) Then what becomes of the precious prize that Roman citizenship once was? It becomes a cheap, common thing, to be given away like bread. I say no! We are Romans! Warriors! Let us rid our minds of this poisonous idea. Crucify their leaders. Sell the rest as slaves. Teach them once and for all what it is to make war on Rome. <u>That</u> is the <u>Roman</u> way.

Julianus returns to his Senate seat, visually at Commodus's feet. Commodus gazes left down the hall, in a frame where he dominates, and yet is unbalanced in the corner. Mann cuts to a low angle centered shot as Livius walks forward into a close-up.

> Livius: Honorable Fathers of Rome: You have greeted me as a soldier who came in Small Triumph from the wars, and I thank you for it. But you will have a hard decision to make here today, and it must not be that I, as a soldier, swayed your vote. I ask therefore of Caesar that a man who is neither soldier or senator, but a philosopher--a man of reason--be permitted to speak for me.

Commodus, seen in long shot sitting under a statue of the wolf who nursed Romulus and Remus, makes an acquiescing motion with his hand.

Mann cuts back to Livius, who walks back and looks at Timonides. Mann tracks back with Timonides, keeping him framed in a medium close-up as he speaks. As he first steps forward, moans come up from the Senate. "Fellow

Romans..." Mann cuts to a medium long shot of the section of the Senate to Commodus's right. Nigia is there, standing. One of the senators behind him shouts "Greek! Greek!" Mann cuts back to Timonides, who waves his finger at the senator. "Born a Greek, I became a Roman by choice." Mann cuts back to the right side of the Senate. Nigia steps forward rapidly, dominating the frame in a medium close-up. "Slave," he says with contempt. Mann returns to Timonides. "Born a slave, I won my freedom." This silences the Senate, and he begins again.

> Timonides: Fellow Romans: I am a teacher. And as a teacher I know that when I have tried to teach the same lesson for a hundred times and still the pupil does not understand, then I am forced to the conclusion that, um, perhaps there's something wrong, either with the lesson, or with the teacher. A hundred times we have taught those we call barbarians what it means to make war on Rome. We've burned their villages, we've crucified their leaders, we've enslaved their young. The fires go out. The dead are buried. The slaves die, slowly. But the hatred that we leave behind us never dies!

Timonides seems to have been addressing himself to Julianus on the part of the Senate to Commodus's right. Now Timonides turns and moves to the side of the Senate on Commodus's left, screen right, a part of the Senate hitherto silent, before returning to look to the side of the Senate where Nigia and Julianus sit.

> Timonides: Hatred means wars. Wars mean tribute, torn from our provinces; (an old man, on the side left of Commodus, nods in agreement) taxes; hunger; disease. (to the side on Commodus's right) How costly that is! How wasteful. And yet the answer is simple. We must have no war.

Nigia steps into the frame. "No war? When your friends continually attack us?" Nigia looks over to the other side of the Senate. "This is treason. These people have proved their aims very clearly: To destroy us, and to destroy the whole Roman way of life." Timonides continues, calmly, turning away from Nigia. "And yet the answer is simple."

Mann cuts away to a crane long shot of the entire Senate, showing Commodus's side of the Senate; Timonides, Livius and the Germans; and the silent side of the Senate to which Timonides and his critics both direct their appeals.

> Timonides: Let us transform my friends from men of war to men of peace. Let us put them on our abandoned farmlands. Not only will they produce food for themselves, but this I pledge you: One day they will send food to Rome.

Julianus steps forward from Commodus's feet. "Yes, I agree. Put them on those lands. Let them produce for us, but as slaves. That's the way it has always been." Mann tracks down and in, narrowing the field of vision to full shots of Julianus, Nigia and Timonides, who strides forward, the edge of the frame closing in behind him, and stops in front of Nigia.. "

> Timonides: Nigia here used to have twenty thousand slaves on his family estate. Where are they now? All sold or freed. Why?

Mann cuts to a medium two-shot of Nigia and Timonides, with a backdrop of Senators.

> Timonides: Because Nigia is opposed to slavery? (Senate laughs. Nigia bows and steps out of the frame.) Hah? No. Because it's no longer profitable to keep slaves.

Mann cuts back to a tracking long shot. Timonides walks left toward the camera, pulling it away from the distant figures of Commodus and Nigia, growing larger in the frame until he turns to face the silent part of the Senate in a medium close-up.

> Timonides: Slaves do not produce as much as free men. Let us do what is profitable, and right. Let us share the greatest gift of all. Let us give these men the right of Roman freedom. Then they will spread the word that Rome has accepted them as equals. Then we will have our human frontiers, the Roman peace that Marcus Aurelius promised.

This is the other path to become the "true heir" of which Timonides spoke.

Timonides steps back in the frame, growing smaller as the camera follows, as he steps back into Livius's group, amid murmurs in the Senate. Rising over the voices is Julianus, shouting angrily. "In the name of Caesar!" Mann cuts to a medium close-up of Julianus, balanced between Nigia and Commodus, and tracks back with him as he walks down the Senate to point at Timonides, Livius and the Germans.

> Julianus: In the name of Caesar! Caesar has asked me, `when has Rome ever been greater or stronger?' I say, in answer to Caesar, that never has Rome been greater or stronger than now! And what is it that has kept our empire together? Our strength! Our might! Equality. Freedom. Peace. Who is it that uses these words but Greeks and Jews and slaves? Behind him and his people are the Vandals.

Livius and Timonides look at each other, shocked by meaning of the speech--that Julianus speaks for Commodus, and that their ruler opposes them in this vicious way--then resume masks of attentiveness as Julianus continues:

"Untold millions of them, waiting for a moment of weakness, ready to destroy us." Mann cuts to a long shot of the Senate room, as both sides listen.

> Julianus: If we take these barbarians in amongst us, our enemies will say it is because we are weak. Then they will pour in on us from everywhere. It will be the end of the Roman empire! (more quietly and solemnly) It will be the end of Rome.

This argument has an oblique resemblance to some of the more extreme Cold War rhetoric, with its mixture of "disease" race-words, and the alien invasion paranoia that emerged in films like The Thing (1951), Invasion U.S.A. (1952), Invaders from Mars (1953) and Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1956).

Mann cuts from the long shot to a medium shot as an old Senator rises from the hitherto silent side of the Senate, and the camera tracks with him out and to the left, to stop in a medium two-shot of Julianus, on the left, facing the old Senator on the right.

> Old Senator: The end of Rome? How does an empire die? Does it collapse in one terrible moment? No. No. But there comes a time when its people no longer believe it. Then; then does an empire begin to die.

As had Nigia before Timonides, now Julianus turns and recedes in size in the frame, returning to Commodus's feet. Mann cuts out to the long shot of the Senate. "Fathers of Rome. I have lived under four great emperors: Trajan. Hadrian. Antoninus. Marcus Aurelius." Mann cuts to a close-up, and tracks the camera to maintain a full-face closeup as the old Senator turns from left to right, addressing the Senate; stops on the words "heart of Rome," and turns to the left as the Senator continues turning right, to face Nigia as he speaks of the

Germans; cuts to Livius, Timonides and Ballomar as he continues to speak of their danger; and ends as he speaks of the "heart of the empire" growing bigger, greater. The movements arguably are motivated by the speech, but I describe the movements here in order to set the speech apart, the second most important thematically in the film:

> Old Senator: And during all those years our empire grew. Changed. The law of life is grow, or die. And you, the Senators, are the heart of Rome. It is through you that the people speak. Speak up! Let the world hear you. Let the world know that Rome will not die. There are millions like them waiting at our gates. If we do not open these gates they will break them down and destroy us. But instead, let us grow ever bigger; ever greater. Let us take them among us. Let the heart of the empire grow with us.
> Honorable fathers: We have changed the world. Can we not change ourselves?

The silent side of the Senate speaks up. "Yes! It is time to change!" a senator rises and says. "An end to war," another shouts. and the whole screen right side of the Senate rises, followed thereafter by much of the screen left side, as Nigia and Julianus stand by Commodus.

The old Senator evokes two themes Marcus Aurelius introduced in the film earlier, that of the two possible fates of Rome--to grow or be destroyed--and the "leaders are hearts" metaphor. He repeats Arnold Toynbee's argument on the necessity of change in civilizations, and paraphrases his warning that "sooner or later, the repercussions (of Western civilization on the world) will assuredly recoil upon the West herself; but for the present this Janus-like figure slumbers on--abroad, a charging bull, at home a now solitary Sleeping Beauty (among world civilizations," which must either recognize its common identity

with the world brought into its sphere, or be destroyed.[55] He also clarifies the "heart" and "head" metaphors that the film has used about leaders. Leaders may be the "heart," but in their role as the voice of the people. Rome itself is the heart. As is characteristic of Mann's films, it is not the hero or heroine who creates the moral civilization, but rather the moral civilization which recognizes the hero.

Commodus, as the Mann Villain, sees only treason, a violation of the law of the street-gang which is his moral code--and above all, a personal betrayal. Mann cuts to Livius's return to Lucilla, who has heard the news. "Rome is with you; the army is with you; I am with you. March against Commodus! With you as Caesar, all Rome will change!" Their camera movement, from right to left, stops as Mann cuts from their medium long shot to a closeup of Commodus, which then tracks out and left following Commodus's movement to a medium long shot of the three of them. "It is all so very clear now why you came. To destroy me." He orders Livius to return to the Northern Frontier, stripped of his "Proconsul" of the Empire rank. Livius will be the Northern Army Commander, to remain on the frontier forever. Lucilla will be returned to her husband in Armenia, never to see Livius or Rome again. Mann cuts to a long shot of Lucilla, moving left into her sleeping area. She shuts the doors as, in deep focus, Livius is escorted away.

Mann fades up on a bonfire in the frontier. The last hostile German tribe is gathered, to listen to Livius, but they will not make peace with Rome and join

the empire. As dead leaves blow by in the wind, Livius asks them to explain what is wrong. "If you are afraid of the hordes of Vandals on your frontier, Rome will protect you. Why do you refuse? Why? Speak out clearly, or be on your way." They get up silently and leave. As Livius vents his frustration to Polybius, a group of riders arrives with a message which, though he does not know it yet, will obliquely answer his question. The Eastern half of Rome is in rebellion. Rome is too weak to protect them, the German tribes know.

Livius has not yet been told this. As he rides to the center of the Empire, he stops in a village of Ballomar's Germans. Ballomar himself, clean-shaven and hair cut, accompanied by his wife, greets Livius. Timonides greets him as well. "All is well with us," he says. "We prosper," Ballomar says. "I have a home, like a Roman," Ballomar's wife Helga adds. "As you see, there's more than enough for ourselves," Timonides continues. "We were right, Livius. There is no limit to what can be done with the human spirit, for good or evil." In spite of this personal victory, even here there are signs of problems. To the accompaniment of foreboding strings on the soundtrack, Livius finds that Timonides has heard nothing from Lucilla, as he himself has not for months; and Rome is suffering from famine and disease.

Mann cuts to a priest and two attendants in medium shot, burning flowers to the gods as, in extreme long shot deep focus, a crowd of Romans recite a prayer in unison. In the far right corner of the frame, Livius arrives. Mann cuts to Livius, who, in a succession of left to right pans is led into the palace. Livius

surrenders his sword before being led into Commodus's private arena--a guard against assassination that Mann never showed being practiced around Aurelius. Commodus complains that he is alone, and has no one to turn to, "except you." Commodus smiles, and Livius walks into his close-up frame, now a two-shot close-up. "I have not wanted to be away," Livius says, not smiling. Commodus then sits down on his bed. This staging makes it possible for Livius to look down in his close-ups at Commodus, and Commodus to look up at Livius, seen in the edge of Commodus's frames as a dark mass.

Commodus finally explains what is going on. All the East has rebelled, including Marcellus and Virgillianus. Sohamis of Armenia also has rebelled. "He has forced Lucilla to flee with him, Livius!" Livius asks, "where is the Eastern Army, Commodus?"

Mann cuts to Commodus's close-up. Commodus looks blankly at Livius, then stands and turns to his left. Back to Livius, he says, "Well, they've sided with the rebels. There's only--" Commodus turns and gazes winningly at Commodus "--the Northern Army to crush them," he says crooningly. "And you. You are the only one they will follow, Livius. Take command."

Mann cuts to a low-angle close-up of Livius. Mann wanted either Charlton Heston or Kirk Douglas for Livius's role, and this is one of the scenes where Stephen Boyd does not rise to what is required.[56] Mann's intent, surely, was to have Livius respond with one of the emotion-filled charismatic glares of horror and anger that each actor had in their repertoire. Boyd gives some

suggestion of that look, but he is too cool an actor, lacking Douglas or Heston's capacity for extremes. What Mann intended, I suspect, was that this scene was to be the full recognition by Livius of Commodus as the male structural equivalent of the Noir femme fatale, which Livius--in the Noir male role--both loathes and yet perversely finds irresistible. Christopher Plummer rises fully to the part, practicing his seductive wiles with his voice to such an extent that his "take command" comes across almost as a double entendre.

This homoerotic Noir context explains the next line and shot. Mann cuts to a medium long two shot of Livius and Commodus, and tracks in to a medium close-up two shot as Livius draws nearer to Commodus. "Do not give me this power, Commodus." Boyd underplays it, but the implication of the line is, "do not give me this power, because I will be forced to destroy you, which I cannot bear to do." Commodus embraces Livius, and says "the gods are with me." Mann cuts to an angle over Livius's shoulder--increasing Commodus's command of the frame--as Commodus adds: "They will always be with me. Go to the East, and crush this rebellion." Mann switches to the reverse angle as Livius repeats: "Do not give me this power." Mann reverses back to Commodus: "I'm not afraid." Mann reverses to Livius, to show Boyd's non-reaction as Commodus taps Livius on the shoulder.

Mann dissolves from this scene to a Mediterranean map, which serves as the transition between the Rome scene and the low hills of Armenia. Of note--foreshadowing mise-en-scene to come--are drawings of heads below the city of

Antioch. Mann dissolves from the map to Livius and Victorinus, who leave their army behind to ride up to speak to Virgilianus and Marcellus, at the head, presumably, of what formerly was Rome's Eastern Army. Mann cuts to a medium long establishing shot of each group. In between each side, in the distance, is a tent.

> Livius: You asked for this meeting. Speak.
> Virgilianus: You were prepared to do battle against us even before you'd spoken to us.
> Livius: You have rebelled against Rome.
> Marcellus: Marcus Aurelius spoke of an empire of equal nations.

This is, of course, the vision that Livius has tried to pursue without hurting Commodus throughout the film. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Livius and Victorinus as Livius says angrily, "Rome will not tolerate rebellion!" This is the role of the law-enforcer, Livius's habitual point of retreat from moral judgment. Mann cuts to a medium shot of Virgilianus and Marcellus. "We're old friends, Livius!" Virgilianus protests. "You are traitors," Livius replies. Mann cuts back to Livius. "You have caused two Roman armies to mutiny. You have threatened the empire." Mann cuts back to Virgilianus and Marcellus, who look at each other in dismay, as Livius himself looked at Timonides during Julianus's harangue. This is a bewitched Livius, their looks say; he is not speaking in his true voice. Marcellus looks back. "We are not alone in this, Livius." Mann cuts to Livius and Victorinus, who look at each other. Livius keeps looking, past Victorinus, who turns and follows his gaze, and Mann cuts back to the establishing shot as Livius dismounts and goes to the tent.

Inside is Lucilla. Mann shows her in depth-of-focus in an establishing shot, cuts to a close-up, to a close-up reaction of Livius, and returns to the establishing shot as Lucilla runs up and embraces Livius. "You are a part of this, Lucilla?" he asks in confusion. "I am a great part of this," she replies, the camera tracking left with her as she pulls Livius deeper into the tent. "We are breaking away from Rome. We will make our own empire here in the East--an Eastern empire!" Mann cuts to a close-up over Lucilla's shoulder, as Livius turns screen right to face her. "`An Eastern empire'! You will make chaos! What will hold you together? What would you do but divide the empire?" Mann cuts to an oblique reverse angle, a medium shot which, by its relative distance, undercuts the visual strength of Lucilla's counterargument. "But not if you join us, Livius. We will have all of Rome, greater than ever." Livius turns away from her and moves toward the camera. The camera tracks back slightly with his movement, framing Livius in a medium shot, and Lucilla in a medium-long shot, visually shrunken in the frame. "What have you done, Lucilla!" Livius exclaims; Mann, in his usual fashion, visually reduces Lucilla in size to create a visual analogue to Livius's response.

In point of fact, Lucilla's proposed Eastern empire was indeed how Rome resolved its social and governmental crisis in the West. But for the purposes of Mann's story, Lucilla's act is one of despair. She is, as was true of Vance in The Furies, "beyond the pale," outside of family and law, lost in the wilderness of rejection by the unjust society; she is capable of doing things now that she

would find terrible before. When the Mann protagonist is frustrated in the pursuit of a rational, just social order, the protagonist curdles; gentle impulses become transformed into violent actions. Lucilla in effect is now prepared to destroy the empire, because in so doing she can bring about the destruction of her brother. Commodus's actions have transformed Lucilla into the twin of Commodus. As in Winchester '73, where Lin McAdam becomes transformed by his obsession for revenge against his parricide-brother into a monster, ignoring the cautions his friend High Spade gives him, so Lucilla becomes the empire-destroyer, twisted by her own hatred of her brother, unable to recognize the validity of Livius's objections.

What Mann signals in the scene with his camera shots is that this abandonment of the unjust society is premature. "I'm trying to prevent the disaster my brother has set upon us," Lucilla says. But even in her words, she admits that the "disaster" has not yet come to fruition. As Mann has hinted in Livius's problems with the last German tribe, rebelling now against Commodus simply extends the internal conflict with Commodus throughout the Empire. In Mann's shot treatment, he sides with Livius, the reformer. Mann cuts to a close-up of Livius as he turns screen right again and replies to Lucilla: "There may be a great deal wrong with what Commodus has done, but this is not the way to oppose him. I cannot let you destroy the empire!" Because the two are not friends but lovers, this is the deepest level of the "point of ritual death" in their romance; physically separated, they are now spiritually divided.[57]

Livius rejoins his army, and Virgilianus and Marcellus turn away; each prepare to attack the other. Mann cuts to Lucilla, watching them take positions. She reacts in shock to a third force, to which Mann cuts, an army riding out of the hills, which attacks Livius and his troops. It is Sohamis's Armenians. Lucilla watches as Sohamis's chariot comes up to the tent, and Mann cuts to a reverse angle medium long shot, tracking in to keep that angle as Lucilla shrinks back from him. "You have violated the truce!" she snarls at him, and turns and enters the tent. Mann reverse-cuts to the interior of the tent as Sohamis enters and stops in medium shot. "We have done more than that, Lucilla. We have joined with the Persians." She turns in surprise, and Mann cuts to the tent exterior as Sohamis returns to his chariot and rides off.

Mann cuts to Marcellus and Virgilianus, who look on at this unexpected conflict anxiously. They hear the sound of horses and ride over to a hillridge, where they see the Persian army approaching. "What can we do?" Marcellus says to Virgilianus. "Join Livius? How would Commodus repay us except with torture and death?" Virgilianus says, "it is Romans and Persians, while we stand by." Here is another dilemma: Allow their fellow Romans (whom they had hoped would join them rather than fight) to be slaughtered by their enemy, or attack the Persians, and save the Empire so that they could be tortured? They lead their cavalry into the Persians, and order their foot soldiers to set up a defensive fire screen behind them; better to die in battle defending the empire than survive.

With the Eastern Army's defensive screen to shield them, the Western Army defeats the Armenians, and Victorinus leads them to the aid of the Eastern Army. Livius stays behind to engage Sohamis in single combat. Sohamis just has time to tell Livius that he has ordered Lucilla to be killed if he dies before a Roman footsoldier spears him. Livius rides off to the tent, just behind Sohamis's soldier, and kills the soldier inside the tent just before Lucilla is killed. "I've lost, let me die," she protests. "No, Lucilla, I want you to live," Livius says. "I want to die, I want to die!"

It is in the aftermath of this that Livius, in a slow right tracking pan long shot of an area outside of Antioch covered with monolithic stone heads, finds his progress (and that of the shot) blocked by Nigia and Julianus. Behind them are lines of bound prisoners and crosses. "Hail Livius," Julianus shouts. "Commodus, Emperor of the Roman world, salutes you, and proclaims that henceforth you will be known as Gaius Metellus Livius Pompeius, Conqueror of Persia." Mann cuts to a medium two-shot of Julianus and Nigia, as Julianus continues in a more conversational voice: "Caesar has asked me to say to you: `Livius, my friend, my brother, I wish you to share the throne; to become Caesar with me." "But first," Nigia says, holding up a paper. Nigia rides forward, and Mann tracks left with him, the signal that here is the irrational order. Nigia hands the paper to Livius. "The following villages to be destroyed. From each rebel city of Capadocia, Syria and Egypt, five thousand persons are to be taken and crucified." Mann cuts to a closeup of Livius as he looks up from the paper,

turning right to face Nigia offscreen as Nigia continues: "Five thousand persons from each city to be burnt alive." "We'll teach them to make revolution," Julianus adds. Mann cuts out to a medium two-shot of Livius on the left and Nigia on the right, facing each other in profile, as they had at Marcus Aurelius's funeral. Livius looks down and tears up the paper. "Stop the crucifixions! seize these men!" he orders. Livius resumes riding forward, exiting the right side of the frame. Mann cuts out to a long shot, panning right slowly to stop on one of the head monoliths as Livius and his men ride out of the frame, and then fades to black.

This is one of the more dramatic instances of the conflict between reason and inclusiveness associated with rightward camera movements and passion and selfishness associated with leftward camera movements. Livius resumes the rightward movement which Nigia and Julianus initially obstructed. The orders that accompany Nigia's leftward movement are irrational, proposing as they do in effect the destruction of the Eastern empire. Boyd again does not have the right kind of look,[58] but the camera movements signal the intent of the scene. Livius sweeps aside these obstructions, and the shot ends on one of the giant heads; Livius has the heart to rule the empire, and now he has the head; he knows what needs to be done, as Marcus Aurelius predicted he would.

Mann cuts from this rightward camera movement to another: Timonides, Ballomar, Helga, and the rest of the German tribe is carrying its excess produce to Rome. Mann cuts from this to a corresponding leftward camera movement--

interesting--as a stream of Romans comes out of the gate to meet them, and to accept bread and pigs that the Germans bring. Mann stops the leftward movement on a long shot of Timonides, standing above the crowd. He spreads his arms wide, staff in hand. "Romans! Romans!" Mann cuts to a low angle close-up, and then a reverse angle to show the crowd in front of Timonides, before returning to the close-up. "Now can we say to our Senate, to our empire, to the whole world: Look! Here we meet in friendship, the blonde people from the North and the dark people from the South. What we have done here could be done the whole world over!" Mann cuts back to the reverse angle to show the crowd cheering.

Mann dissolves from this balanced unity of left and right movements to a fast pan from right to left, following Commodus's chariot. "Where is this gift from Gaius Livius," he shouts. The chariot stops in front of a row of wagons. Commodus rides along the length of wagons as, one by one, their side doors are pulled open to reveal bears, lions, tigers; dangerous beasts. Commodus stops at the last wagon. The door is opened to reveal Julianus, Nigia, and Commodus's other representatives Livius ordered seized. Commodus laughs, then asks if they told Livius of his message. "This was his answer," Nigia says. "Tell Caesar there will be a new Rome--" Mann cuts to a close-up of Commodus; "--or a new Caesar." "Commodus picks up his whip and strikes at Nigia; Mann cuts to show Nigia falling back in the cage, then returns to Commodus. "Cleander!" he shouts, and shuts his eyes, swaying as if faint.

Mann cuts to a medium long shot to show Cleander, silent, expressionless, at Commodus's side. "Get me gold, Cleander." Mann cuts to a close-up of Commodus as he continues speaking, quietly and intensely. "Strip all the public monuments, the temples, the gods and goddesses; get me enough gold, Cleander, to drown Livius and his new Rome." Commodus shuts his eyes again, then opens them and straightens. "Destroy the barbarians," he orders rapidly, as an afterthought, and whips his horses onward, moving out of the frame to the left, maintaining the right/left opposition. Mann uses the leftward movement to disguise a track right to a close-up of Cleander. Cleander has the slight suggestion of a smile. In only two scenes does he have any expression at all in the film: As he eats his half of the apple which kills Marcus Aurelius, and at this moment, when he knows the Germans are to be killed.

Given the significance that Cleander seems to have in the plot, it is odd that he is given so little prominence in the film. Unlike Urraca in El Cid, who likewise prompts false leaders to destruction, Mann never shows Cleander advising Commodus to do anything. It seems that, given his prominence during the period before Marcus Aurelius was poisoned, there ought to be more of him in the finished film. A scene or two seems to be missing. But perhaps not; part of Cleander's menace is that he is so terribly silent, and is given so little motivation for his acts. This is what makes him inhumanly monstrous. El Tigre, in The Furies, is even less developed than Cleander, yet serves a similar function as a distillation of T. C. Jefford's antisocial fury. Like Cleander, El Tigre

has few lines, but is given the role of carrying out T. C.'s most savage act, the murder of Juan Herrera, just as Cleander is given the order to destroy the German village. As is the case at this moment, El Tigre smiles as he is given the order which unleashes his employer's most savage feelings. In The Furies, El Tigre's act leads to T. C.'s own murder by Juan's mother. In The Fall of the Roman Empire, as Mann will suggest, Cleander's act--his expression of Commodus's antisocial fury unleashed--will lead to Commodus's death, and the fall of the Roman Empire.

Mann cuts from Cleander to a slow left pan of the German's village, accompanied on the soundtrack by the same music that played as they brought food to Rome. They are celebrating the harvest, dancing and eating; this is the visual image of the epithalamion--in this case, the marriage of Rome and the tribes, the union which, in the New Comedy, is the signal for the founding of the new society which is to replace the old, "humorous" (in the old sense of a society unbalanced in one of the for humors) society. "The appearance of this new society is frequently signalized by some kind of party or festive ritual," Northrop Frye observed.[59] The movement stops on Helga, Ballomar, and Timonides, the symbol of this union of peoples.

Mann cuts to a long shot of Morris-dancers, with a man blowing a conch-horn on the right edge of the frame. Suddenly the man is impaled by a flaming spear. He falls left, through the frame, and is followed by cavalry, riding rapidly

leftward through the frame. In a succession of shots, Timonides stands up on a rock and speaks.

> Timonides: "Men of Rome! Men of Rome! Do not touch these people! They've become your brothers! Let them live in peace; they're Romans now. Do not harm them! The whole Northern people will answer with death and fire! Their hatred will live for centuries to come; rivers of Roman blood will pay for this. You will make nations of killers out of them. Put aside your weapons. Let us live together in peace! Peace!

A Roman throws a spear at him. He collapses, rises again, shouting "No! No!" and falls forward. Mann cuts to a closeup of Timonides as Helga and one of the German tribesmen picks up Timonides and turns him face up. Helga strokes his face gently, and then from either edge of the frame, Romans pull the two away, with knives at their throats, leaving Timonides alone in the frame, with the sounds of screams offscreen.

Mann dissolves to Livius's arrival up the same road through the village he travelled before, with Lucilla in a chariot beside him, in a slow left-to-right pan. It is still smoldering. Livius dismounts, and Lucilla joins them as they walk through the scene in a left-to-right tracking shot, past bodies and burnt huts, stopping on Timonides's body. Mann cuts to a close-up as Livius kneels over Timonides's body, "What happened, gentle Greek?" Livius says gently. "Did you try to tell them there were three possibilities? Did you not know that there was a fourth possibility? This!" Livius stands, shouting angrily. "This is the way they answer reason," Lucilla says coldly. "And now even you must see that this is the only way to answer them." Livius begins speaking gently again. "Look at

his face. Tell me what I must do in his name?" His face contorts, and he shouts angrily: "March the army into Rome and drench the city with blood! Livius is audibly divided between reason and passion. "He's dead," Lucilla says sadly. Livius kneels, followed by Lucilla. "He does not seem dead to me." Mann cuts to a close-up. "I can still feel his life. I can hear his words." "He was my father's friend," Lucilla says. Mann cuts to a close-up of Timonides. Lucilla fingers a medallion around Timonides' neck, a "P" combined with an "X", the consonants of "pax". This emphasizes more precisely what is being mourned in Timonides: The death of the Pax Romana, the true Pax Romana of which Marcus Aurelius spoke.

Livius tells Lucilla that he will go into Rome alone, and to send in the army at sundown if he does not return. Mann dissolves from a shot of Timonides' body to an extreme long shot establishing shot of Livius in the temple of Jove, as he walks down its center aisle. In the foreground, to the left, is a fallen head--presumably, the head of another god that has been decapitated to obtain its gold. At the base of the statue, Commodus is slumped. "I've been made a god," he tells Livius, to the accompaniment of dreamy music. "Did you know?" Mann cuts to a long shot with the usual staging, Livius on the left looking right, Commodus vice-versa. "I have ordered thirty days of celebration to mark the event." "Leave at once, Commodus. I can still spare your life," Livius says sternly. Mann cuts to a medium long-shot of Commodus, who stands and looks up at the statue of Jove. "I've finally understood why

they've sent me this pestilence. There was famine. There were too many mouths." Commodus turns and faces Livius, leaning on the alter in medium shot. "So the gods made less mouths." Mann cuts to Livius, who walks forward into a medium shot. "Commodus, the army is at the gates of the city. If I do not return by sunset, the legions will march on Rome. Mann cuts back to Commodus, who looks back expressionlessly at Livius. "I offered you everything. And yet you put yourself against me. You could have become a god." "Take a sword, Commodus. Take a sword, and I will show you," Livius responds angrily. "I will show you how much of a god you are!" Livius starts to leave, to go to the Senate. "I loved you, Livius!" Commodus says loudly; Livius, in long shot, stops. Mann returns to Commodus in medium shot, as he continues quietly, smiling. "Yet now you must die. But that is the sort of joke the gods love best. You told me once that you never heard the gods laugh. Listen. Listen carefully." Commodus begins laughing, louder and louder. Mann cuts to a long shot of Livius, motionless, then cuts to the establishing extreme long shot as Commodus's laughter echoes off the walls. It is a scene of madness.

If Commodus is insane, it would seem unlikely that the Senate would support him. But this is not the case. Mann dissolves to a long shot of the Senate, shot from the wolf-statue behind the throne as Livius and Commodus enter. The entire Senate is on its feet, shouting "Caesar!" Livius is ignored. Mann cuts to a low angle reverse shot as, smiling, Commodus spreads his arms wide. At once the Senate is quiet. Julianus steps in front of the senators and

makes a sycophantic plea that they might be allowed to call the empire and the city "Commodus." The senators cheer when their plea is granted. Commodus then indicates that Livius may speak.

Mann cuts to a medium long shot of Livius, with a curved foreground of senators turned to face him. He walks past them from left to right, as the camera tracks back and to the right, pulling out to a long shot of Livius and the senators. "Honorable fathers of Rome: What have you done? What have you become? You are the Senate of the people of Rome. The voice, the conscience of the empire." Mann cuts to a close-up of Livius "Stand up!" Mann tracks in rapidly as Livius moves toward Commodus, and tracks past him rapidly as he stops--in effect, zooming in on Commodus, as on a monster in a horror film. "Rid yourself of this man who has imperiled the life of the empire!" Mann cuts back to the close-up of Livius. "The Northern Army is at the gates of Rome; the Army will support you." Mann cuts to the long shot, as the senators cry out "Traitor! Traitor!" Mann cuts back to a close-up of Livius, looking around in confusion. If the Empire is a body, the entire senate is infected with the Commodus disease. The empire is now the empire of Commodus.

Mann reinforces this with the next scenes, showing the army and the people of Rome. Nigia rides out to announce a change in command, from Livius to "Caesar himself." Accompanying this change in command is 3000 dinars in gold for each man in the army. Discipline collapses, as the entire army begins shouting "gold!" Mann cuts to medium shots of Lucilla and Livius's

commanders, who look at each other and the army in confusion. Mann cuts to the square in front of the forum, as Livius is led out under guard. The army's cries on the soundtrack blend with the sound of the people of Rome talking to each other. Livius is chained to a post with Ballomar, Helga, and the surviving Germans. "You see, Livius? The day has run its course and no army marches on Rome," Julianus says to him. "Our new god, Caesar, demands human sacrifices. You and these others will be the first."

Mann returns to the army. "There's your great Roman army--bought for a handful of gold," Commodus's agent tells the commanders. Victorinus accepts this, and goes to the wagon for his share. "What about Livius," Polybius asks. What about the years of sacrifice for Rome, Lucilla asks. "Our time has come," Victorinus replies. Victorinus and Polybius begin fighting (as, in the background, others begin fighting over gold. Polybius is shot by a stray arrow. "Save yourself," Polybius tells Lucilla. She cannot understand what has happened. "Not my father's army! What's become of it?" "There's nothing left," Polybius says. "Darkness. Death. Bloodshed. Run quickly, Lucilla." Victorinus comes up with his gold to look at Lucilla and Polybius's body. "You don't understand all this, do you. In the old days there was gold from the wars for the legionnaires. But your father--he was a great man--but with his new Rome, it was all changed." He walks off. Lucilla picks up Polybius's dagger, stares at it, then boards her chariot and enters Rome.

Mann cuts to a long shot of Lucilla, riding through the Romans, dancing in the streets in celebration of the Emperor's holiday. The camera trucks down as it tracks right, so that Lucilla gradually becomes lost in the crowd, before re-emerging in a less crowded area. Mann cuts to a point-of-view shot of Livius, chained, which quickly becomes expressive as Mann rapidly tracks in to a close-up. Mann reverse-cuts to show Lucilla, staring at Livius as she passes, and then to a long shot as she moves toward the emperor's palace. Mann cuts to the pool at the heart of the palace, as Lucilla passes, then shows a man sitting in long shot in front of the statue of Faustina. Lucilla tries to stab him--and finds that it is Verulus. "Help me save the man I love," Lucilla says. "I want you to kill my brother." Mann cuts from a medium shot over Verulus shoulder of Lucilla to a close-up over Lucilla's shoulder as Verulus reacts to her words. "I'll give you money, my jewels, everything I have. There's nothing left for me, only my love." "There is not money enough in the world to pay a man to kill his own son." Mann reverse-cuts as Lucilla backs away from Verulus; as she backs away, Faustina's statue is revealed. "Your son. My mother--my mother loved you!" She turns to look at Faustina, who now commands the frame. Mann cuts back to Verulus. "Yes, she loved me. And I loved her." Lucilla clearly knew that her mother had loved <u>some</u> gladiator, but not this one. And now this family secret--the reason for Lucilla's resentment of her brother and her cruelty to her mother of which Commodus complained--is now revealed.

"It's a lie!" Commodus shouts. Mann cuts to a long shot, over Faustina's shoulder, as Lucilla and Verulus turn to face Commodus, at the apex of a diagonal that extends from the far left of the frame to the far right. Commodus moves forward, and as he does the camera tracks in to isolate Commodus and Verulus. "It's a lie," Commodus says softly. "No, Commodus, it's true; you should never have been Caesar," Verulus says. "It's a lie. I'm the son of an emperor," Commodus says, picking up a short sword from a table. "Marcus Aurelius was my father. You're not my father!" Commodus lunges left, striking at Verulus, who throws him backward to the right edge of the frame. Mann cuts to a close-up of Lucilla, looking on in shock, and to a full shot of Commodus on the floor, who rises and points his sword at Verulus offscreen." "You're my son. You're my son," Verulus says. Commodus drops his sword point and starts crying. Mann reverse-cuts to a two shot as Commodus moves left, toward his father, who waits for Commodus with open arms. The camera tracks in with Commodus to an over-the-shoulder closeup of Verulus as Commodus stabs him. "No!" Commodus says, and pushes Verulus backward. Commodus moves forward, the camera tracking with him again into a close-up. "My son," Verulus says, as Commodus stabs him again, pushing him backward toward the pool. "my son," he mouths silently, and Mann cuts to a longshot across the pool as Verulus falls backward to the left into the pool.

Commodus, a spiritual patricide against Marcus Aurelius, has now killed his biological father. Mann cuts back to Lucilla, who flees the room through a

door to the right, and pans right with her to the palace entrance. Mann tracks behind her in a deep focus medium shot out to the palace porch, to show her against the backdrop of the Roman celebrants of the god Commodus. "Gods of Rome--your empire has died!" she seems to shout. Mann reverse-cuts to a close-up to show that it is her thoughts. "The light of the world has gone out!" Mann returns to the medium shot as Lucilla descends the steps to become part of the crowd, cuts to a medium close-up tracking shot as she makes her way through the crowd. What follows is a mixture of spoken word and voice-over, like Marcus Aurelius's conversation with himself and Death. It is the third great speech of the film, the one which defines what is happening to Rome. As Lucilla's fate is identified with Rome, it is as though she speaks as Rome, a Rome that is in the process of dying and, like Marcus Aurelius, is no longer capable of speaking in a voice that is used to converse with others. Rome is reduced from an assembly where many people exchange ideas, as in the Senate where Timonides and the Old Senator spoke for Aurelius' new Rome, to a voice in one person's head, heard by no one. "People of Rome! People of Rome!" she shouts, but no one listens. Her voice competes with the crowd noise and a bouncing, frenetic theme that accompanies their dancing. In voice-over she continues: "Quickly! Quickly run to your neighbors. Tell them the night is full of thieves. They have robbed us of our most precious treasures: Of our pride; of our glory; of our wisdom; of our honor!"

Mann cuts to an extreme long shot of the forum square, a re-establishing shot that shows her destination, the prisoners chained to stakes, then back to a tracking medium close-up of Lucilla. "People of Rome! Cry out!" she shouts again, "Death is in the air!" No one reacts. She continues in voice-over. "They do not see. They do not hear. Only the jackals who are waiting in the darkness know. Only the vultures who are wheeling in the black skies know. Mourn. Mourn for the land that is no more!" Lucilla reaches the barrier of guards surrounding the prisoners' platform. She goes through the guards to the empty square in front of the platform, as though unseen. In contrast to the bouncing woodwind and percussion crowd theme, Lucilla's Rome theme is taken up by the brass section of the orchestra. "Oh Livius! Livius! Give me your hand, Livius! Out of all we have fought for, out of all our dreams, we have each other." Lucilla embraces Livius. Mann cuts from the square to a medium shot on the platform, showing Livius, Lucilla, and the square behind them. "We have each other," Lucilla says aloud, to the one person who will listen to her. Behind her, Nigia rides up, and orders Lucilla to be chained as well on Caesar's orders. "Why did you come, Lucilla? You could have lived." "I love you Livius. We are part of each other. I Live only if you live." The new Rome they fought to bring into being now only exists with them.

Mann cuts to extreme long shots of the people of "Commodus," and to the arrival of the army of "Commodus." Mann pans with Victorinus as he passes the camera, and then trucks up to show a giant hand. Mann reverse-cuts to show,

in foreground, a group of penitents flagellating themselves before the giant hand in extreme long shot in the background. Mann cuts to trumpeters above the forum who play a flourish, and then to the hand in long shot. A figurine is in the palm of the hand, and the body of the figurine opens up to reveal Commodus. The hand--and Commodus' appearance from within the body, is a contrast to the giant heads shown with Livius. Once he has learned what to do, Livius, in Antioch and in Jove's temple, has been shown in the context of decapitated heads. Now, in counterpoint, Commodus is shown as the giant hand. He emerges from the body, like Marcus Aurelius's cancer manifested in a form, from the empty shell of the body in the hand's palm. It is the visual manifestation of the body's revolt against thought and reason, and the answer to the riddle Mann posed at the beginning of the film: What part of the body is "never unwell?" The disease that kills the body.

Mann shows Commodus, the emergent god of the hand, being greeted by the crowd. Commodus takes up a torch, and in a left tracking shot walks toward the prisoner's platform, and stops in front of Livius and Lucilla.

> Commodus: When my father Marcus Aurelius died, you brought me a torch and hailed me undoubted Caesar. I swore I would not forget that. So I am paying my debt to you, Gaius Metellus Livius. I have fought many times in the arena, but they whisper that no gladiator would dare to kill a Caesar, a god. Only you would dare. If you fought me now, the world would know it was to the death. Kill me, and they're yours.

Livius nods in the direction of the prisoners, and then nods at a guard, who unchains Livius. Mann cuts to an extreme long shot as the flagellants in front of

the hand leave the square; to a close-up of Lucilla and Livius, who look at each other; to the trumpets high above the square, the visual source for the soundtrack's blaring horn flourish; to the extreme long shot again, as, on signal, two sets of spears are arranged. Mann cuts to a depth-of-focus shot, with Commodus in medium shot and Livius in extreme long shot. Mann cuts to an extreme long shot from above to show soldiers form a square around them with their shields; to Lucilla, in close-up; and to the soldier's square. Mann cuts to medium shots of Livius and then Commodus as the soldiers lift up a second level of shields, and the fight begins.

Spartacus had its gladiator fight near the beginning. Mann and his screenwriters placed theirs at the end, as the physical culmination of a conflict building throughout the film. The very pattern of the shots, in their tendency to move between extremes of nearness and farness are suggestive of the "distance" between the character's point of view. Howard Fast had thought that Spartacus was all downhill after the gladiator fight, and indeed--though that was not the intention of Trumbo and Douglas, in the finished film as initially released that is almost the last moment in which Spartacus is seen fighting--a structural flaw in the film which Duncan Cooper has discussed at length. The Fall of the Roman Empire benefits here from its lack of internal conflict in its creative staff; the final fight of this film is the culmination of a conflict the protagonist and antagonist have attempted to deny existed through the course of the film.

In its execution, Livius and Commodus's fight is the equal of its more famous counterpart. Like it, it has its important counterpoint. But where Spartacus uses the fight scene as a backdrop to a foreground discussion on important plot points--which tend to get lost in the pace of the fight, as Trumbo complained--Mann paces his fight so that, as it reaches a lull, he cuts to a scene which changes the meaning of the fight itself. Mann cuts to a two-shot of Julianus and Victorinus. "Victorinus. No matter which one comes out alive, you have the power now. You have the army. Make me Caesar, and I'll give you one million dinars in gold." Victorinus is silent. "One million five hundred thousand dinars." Mann returns to the fight scene, now being fought with broken spears. However the outcome and its effect on individuals, the fight has become irrelevant to Rome.

Commodus rushes one more time at Livius, in a god's-eye point of view, and falls into what seems to be an embrace. Mann shows close-ups, first of Commodus, then of Livius; of Nigia, looking over the shield wall with a concerned look, torch in hand; and to a medium shot as Commodus drops his spear and holds Livius. Mann cuts out to Victorinus and Julianus, the latter distracted from his bidding, and returns to a close-up of Commodus over Livius's shoulder. It is a reprise of their several embraces throughout the film; it echoes Commodus's "embrace" of his father as he stabbed him. "If you listen," Commodus says, "very carefully, you'll hear the gods laughing." Mann cuts to a reverse close-up of Livius, then returns to Commodus, who pushes himself

away from Livius. Mann cuts to an extreme close-up of Commodus. "Burn them!" he shouts, and Mann cuts to the god's-eye view. "Burn them!" he shouts again, accompanied by a xylophone flourish--the usual instrument since Saint-Saens for the voice of Death--and Mann cuts to a close-up as Commodus drops to the ground, dead.

Mann cuts to a low angle shot of Nigia, who moves left across the frame, shouting "Burn them!" He tosses his torch. Mann cuts to a close-up of Lucilla reacting; to a whip-pan of the torch in the air, stopping the pan on Lucilla who screams as the torch lands nearby. Mann shows more torches, Ballomar and Helga as the flames rise around them, and Lucilla again. "Livius!" Mann cuts to a close-up of Livius, still dazed, on the ground. "Livius," Lucilla calls from a smoke-filled frame. Mann pulls back to a medium shot of Livius, who begins to move; cuts out to the god's-eye shot of the square, which collapses at Livius's touch; to Nigia, in long shot, shouting not to let Livius go. His orders are useless, however, as the crowd has grasped something of what is going on. It surges around him. As Lucilla's theme comes up on the soundtrack, Livius enters the frame of Lucilla's close-up and uses his broken spear to pry apart her chains. Mann cuts out to the square to show the shield-wall soldiers rushing to push back the crowd that has overtaken Nigia; to Ballomar and Helga, screaming amid flames; and to the soldiers, struggling with the crowd. Mann cuts away to a passageway on a building overlooking the forum; Romans run, terrified, from right to left across the frame. Mann cuts back to Lucilla and Livius.

Livius breaks Lucilla's chain, and they exit the frame to the right. Mann cuts to a long shot as they move away to the right, away from the flames. Mann inserts a close-up of Ballomar and Helga. "Wotan, avenge us! Destroy Rome," Ballomar shouts. Mann returns to the shot of Livius and Lucilla. "Destroy Rome," he shouts again, as the flames engulf the platform.

Mann inserts a close-up of Lucilla and Livius; they react, but there is nothing that can be done. Indeed, Rome is already destroyed. Rather schematically, the mid-range shot has disappeared in this sequence. There is now only extremes, of long-shots and close-ups; there is no "heart," no mid-range between masses of people and individuals.

Mann returns again to the long shot, and they continue to the right, the camera tracking with them to stop at Commodus's body. Livius picks up Commodus, and Mann tracks out and tilts up as Livius walks up the stairway to the base of the giant hand. Mann returns now to the medium shot, showing Commodus's cohorts. Victorinus steps forward and shouts, "Hail Livius! Hail Caesar! But it does not last. Mann cuts to a close-up of Lucilla against the backdrop of the crowd, as they shout back "Hail Livius! Hail Caesar!" It is the realization of her desire, but she ignores it, looking at the body of her brother. The camera tilts up as Livius joins her in the frame. From offscreen come voices. "We're in command now, Livius. Rome is ours! Take command--be Caesar!" Victorinus says. "Gaius Metellus Livius--the people are asking for you," Julianus says. "The empire is yours--Livius," Nigia says.

Mann tracks with the couple in medium close-up as they step forward (to the right, in accordance with Mann's schema) and stop in front of Julianus. "You would not find me suitable," Livius says coldly, as Timonides' theme, the theme of the Roman peace comes up, "because my first official act would be to have you all crucified. He looks over at Nigia, then Julianus, and then to an area to the left off camera. Mann cuts to a medium long shot facing Livius and Lucilla, which shows that Victorinus is the last person he looks at. The camera tracks away to keep Livius and Lucilla in medium long shot as, behind them, Commodus's associates begin bidding for the empire. Livius and Lucilla start down a stairway, and literally drop out of the frame. Mann cuts to a long shot, tracking backward in a crane shot to an extreme long shot as Livius and Lucilla disappear into the crowd. There is now just the body of the crowd, with the giant hand; no "head," no "heart." "Two million nine hundred thousand dinars!" "Emperor of the greatest empire in history, from Britain to Egypt? More, Much more," Victorinus says, starting down the stairs, looking after Livius and Lucilla. "This was the beginning of the fall of the Roman empire. A great civilization is not conquered from without, until it has destroyed itself from within," the narrator says. The camera tilts up to show smoke rise into the sky from the burning prisoner-platform--whose deaths were the death of the Roman peace--as the camera had done with the smoke of Marcus Aurelius's funeral pyre, and fades to black.

ENDNOTES

1. Ambassador College Editorial Department (H. Armstrong Roberts), "The Modern Romans: The Decline of Western Civilization" (Pasadena, Calif.: Ambassador College Press, 1971), p. 5

2. Irwin Edman (ed), Marcus Aurelius and His Times (Roslyn, NY: Walter J. Black, Inc, 1945), p. viii.

3. Unfortunately, Janine Basinger, who otherwise is quite sensitive to Mann's strengths, seems to have a blind spot when it comes to The Fall of the Roman Empire and The Furies (1950), which is the second most underrated Mann film. The two films are about the same issue: How empires are preserved once they are built.

4.See Jeanine Basinger, Anthony Mann (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979), p. 31; Peter Ustinov, Dear Me (London: Heinemann, 1977), p. 217.

5. Arguably, Judith Anderson's stepmother is the villainess in The Furies; yet she can only lead T.C. Jeffers to commit evil, not make him do it. Jeffers is thus more like Commodus in Fall of the Roman Empire: Capable of fighting and achieving for its own sake, but not capable of fighting for the community. He is, like Mr. (X) in Bend of the River, a person who has heroic traits, but is not quite heroic enough in the end.

6. Rarely, Mann has female villains. With the possible exception of Sally Holland in Strategic Air Command (1955), they are usually secondary characters like Flo Burnett in the Furies and Princess Urraca in El Cid.

7. see Janine Basinger, Anthony Mann (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979), pp. 101-102. See also Jim Kitses, Horizons West (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1969), pp. 46-59, who serves as Basinger's source for this idea. I should add that my own understanding of Mann is much influenced by Jim Kitses's work, as well as Basinger's.

8. See in particular Basinger's comments on Howard Kemp in The Naked Spur (1953), which nicely distinguishes the divided nature of the hero (Basinger, p. 113).

9. Basinger, pp. 112-113.

10. That this is a "fall" is suggested concisely by T.C. Jeffers' motto on his own paper currency, "`amicus humani generus'--friend of the human race." T.C. breaks his word to let the Herreras go free by killing Juan Herrera--prompted by a secondary character who might be said to embody the darker side of T.C., "El Tigre."

11. Basinger, p. 165.

12. It is intriguing that Rodrigo and Chimene's children are twins, "exactly alike," as Rodrigo says; this is perhaps a hint of the twin nature of the "hero" in this film, or perhaps of the two parts of Spain that are different, yet actually alike. Uracca and Alfonso as "twin" villains, in accordance to Mann's usual practice of villain and hero parallels, is also worth noting.

13. The Furies is suggestive of a similar dependency between Vance and Rip Darrow.

14. Charlton Heston, The Actor's Life: Journals, 1956-1976, p. 131.

15. Basinger, p. 178.

16. Jean-Claude Missiaen, "A Lesson in Cinema," Cahiers du Cinema in English, No. 12 (December 1967), p. 46.

17.Lakoff and Turner, More than Cool Reason, p. 222.

18. Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (New York: Heritage Press, 1946), pp. 70-72.

19. Gibbon, p. 70.

20. Lakoff et al, Master Metaphor List pp. 100; 152.

21. El Cid uses this same heart metaphor in a scene with Rodrigo and Chimene as she pleads with him to rest and live: C: "Someone else will lead them." R: "They have made me their heart."

22. Northrop Frye, The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976), p. 173.

23. Franklin Roosevelt, quoted in Cabell Phillips, The Truman Presidency (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 76.

24. Harry Truman, quoted in Phillips, p. 77.

25. Truman, quoted in Phillips, p. 82. This is not to say that the language describing the United Nations is utterly unique. The British Empire on occasion was referred to as a "brotherhood of nations," and collective defence is as old as war. But in accordance with Grice's maxim of relevance, we may assume that this language is used in reference to the most immediately relevant context.

26. Papers of the Presidents: John F. Kennedy, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 517.

27. The Roman Empire lent itself as a model for thinking about why the United States should be internationalist. It tends to be forgotten that this internationalism was a matter of some conflict, and that even in 1963 internationalism needed defending. In the Kennedy speech quoted above, Kennedy was advocating the cause of internationalism to both Europeans and Americans who were wavering. Only a few years earlier, the internal debate in the United States over internationalism had been vitriolic. In 1950, Joseph Kennedy--John Kennedy's father--called for troop withdrawals in Korea and Germany, and demanded to know what business the United States had in Indochina and Korea. Much of this is documented in Blanche Wiesen Cook, The Declassified Eisenhower (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), pp. 89-108; 324-334. The irony is that Eisenhower, who kept the isolationists in check, also promoted the selfish exploitations of multinational corporations which helped cast doubt on the self-sacrificial basis of American motives, as Cook summarizes on pp. 340-344.

28. Northrop Frye, The Secular Scripture (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976), p. 173.

29. Mann regularly worked with his writers on his scripts. Jacques Rivette indicated in Cahiers du Cinema that this was one of the marks of the auteur-director: "[T]here isn't a singe one of the great American directors who doesn't work on the scenario himself right from the beginning, in collaboration with a scriptwriter.... And that's why in Cahiers we've chosen to defend directors like Hitchcock rather than Wyler, and Mann rather than Zinnemann, because they are directors who actually work on their scenarios." Jim Hiller (ed.), Cahiers du Cinéma: The 1950's (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1985), p. 38.

30. Basinger, p. 139.

31. Gibbon, p. 65.

32. This is another area where the film conflicts with the generally assumed history. Marcus Aurelius thanked the gods for "such a wife, so obedient, and so affectionate, and so simple" (Meditations I, in Marcus Aurelius and His Times, p. 19.); he does not seem to have been aware of any marital conflict.

33. Jim Kitses, Horizons West pp. 33-43; 46-53.

34. This is a plot development Mann and his screenwriters devised. The actual Lucilla, according to Gibbon, "imitated the manners of Faustina" (Gibbon, p. 68).

35. George Willis Botsford, A History of the Ancient World (New York: Macmillan, 1916), p. 498.

36. Anthony Mann, "Empire Demolition", Films and Filming March 1964, p. 8.

37. Mann, p. 7.

38.Basinger, p. 28.

39. Basinger, p. 179.

40. quoted passages from F.R. Cowell, "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases: Who (or What) Killed Roman Freedom?", The Saturday Review (January 26, 1957), p. 11.

41. Arnold J. Toynbee, "Lessons for us from Athens and Rome," The New York Times Magazine, January 31, 1960, p. 60.

42. Missiaen, p. 50.

43. I emphasize Bend of the River, but it could be said that this is the crucial theme of most of Mann's films from The Furies onward.

44. Cahiers Du Cinema in English, no. 12 (Dec. 1967), p. 46, cited in Basinger, pp. 124-125.

45. I cannot say that Mann and his writers deliberately had Boethius in mind, but Will Durant was the film's historical adviser, and even a casual student of

the late empire would be bound to know of the Consolation of Philosophy, though it post-dates the events of the film.

46. Anthony Mann, "A Lesson In Cinema," Cahiers du Cinema In English No. 12 (Dec. 1967), p. 50.

47. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations, in Irwin Edman (ed.), Marcus Aurelius and His Times (Roslyn, N.Y.: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1945), p. 62; p. 60.

48. Marcus Aurelius, p. 65.

49. Mann probably learned of the punishment from his work on Spartacus; Crassus carried out a decimation after his initial defeat by Spartacus, according to Petrarch, and Trumbo had at one time intended to put that scene in the film. It was regarded even by Plutarch as an old-fashioned, "classical" punishment.

50. "nationalism" is of course not the best term, but I use it in the sense that George Orwell does in George Orwell, "Notes on Nationalism," The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1968), pp. 361-379.

51. Meditations, IX, 8, Marcus Aurelius and his Times, p. 94.

52. It is interesting to note that, on comparable budgets, Mann's film has literally dozens more huge crowd shots than Spartacus. By comparable, I am favoring Spartacus, as it has a listed $15 million budget, and Fall of the Roman Empire a little over $10 million. Simply looking at the "cast of thousands" scenes, one could easily come to the conclusion that Spartacus was the lower budget film. Of course, Mann had much less of the internecine warfare and script rewriting and reshooting to contend with.

53. Mann in fact admired Hitchcock's use of the camera. Speaking of his Lincoln Assassination Noir, The Tall Target, Mann said: "I tried to do a Hitchcock, or, if you will, an exercise in high voltage: The maximum suspense and tension, in action that was very concentrated in time and space." Jean-Claude Missianen, "A Lesson in Cinema," tr. Donald Phelps, Cahiers du Cinema In English No. 12 (Dec. 1967), p. 46. According to Janine Basinger, Mann liked to quote Ernst Lubitsch's comment, "there are 1,000 ways to point a camera, but really only one." Basinger, p. 33.

54. as Basinger notes, Mann used wide-angle lenses extensively in his Films Noirs. See Basinger, pp. 51-53.

55. Toynbee, "The Unification of the World," Civilization On Trial, p. 79.

56. To be sure, given Heston's denial of any homoerotic content in Ben-Hur, Mann may well have had problems with Heston had he shot this scene and Heston worked out what was going on.

57. "point of ritual death" is described in Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971 [1957]), p. 179.

58. Here again I cannot help but mourn the lack either of Kirk Douglas or of Charlton Heston in the role. Boyd's expression is approximately apt: a stern stare. Heston or Douglas would have added passion to it, or some slight quiver of the body indicating the breakthrough that occurs in this scene. It is a lapse on Mann's part not to have elicited more from Boyd at this point, but perhaps Boyd could not accomplish a look or movement that would indicate sudden anger, followed by comprehension and cool purpose.

59. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 163.

CHAPTER EIGHT

But the stable Roman family didn't last. Changes rapidly took place in the social life of Rome. Tribute poured in from the conquered nations.... Roman men began to "play around" on business trips, in their offices, with neighbor's wives. It was now considered naïve to be honest in business. The old virtues of "God, country and home" were considered as so much flag waving and square talk.... Today we are beginning to pay a high price for our rejection of true values and the acceptance of indulgent and permissive leadership.

--Ambassador College Editors,
The Modern Romans: The Decline of Western Civilization (1971)[1]

Like Caesar peering into the colonies from distant Rome, Nixon said the choice of government by the Chileans was unacceptable to the president of the United States.

--Senator Frank Church
CIA hearings, 1976[2]

They'll be ga ga at the go go
When they see me in my toga
My toga made of blond brilliantined biblical hair
My hair like Jesus wore it
Hallelujah I adore it
Hallelujah Mary loved her son
Why don't my mother love me?

--Hair (1966)[3]

DEATH AND TRANSFIGURATION

Fall of the Roman Empire (1964), the most perfectly realized of the Roman Empire epic films, was also the last. The Bible (1966), first of a projected sequence of films, was the last traditional Bible epic film. What happened to make them disappear? The conventional answer is that they were expensive films, and the studios could no longer afford to risk making them. This is true, but also begs the question; they had always been expensive films. Cleopatra (1963), infamous for its turgidity and its cost, broke 20th Century-Fox, and stands as the symbol of why epic films died. Yet they were already in decline before Cleopatra was released.[4] If Cleopatra cannot be blamed for destroying epics, however, it does show signs of the pressures that inhibited the genre.

What distinguishes Cleopatra in particular is its emphasis on the personal, rather than the social; Rome and Egypt become the backdrops for the main characters rather than the source of their identities. The film seems to have a palimpsest theme that, in becoming an empire with colonies, Rome endangered its own identity. Cleopatra initially behaves much like the foreign-born queen of Land of the Pharaohs (1956), a noir-sorceress who seduces

Pharoah and kills him out of greed for his wealth. In the context of the United States' various defense alliances with leaders of internally divided countries, like Vietnam, this might have been a compelling film. Individual scenes, and the strategy of Caesar's "protectorate" Egyptian ruler advising him to defy Rome's constitution suggest this. However, as it progresses toward its conclusion the film progressively obscures the political context and significance of its protagonists' actions in favor of emphasizing their personal failures of communication. Cleopatra herself turns into a passive observer of her own story.

Cleopatra is an ironic romance, in that the new society of the protagonists is unable to cohere against the combined forces of the old society. But since Cleopatra and Anthony (and Cleopatra and Caesar) fail to state how their society is to differ in any way other than in a poorly-articulated romantic sensibility from the society which suppresses them, the result is less epic than it is bathetic.

Cleopatra's failure of conception was not financial. In order to understand why Cleopatra's Rome was more spectacle than epic, it is necessary to look past the financial investment to the social

context. To paraphrase Durant, the fall of the Roman and Biblical epics had not one cause but many. The event is not to be found in the terminal films of each genre, but in the process of identity conflict negotiation which had called forth these genres. As the United States' position in the world continued to change, the metaphors through which that position was understood metamorphosized. Rome and the Bible became transformed from analogies embodying movements toward national consensus, to polarizing rhetorical frames for the political Left and Right. This change is too complex to develop fully here, and will be the subject of a subsequent study. The following outline will however explore what happened to the Rome and Bible genres: What contexts brought about the deaths of the Rome and Bible film genres, and their transfiguration into rhetorical forms of conflict.

The Bible genre died first. The Story of Ruth was liberal in its call for tolerance. A few other Bible films and television programs were liberal in their leanings. However, just as the One-World-oriented The Day the Earth Stood Still (1951) was one of the few exceptions to the monster alien invaders of the 50's Science Fiction

film, so The Story of Ruth was a rarity in a genre whose theme was the dangers of alien nations and their thralls within the Chosen Nation. Most Bible films reflected the thematic concerns expressed by the political Right.[5] As with Science Fiction films like Invaders from Mars (1953), with its alien-possessed citizens, the Bible film was at its peak of popularity during, and shortly after, the McCarthy period. The popularity of the Bible films coincided with a conservative consensus. When McCarthy was censured, the Republican party's radical Right also declined in influence, along with much of the McCarthyist rhetoric about traitors. The Story of Ruth's transformation from a spy story with a military climax to an anti-McCarthy story over the course of eight years reflects the changes the United States' political organizations were undergoing.

DeMille's Bible Film genre was perfectly adapted to defining the United States' conflict with the U.S.S.R. as part of an eternal struggle between good and evil. As the country became habituated to the Cold War, however, the collective fear shifted from imminent invasion to global destruction at some point in the future through

nuclear war. Former foreign department officer Ronald Steel observed in his post-WWII history Pax Americana (1967):

> With the recognition by both sides that virtually nothing is worth a nuclear war, a good deal of air has gone out of the Russo-American confrontation. Fanatics in both camps--whether Birchites or Maoists--may still speak of victory, but responsible political leaders know better. President Eisenhower summed up the grim truth about the atomic balance when he said that there was "no alternative to peace."[6]

The evil became less the political adversary than the consequences to come from the nuclear war that would result if one side or the other temporarily wavered in their self-control. Murderous Martians were replaced by atomic fallout or atomic monsters in Science Fiction films like the doomed society of On the Beach (1959) or the innocent, lethally radioactive children of These Are the Damned (1961).[7]

Unlike the Science Fiction film, the Bible film did not have such thematic flexibility in its stories. The early 50's Bible film centered on the Old Testament, with its conflicts of good and evil nations. The triumph of righteousness was their theme, and moral strength and patriotism were their means. In the new war where, no matter who "won," the righteous and the evil nations both could

perish through the automatic actions of militarized bureaucrats, the moral struggle of war became meaningless. Sodom and Gomorrah (1962) uses one of the few Old Testament Biblical narratives that could be adapted to this shift. It followed the standard Bible film narrative pattern, but concluded with a nuclear-style holocaust. The nuclear-style destruction of this film was directed in part at both the righteous and evil nations. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for their evil, and Israel decimated for its moral lassitude; the film was less a triumph of righteousness than a jeremiad of the regrettable but just punishment awaiting sin, in consonance with the rhetoric of the Far Right.[8] In spite of this modification, it was still a box-office failure; the strict moral judgments of each adversary, and the divine interventions of the Bible film did not resonate with the public by the end of the 50's. The idea of a righteous remnant as "victory" had small appeal to the public at large.

Part of Hollywood's response to this change was to shift from the Old Testament to the New Testament. The new films redirected the narrative's focus from a conflict between nations to individual

conflicts of consciousness. This second change is what differentiates the later New Testament Bible films from Quo Vadis (1951), The Silver Chalice (1955) and Ben-Hur (1959) in particular, and to a lesser extent The Robe (1953), Salome (1953), Demetrius and the Gladiators (1954), and The Prodigal, each of whose characters undergo a conversion from evil society allegiance to the good society. Beginning with The Big Fisherman (1959), the new films emphasize the conflict of good and evil persons rather than nations. They include King of Kings (1961), Barabbas (1962), and The Greatest Story Ever Told (1965).

In contrast to The Ten Commandments (1956), with its plethora of miracles, or even David and Bathsheba (1951), in which touching the Ark of the Covenant kills or does not kill in accordance to divine will, the new films downplayed physical miracles. Rather than stressing good and evil, or world redemption, or even the formation of a new society, the new Jesus films emphasized individual spiritual transformations. That they emphasized individual spiritual change while at the same time taking as their subject the mission of Christ to redeem humanity and the Fallen

world, the template for almost all epic romance in Western culture, marked as it is in the New Testament by a number of miracles, seems at the very least expressive of a perverse desire to work against the grain of their chosen source. Gerald Forshey notes that The Greatest Story Ever Told seemed to go to great lengths to provide a rational explanation for all of the miracles the film shows. One commentator at the time concluded that the filmmakers "yield to no one in their respect for religion, but they don't want to make fools of themselves," and that the lack of miracles was proof that the United States was not a religious society.[9] Forshey argues, correctly I think, that this shyness toward miracles reflected both a desire not to antagonize audience segments, as well as a conscious adoption of some modernist theological interpretations.[10]

Even as they downplayed the social implications of their theme in their dialogue and plots, the publicity of early 60's Jesus films also seemed to make an effort to relate the conflicts of Jesus's society to the present; "As it is today, so it was in the turbulent times before Christ, that the menace of pagan tyranny shadowed the hearts of men who would be free.... Into this troubled world came

Jesus of Nazareth, who feared none, nor even death, to bring forth enlightenment and triumph," the program for King of Kings (1961) began.[11] Forshey suggests that this might relate to Kennedy's warning in his inaugural speech that "those who make freedom impossible make revolution inevitable," and that "a society unable to help the many who are poor could not save the few who are rich," although he does not explore the issue further.[12] But if that social implication is to be drawn from these films, then the context which informed them must have changed considerably.

The answer to this puzzle of context is to be found primarily in the rise of the Third World. I would point again to Toynbee's comments on the need for the West to overcome the "handicap of affluence" and assist the development of the Third World; Toynbee, Kennedy, and the early 60's Jesus films share this same theme. Toward the latter part of the 50's, the focus of the Cold War shifted away from Europe. As decolonialization progressed, the United States government found that the new nations were not prepared to fall into line behind either the United States or the U.S.S.R. John Foster Dulles had regarded this as immoral, but the U.S.S.R. had

responded with developmental aid that attracted many of the new nations, particularly in contrast to the more grasping approaches of Western corporations. In the late 50's and early 60's the new concern became to win the hearts and minds of the new nations, both as an ideological principle, and to preserve them as trading partners for the West.[13]

In the context of this concern about the poor,[14] the Jesus films contrasted revolution with spiritual transformation. They were in effect defensive fantasies for their audience, reassuring narratives of the justness of gradual over revolutionary change. As Forshey notes, the failure of Judas the Revolutionary in King of Kings (1961) contrasts with the audience's knowledge of Jesus's success.[15] Even more striking is Barabbas (1962), which functions essentially as a satire on the fallacy of revolutionary action.[16] The Jesus of the early 60's films was an anti-revolutionary figure, the hero who chides the poor to be patient, and the rich to be generous. The Greatest Story Ever Told (1965) is the last of these films. As violence became real abroad in Vietnam, and at home in Watts, the subgenre was one of its first victims.

Doctor Strangelove, or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb (1964) offers another hint about why the Bible film fell out of style. Its catalyst character, General Jack T. Ripper, orders a B-52 wing attack on the U.S.S.R., resulting in world destruction, in defense of God, country, and precious bodily fluids. He was a new recognizable type, the "radical Right conspiracy nut." In the late 50's, as the Cold War was thawing, the radical Right increasingly began to organize itself outside of the Republican party. Of particular note was the formation of the John Birch society in 1958. Its premise was that most large corporations, and both the Republican and Democratic parties, were run by Communist agents. Only an organization using Leninist methods against the Communists could forestall the ultimate takeover from within of the United States. A scandal within the Eisenhower administration over military-sponsored "information" meetings publicized the activities of such groups. Press coverage and congressional hearings broadcast the more extreme views of a number of the radical Right leaders.[17] Major General Edwin Walker, the inspiration for "Ripper," was a particular star in Congressional hearings as he explained that a

"control apparatus," whose members he could not identify and whose actions he could not define, was "selling out the Constitution, national sovereignty and national independence."[18]

The association of such views with Fundamentalists, along with the backlash against Fundamentalist concerns about Kennedy's Catholicism in the 1960 presidential campaign, helped to discredit overt links of politics with religion. Religious-themed programs lost their popularity, and were displaced by less expensive or more popular productions. From 1951 to 1962 there was an unbroken string of at least one (and usually more) Biblical-theme television or film production each year. After 1962 no new prime-time religious theme programming was made for the major networks for the rest of the decade.[19] Even the Bible theme film and television productions in that last year were unusual: Barabbas was a satiric anti-hero Bible film; Noah and the Flood was a world-premiere of Igor Stravinsky's ballet on television. Stravinsky's ballet was appropriate to the concerns of nuclear war, with its conclusion of the covenant of the rainbow, in which God promises not to destroy the world again. In the following year, instead of Bible narratives,

NBC began a one-year series in 1963 entitled "Greece: The Golden Age."

It is interesting to note that Greece, not Rome, was the subject of a number of television productions between 1963 and 1966. Rome was the more powerful analogy to apply to the United States, but its usefulness as an attractive medium for relevant narratives was limited, as Rome had become too closely identified with the United States for stories which seriously treated politics of Rome to be regarded simply as entertainment. A roman story either had to be done in such a fashion as to overtly proclaim its irrelevance to contemporary politics, like Cleopatra, or if, like Spartacus, it was political, it must be made non-polemical. Spartacus is a well-documented example of the difficulty an expensive mass culture narrative like film faces when its analogies are too successful. The theme in Spartacus that Universal's executives particularly tried to eliminate were references to Rome's fall; Rome's fate haunted the United States.

As Toynbee expressed it in his tutorial America and World Revolution (1962), "America...now stands for what Rome used to

stand for. In all the territories which fell under its influence, Rome always supported the rich against the poor...Lafayette is ready to pay a high psychological price in being transformed into a Metternich."[20] The Mask of Jove (1966), a study of Roman society whose text draws no parallels or analogies at all to the United States, saved its reminder of contextual relevance for the dust-jacket, where it might attract the casual, perhaps inattentive bookbuyer: "It is these features of society during the Roman period which will make The Mask of Jove a mirror held up to American society today and inevitably lead the reader to wonder if his society too will decline and fall as the Western empire did, ossify as the Eastern empire did, or take its own unpredictable direction."[21] Roger Price, a photographer, published a book entitled The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (1968), which consisted of pictures of mostly American political figures and events, matched with captions taken from Gibbon's book. Rhetorically, America was Rome by the mid 60's.

The fact that stories about Rome were political forced Roman settings out of mass media narratives. Rome however became a

dominant rhetorical tool in political rhetoric, precisely because the Toynbee and film-schooled public could be reliably expected to understand the meaning of Roman references, and to see in Rome's fall an issue of concern for the United States. Rome had been the preferred analogy of the political Left, but by the early 60's the Right began to take it up.[22] In Newsweek magazine, in a purchased editorial, The Chairman of the Board of the Hyster company charged President Kennedy with "a planned program for building the power of the executive branch to near-dictatorship." Next to that, Raymond Moley had a "Perspective" column entitled "Caesar the Destroyer," in which he discussed a recent book by John Dickenson, Death of a Republic (1963).[23]

> From Theodor Mommsen's scholarly but slanted history of Rome to the present gaudy production of "Cleopatra," Caesar's virtues have been exaggerated.... The once-sturdy fiber of the Roman people as well as their protective institutions had been undergoing a decline for a long time.... Dickinson says Caesar substituted `a new mystical basis of authority for the traditional sanctions of the old Republic. At the moment of his death he had built nothing, founded nothing...[except] a psychological acceptance for his rule....' His warnings embody wisdom which our generation will ignore at deadly peril to human liberty.[24]

Like the Saturday Review quotation from Tacitus a decade earlier, Moley never mentions Kennedy or his actions directly; the reader is expected to draw the tacit parallel for his/herself--perhaps aided by the Hyster editorial. Like H. J. Haskell's oblique attacks against Roosevelt and the New Deal two decades earlier, Moley valorized Cicero as the alternative to interventionist executives.

Moley significantly did not use Toynbee as the medium for his attack. By 1963, Toynbee had a partisan identity. As I have discussed above, Kennedy and his aides had used Toynbee as a paradigm; Sargent Shriver even described the Alliance for Progress and the Peace Corps as programs created directly to respond to causes Toynbee had identified for the collapse of the Graeco-Roman civilization.[25] Toynbee returned the complement. He said of the Peace Corps:

> Critics of the present Administration have, of course, been quick to point out various ways in which this project might miscarry. Yet the risk involved in launching it is, I should say, a small one compared to the risk of taking no action in this field. Inaction here, would, I believe, mean eventually losing the Cold War. On the other hand, if the Peace Corps makes even a partial success of its job, it may achieve for America, and for the Western World as a whole, the one thing that we need above all. It may help us to break down the psychological

> barrier that now insulates us from the great majority of the human race.[26]

After Kennedy's assassination, Murray Kempton and James Ridgeway returned to Rome to place the event in perspective. They quoted from Shakespeare's play Cymbeline the lines "Home thou art and ta'en thy wages./Golden lads and girls all must/As chimney sweepers come to dust."[27] They added:

> Cymbeline is a Roman play. The Kennedys are a Roman family. America seems only a Roman crowd. For us alone in it, there is only a terrible irritation with God and with self and with every other face that is left.[28]

Kennedy had given the country a context in history, they argued, that the country could not maintain on its own. The unity which his rhetoric had provided was broken. "We had lived among old Romans; now the doors were closing and we must live with ourselves."[29]

Rome persisted however, in forms designed to polarize rather than unite the nation. In its May 3, 1966 issue, the National Review published two articles on Rome's relevance to the United States: Thomas Molnar's "Imperial America," from which I have quoted above; and William S. Schlamm, "Whose Decline?", a review of Spengler's published letters. The title of Shlamm's article referred

both to Spengler's Decline of the West and Schlamm's purpose, the decline of Arnold Toynbee:

> It is generally known, or it ought to be, that Arnold Toynbee's few original ideas are Oswald Spengler's. Yet Toynbee, for rather inexplicable reasons, still enjoys a viable reputation in the declining West...."[30]

Schlamm spent much of the rest of his article comparing Toynbee unfavorably to Spengler, whom he found "so much more intelligent than Toynbee," even when he was wrong. Garry Wills, at the time one of the National Review's regular contributors, also published his compilation of classical literature, Roman Culture, in 1966.

Kennedy used Rome's history as the template both for our own identity, and, in concert with Toynbee, as the lesson of what needed to be avoided in order to make the new internationalism more just and lasting than Rome's empire. Molnar, in what seems to be an expression of despair over what he regards as the pervasive, corrupting power of liberalism, and in the context of a seemingly endless dominance of Democratic presidencies, seems to argue that the United States is doomed to become Rome because of its passive, uninformed electorate. Power devolves to the presidency:

> Roman and American examples show that with the extension of responsibilities and the complexification of interests there goes increasing centralization.... This does not mean that traditional institutions and practices vanish; they are, however, slowly emptied of power and significance.... [Congressional barters] are denounced by [James MacGregor] Burns and others as representing partial interests as against the President who "represents the nation." A new and Caesarian notion in American politics and parlance. [Caesar] is compensated by privileges. One kind of privileges [sic.] is to offer Julius the crown, or Franklin D. Roosevelt four mandates. But there are others, and they grow naturally.[31]

Toynbee, in his proclaiming of the need for the Universal State, and Kennedy more obliquely in his arguments for increased collective organization of the nations of the West, argued that nationalism must give way to internationalism. In Molnar's interpretation of this, the United States is already a new empire, "increasingly socialized within and imperialistic abroad."[32] The One World of the Imperial States of America awaits only time and consolidation to be declared.

Another sign of Toynbee's influence and the backlash of fear his idea of the universal state provoked may be found on the streets of midtown Manhattan. Someone--presumably a city construction worker, as s/he used the same paint used for marking sidewalks--

stencilled the following warning on the corners of 45th and Third and Fifth Avenues: "Toynbee ideas in Kubrick's 2001/Resurrect Dead on Planet Jupiter." Presumably, the author believed that Kubrick's film 2001: A Space Odyssey (1968) was a propaganda vehicle by which a "control apparatus" of the sort General Walker had spoken was trying to influence him and others. More plaintively, in another stencil on 47th Street and Fifth Avenue, identifiable only by the consonance in letter shapes and sidewalk paint, the unknown author somewhat obscurely wrote: "Please make these tiles as the American media is working with the Soviet Union and its thousands of fronts in the U.S.A. to murder this."[33]

One of the consequences of Rome's politicization was the return of moral judgment in instances of its invocation. The Rome analogy does not have among its implications either a manifest right to empire, or an inherent claim to morality. It is an analogy which implies either rational consensus of the client nations, as was the case with Fall of the Roman Empire, or subversion and military conquest. Marshall Windmiller, in his book The Peace Corps and Pax Americana (1967) took the latter position. He argued that the Peace

Corps, which seemed to be a rational benevolent act carried out in concert with other nations, was in fact a propaganda agency whose purpose was "to assist in the expansion of American cultural values to develop pro-American, English-speaking elites, and to make America's role in world affairs, whatever it may be, more palatable."[34] The Peace Corps, in other words, was an agency of world empire. Peace Corps volunteers served unconsciously as centers of Charismatic power (in Weber's sense), Windmiller argued, which served to suppress rebellion against hegemony of the rich nations.[35] This empire-building was not being carried out, however, for the United States. The officials who directed the activities of the Peace Corps from the Johnson administration forward were conscious agents of "a world in which national sovereignties wither away and political and economic power is monopolized by international corporations."[36] The corporations had taken control of the Republic from the people, and the naïve Volunteers were "points of the lance", not even of Democratic Empire, but rather of the Imperial Corporate Oligarchy to come.

Windmiller argued from a position within the "empire." Some protesters against the Vietnam war used the familiar context of Christians in Rome to position themselves as members of a moral new society threatened by pagan imperialism, whose mission was not simply to retain their own identity, but to redeem and transform the empire. In this sense, as was noted at the time, they were not a little reminiscent of the Transcendentalists, who also sought to recover a spiritual identity through moral political action against slavery. Karl Meyer, who burnt his draft card and was prosecuted, described his reasons for doing so thusly: "If the penalty for damaging a paper card is so harsh, then the possession of the card becomes an act of universal fealty--incense on the altar of Caesar."[37] Protestor Marjorie Swann of the New England Committee for Nonviolent Action noted that churches were becoming involved in the antiwar struggle, and commented: "[W]hat was the most exciting for some of us was the sense that the church was finally coming into its own--doing what a church and its representatives should be doing in a society wracked by violence and injustice."[38] Tom Cornell

elaborated more fully on the Christians in Rome analogy in his statement before sentencing for burning his draft card, in 1966:

> It is characteristic of states to gather power unto themselves. With the accumulation of power they quickly forget the source and the purpose of power. They tend to take on divine prerogatives.... Throughout the Old Testament there is the recurring theme of idolatry. The early Christians were well aware of it too. I submit, Your Honor, that the state today, the Government of the United States of America, is just as much a pagan God as Caesar was in imperial Rome, and that our society is just as guilty of idolatry as the worshipers at Caesar's pagan altars....[39]

Religion was not confined to rhetoric. Rev. William Sloane Coffin was the most notable of many anti-war religious leaders in what was the last major flowering of activist Modernist theology to date.[40]

Hair invokes the Christians in Rome analogy as one of its themes, at a time when the Anti-War Left had begun to coalesce. Its ending, in which Claude allows his hair to be cut and descends from the dream of Planet Exanaplanetooch to be shipped off to Vietnam, foreshadows the pattern of 60's youth rebellion narratives. With the ambiguous exception of The Graduate (1968), in which at least the daughter is rescued, all of the major 60's youth rebellion stories

were ironic romances. The protagonists of these films are unable to overcome the monster and release the fisher-king from enchantment. The two Jesus films of this period, Godspell (1973) and Jesus Christ Superstar (1973), were also narratives of the new society which fails. Each arguably is also a story which ends halfway, at the nadir of descent where the hero is isolated from society, before coming together again to overcome the monster and break the enchantment which blights the land.

Conservative Christian groups also took up the theme of Christians in Pagan Rome as a means of attacking Modernists, 60's radicalism, and liberalism. In Ambassador College's pamphlet, The Modern Romans, part of which I quote at the beginning of this chapter, their argument returns to the theme of Sign of the Pagan (1954), that a Christian Rome will collapse when it forgets its Christianity. All of the political and social upsets of the 60's could be traced directly to a failure of true Christian belief: "We need a national *change* of spirit NOW--before it's too late! Before history repeats its agonizing sequence of events on our nations, the Modern Romans." (italics in original)[41] Christians in Rome has not received

any direct film treatments since 1973, which I would take to be more a mark of the generally center-Left political inclination of Hollywood currently than it is of a lack of interest in the theme.

In the early 70's, the Fundamentalist churches began growing, in part because their Anti-Modernist message of inevitable social collapse seemed to fit the times. Television programs of a predominantly conservative cast began to be aired again in 1974, after a twelve-year gap: The Story of Jacob and Joseph (1974); Moses the Law-Giver (1976); David (1976). Each of these stories were about the hard times the tribes or the kingdom of Israel suffers in the absence of the truly religious leader. Hal Lindsey's Premillennialist linkage of Cold War history to Biblical prophesy of the "latter days," The Late Great Planet Earth (1970), which predicted that all of the Western nations would become united in a great empire under the Antichrist in a war with "Gog"--the U.S.S.R.--became a bestseller. Congressman John B. Anderson[42] exulted in 1974 to the National Association of Evangelicals in Boston:

> It was [the Modernists and liberals] who denied the supernatural acts of God, conforming the Gospel to the canons of modern science.... It was *they* who found financial support for architectural monuments to their

> cause. It was *they* who were the friends of those in positions of political power. *They* were the "beautiful people," and *we*--you will recall--were the "kooks." We were regarded as rural, reactionary, illiterate fundamentalists who just didn't know any better.
>
> Well, things have changed. Now *they* are the "kooks"--and we are the "beautiful people." *Our* prayer breakfasts are so popular that only those with engraved invitations are allowed to attend. *Our* evangelists have the ready ear of those in positions of highest authority. *Our* churches are growing, and theirs are withering.... *They* are tired, worn-out nineteenth century liberals trying to repair the pieces of an optimism shattered by world wars, race riots, population explosion, and the spectre of worldwide famine. *We* always knew that things would get worse before the Lord came again. (italics in original)[43]

In this reading of world history, the United States, though better than most nations, was doomed to collapse as part of the One World government empire that the New Testament Book of Revelations predicted before the end of the world.

A true Premillennial sees the object of his or her activity as conversion. Politics are pointless. Less pessimistic conservatives, such as Pat Robinson, use Rome as both the negative model of collapse following immorality, as well as the model for a conservative Postmillennial Christian Empire.[44] This version of empire is similar to the Modernist's image of an ecumenical world

government of peace, but in the Conservative peaceable kingdom, there is only one kind of religion--Fundamental Christianity:

> The prophets tell us that there will be a time when the missing ingredient to complete God's world order will take place--the hearts of mankind will be changed to want to live a life of love with their fellow man.... When men's hearts have been changed, when from their hearts they want only good for their fellow men, and naturally, as if by instinct, they obey God's laws, then there will be world peace, a universal brotherhood of man, the sharing of wealth, and a paradise on earth.
>
> Until that happens..., any attempt to create a government structure with no Godly values and based on corrupt and venal men will either lead to the foolishness and impotence of the current United Nations or, much worse, to a worldwide dictatorship more horrible than anything the world has yet known.[45]

The activities of the Christian Coalition were devised to be the means through which "God's world order" would be brought about.[46] The alternative, as radical-conservative jurist Robert Bork's most recent book Slouching toward Gomorrah (1996) suggests, is a decline into decadence and divine punishment.

In the years after Fall of the Roman Empire, Rome became increasingly a rhetorical device of the Right. Fittingly, T.H. White wrote one of the last relatively centrist narratives, a play called Caesar at the Rubicon (1968) It portrayed a frustrated Caesar,

unable to reach a compromise with the Senate over necessary reforms, driven to overthrow the Republic in order to save it. This rather resembled Molnar's fantasy of what another Democratic president would do, but it did not succeed in being produced. Charlton Heston produced and starred in a version of Julius Caesar (1970), but it received middling reviews and spawned no imitations. On television, only one Roman miniseries was made in the United States: A. D. Anno Domini (1985), a Christians in Pagan Rome narrative. The introduction of Christians was the variant it reduced to the 70's BBC's miniseries I, Claudius, with its narrative of corruption in high places. Where I, Claudius concluded pessimistically, A.D. ends in the progression of its protagonist, Julius, from Caesar's aide to a revolutionary Christian, preparing for a Christian Rome. Another character, Caleb, observes "the villa Jovis--Tiberius's old mansion--obliterated by the brilliance and sheen of the light."[47] Pat Robinson published America's Dates With Destiny (1986), in which he showed "a view of history that has been virtually hidden from generations."[48] Part of this view, after noting the "loss of majority rights" which accompanied the founding of the

American Civil Liberties Union, was the following chapter: "Franklin Roosevelt Begins His `Imperial Presidency'". The book concludes with a section on "Finding Our Way Again", which begins in 1980 with Ronald Reagan's campaign for the presidency.

More angry Fundamentalist voices, dissatisfied with the compromises of Reagan's government, came up with a darker version of Christians in Rome. Lindsey Williams, an early author of the Patriot movement, quoted a lengthy Roman parable in his book To Seduce a Nation (1984). It illustrates the ongoing use of metaphor in the re-creation of new interpretations of the United States today:

> Once There Was A Great Nation--
> THAT HAD A GOVERNMENT...
>
> It was founded by the pilgrims who decided to leave their own country, which didn't encourage freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the individual. So they migrated to an uncivilized land inhabited only by savages. The rock where they landed was to become a national shrine--and one of the most famous monuments in the world.[49]

Williams goes on to tell the whole story of this Great Nation's rise and fall, making references to what seem to be figures from American history, as interpreted through a very conservative point of view. At the end of it, Lindsey concludes with: "That Nation's

name? Ancient Rome." He adds the names of the specific Romans to whom the parable refers, leaving his readers to make the connections of Julius Caesar to Abraham Lincoln, Caligula to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Marc Anthony to Douglas MacArthur, and perhaps most remarkably of all, Cicero to Senator Joseph McCarthy. "I ask," Williams writes later, "will we as citizens obey the bureaucratic un-elected government of today, or will we be obedient to the Constitution that our wise forefathers gave us, which made America great?"[50] Former Supreme Court nominee Robert Bork's Slouching toward Gomorrah (1996) makes a similar reference to Rome's decline as part of his Old Testament jeremiad. The forms change, but the metaphors continue to shape identity conflicts.

Since the 60's, with rare exceptions such as Frank Church's quote above, the Left's use of Rome seems almost to have disappeared. Whether this is because Rome is too "hot" a rhetorical device to escape censorship, or for some other cause, remains to be determined. Rome emerges sporadically however as an oblique referent through which a film reveals its themes. The Godfather Part II (1974) is an example of this. Francis Ford Coppola intended

it to be an epic. "The film was always a loose metaphor," he said; "Michael [Corleone] as America."[51] Near the end of the film, Mafia lawyer Tom Hagan brings a message from Michael Corleone to Frankie Pantageli, who has offered to testify against the Corleone family and is being held in protective custody by the F.B.I. If he testifies, Hagan warns him, Pantageli's family will die. "We wuz like the Roman Empire," Pantageli muses. Hagan tells him that in those days, the emperor would allow a man to preserve the life and honor of his family if he died properly. After this conversation, Pantageli kills himself in his tub by slitting his wrists at his emperor's orders. The film has shown that Michael controls elected officials of the government as well, so that it portrays--in consonance with Windmiller and other critics of the Left, and indeed with Dalton Trumbo's Spartacus--a republic being transformed into an empire.[52]

The dominant liberal use of Rome however does not seem to be Roman at all: Star Trek. The Federation in Star Trek is, in effect, an empire. Its opponents in the first series, the Romulans and the Klingons, each are overtly an empire. The Federation has the forms

of nation-states, but they are united in a collective military and cultural union--the "democratic empire" of which Franklin Giddings and others wrote at the beginning of the century, and which Arnold Toynbee argued must come about for the preservation of the West.

Gene Roddenberry, the creator of Star Trek, proposed the series in the early 60's as one of number of television show ideas, including one to have been entitled The Centurion, about a Roman Army Commander acting as an agent for Caesar. In addition to the general cultural interest of Rome and empire, Roddenberry's ideas about Star Trek had been inspired by the liberal Science Fiction film The Day the Earth Stood Still (1951), which argued that nation-states must stop warring with each other, or be destroyed to preserve the galactic peace. Olaf Stapledon's League of Nations-inspired Last Men and First Men (1930), in which the United States and China organized between them the "First World State", and Star Maker (1937), with its "Galactic Society of Worlds",[53] were also major inspirations--Roddenberry was still rereading Stapledon in the 80's. Commenting on a reporter's story about the continuing interest in Star Trek in 1976, Roddenberry had the following to say:

> Sometime we must get together and discuss whether or not Star Trek was "optimistic, recklessly liberal." You make a valid point there but not when you categorize it as worried about America's role in the world. Our show postulated that mankind did indeed make it into an era of world peace by the 24th century although we made many references during the series about harsh realities which occurred between our century and then.... The optimistic point we did make is that during all this mankind finally learned the foolishness of petty nationalism and political and racial hatreds and finally discarded them. There was no USA in our series, nor was the Earth planet in any way the "head planet" of the Federation.[54]

In Star Trek, Roddenberry took the general themes of democratic empire which Rome had served to channel, and created a new tertiary artifact, a conceptual Leviathan through which its audience could contemplate world unity.

What was unusual about Roddenberry is that he shared with Cecil B. DeMille and Anthony Mann an awareness that narratives could have an effect on their audience's understanding of the world, as shown in his response to an interviewer's question about the effect of Star Trek on its audience:

> I think that drama is a powerful force we still do not use very well, especially in television. I understand, of course, that we're going to have programs that are frothy and fun. I liked The Beverly Hillbillies. I think the ancient American legends of country boys who outsmart the city slickers are great fun.... I don't ask that every

> program on the air be an exercise in reality, but I would like to see other shows do more, to talk about what we are, where we should be going, and what we lack. It troubles me that there are no programs on television, at least none that I've seen, that point out that the world is operating in a very primitive way on the basis of hate. Our own president hates the Commies, and he and his henchmen believe that everything they do to defeat the Commies, whether it's legal or not, is justified because of that hate.... If we are ever to turn the corner away from that, we need our artists and entertainers pointing it out.[55]

Roddenberry himself, as the list of influences on Star Trek suggests, in part learned to see the world through the narratives he read before he became a creator of narratives.[56]

Star Trek continues today to serve as the unifying Leviathan for its audience of "Trekkies"--though they prefer to be called "Trekkers", the suffix change indicating their own understanding of the serious theme behind their seemingly frivolous attachment to an old television series. The following is from a newspaper article about the release of Star Trek: First Contact (1996):

> To [Unicorn Escobedo, "Captain" of a fan club], being a Trekkie means more than just wearing tacky costumes and reciting the Prime Directive. Escobedo and his crew spend their spare time collecting food, clothing and toys for the homeless. Social work is his way of living up to the humanist philosophies of "Star Trek."

> "I love the idealism of `Star Trek,'" says Escobedo. "So I figure, why wait for four centuries to have something good happen? Why not work to make the world a better place right now?"[57]

Idealistic individuals come together into a body because of the narrative. Once in this body, they speak more powerfully and act concertedly in support of their common dreams--dreams in part given form through the narrative. Reinforced by the collective activity brought about through the narrative, the potential for existence of these common dreams in social reality become possible.[58]

In this chapter I have outlined some of the continuing uses of Rome and Bible analogies and metaphors. But as the breadth of this study indicates, these Leviathan-artifacts have both a complex beginning, and uncertain ends. Historian William O. Aydelotte, in his "Notes on Historical Generalization," commented of Arnold Toynbee's philosophy of civilizations and their trials that almost all historians condemned him, and almost all non-historians praised him:

> This scarcely seems a case where the public is right and the experts are wrong. It is more probable that the uncritical acceptance of cosmologies by the lay public

> represents the desire, apparently implanted in most men [sic], for an easy formula, a unified pattern in the confusion of life's experiences. Popular enthusiasm for these systems may not even reflect a historical judgment; it seems at times to have more of a religious or eschatological character. As Perez Zagorin says, "Many people read Arnold J. Toynbee...as the Roman augurs read the flight of birds."[59]

Indeed, the easy pattern is irresistible: Even Zagorin in the comment above magnifies his distaste for popular enthusiasm of Toynbee by comparing Toynbee's audience to a Roman mob, and Toynbee himself to an augur--a Roman reference that Zagorin could use so freely in part because of its popularization by the object of Zagorin's attack. As Vygotsky notes, the greater part of most people's thought takes place in Complexes, and as Cognitive linguistics has proven, even the most rational thought takes its form in words which have their foundation in metaphors derived from the body and social interaction.

This is not an argument of dispair, but of hope for rationality. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine, but religion and Rome have been the most important narratives of identity for the West, through which change has occurred. As I have shown, from the beginning of the country to the present, change typically began as

Protestant religious movement, using the ongoing Leviathan of religious activity to help the new identity come into being.[60] If we understand that narratives are not just stories, but one of the means by which humans societies are created and transformed, then we may learn to control our narratives rather than them controlling us. As the most important mediums of cultural identity formation this century, the close analysis of films in society is a vital part of that task.

As Max Weber noted, the effect of such fossilized artifacts and rituals of the past is to constrain the channels through which the institutions they preserve develop in the future. But cultural research of the past two decades has shown that Weber's deterministic model of identity mediums is limited; literature and the arts create a narrative frame within which individuals and societies can interact collectively with the past, and through the imaginary artifacts they construct, transform their identities in the present and in the future.

What Cultural Studies has not shown effectively is why narrative frames work, where they originate, and exactly how

narratives assist in the construction or supplementation of oppositional organized activity in the public sphere, as well as supplement dominant social activity. I have attempted to answer these questions, but clearly they await further research. Above all, I would point out that the degree to which the historical evidences I am able to provide are themselves artifacts, remnants of the activity by which they were generated. The ways in which audiences understood these films at the time of their release individually and collectively may be inferred by what they wrote afterward, but what is missing in this study is the actual moment of identity formation and transformation. That moment cannot be recovered from the past, but it may be analyzed in the future. It is difficult to be a participant in the meta-narrative framing of academic discourse without transforming her or his quality of experience of collective experiences like film and television; in some ways, the academic knows both too much and too little to be able to understand. Yet that is what needs to be done in order to see, not the results, but the process of narrative in society. Moreover, this is not a task for one person, but many.

While I am sure of the short-term continuation of Bible and Rome framings, I doubt these terms will continue to have the same relevance in the future--particularly the exclusionary City on a Hill variant. As Toynbee observed in the 40's--and as has only become more obvious over time--we live in a time of transition from national to trans-national economic, social and political relations. Already the United States' film industry is so entwined in transnational commerce, that any such national expressions of identity in cinematic form are more likely to be found on television than film.

Rome--in the form of Star Trek's democratic empire, at least--seems likely to continue as a viable analogy for the trans-national world; at the least, it has the support of current global economic relations. In the final analysis, however, the trans-national world is only beginning to formulate a collective identity. What form it takes remains to be seen. But all national genres of identity such as those in this study will either be transformed into global variants, or wither as transnational activity diminishes their relevance.

While the forms the new narrative frames will take are unknown, I hope to have shown the importance of analyzing them closely to understand social activity. Through the manifestation of feelings and concerns into the tangible abstractions of narrative characters and contexts, the process of rational thought and action is helped into being, and reinforced by the presence of its articulation in narrative. It is given conscious form in characters; it breathes and reacts to the world that we lend it, the world of our needs, our fears, our desires. And out of these artificial worlds we construct the conceptual Leviathan identities through which we create the world around us.

ENDNOTES

1. Ambassador College Editorial Department, The Modern Romans: The Decline of Western Civilization (Pasadena, California: Ambassador College Press, 1971), pp. 16-18.

2. quoted in Bill Moyers, The Secret Government (Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press, 1988, p. 55.

3. Gerome Ragni and James Rado, Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical (New York: Pocket Books, 1969 [1966]), pp. 65-66.

4. The market for Peplum films from Italy--primarily Roman and Greek "epics", but also some Biblical films-- collapsed in 1962. I do not consider the entirely Italian-produced films in this study, as their relation to the United States is tenuous. Their popularity may be taken however as a signifier of interest in the genre. See Richard Comb's comments on peplum and Sodom & Gomorrah in his book Robert Aldrich (London: BFI, 1978)

5. This is somewhat of a simplification, as my earlier section on the 50's shows.

6. Ronald Steel, Pax Americana, rev. ed. (New York: The Viking Press, 1970), p. 43.

7. John Baxter outlines much of this in Science Fiction In the Cinema (New York: Paperback Library, 1970). These Are The Damned is a British film, of course. Joseph Losey was a blacklisted expatriate from the United States, however, and I could select a number of less distinguished American films. These Are The Damned is particularly poignant in the ambiguity of its title; are the radioactive children whom the government imprisons and studies "damned," or are the average people who will be doomed to die (as the protagonist couple does at the end of the film) of radiation sickness in the event of nuclear war? This is one of those films which college students today do not seem to understand, but for anyone living in the period, the anxiety over a seemingly inevitable nuclear war at some point in the future was profound.

8. Panic in Year Zero was made in the same year as Sodom and Gomorrah. It was based on two short stories by Ward Moore, Lot and Lot's Daughter; it

seems part of the attraction of that story was its aptness for representing atomic bomb fears. See Baxter, p. 160. The moral weakness theme common to all the Bible films, but particularly this one, reflected a major concern in the 50's, as David Halberstam notes:

> Many Americans worried that the very material success of America in the postwar years--all those cars, kitchen amenities, and other luxuries--had made us soft and vulnerable to the Soviet Union, where people were tougher and more willing to sacrifice for their nation. Was there strength and truth in poverty? Styles Bridges, a conservative Republican senator, seemed to talk in this vein when he said that Americans had to be less concerned with "the height of the tail fin in the new car and be much more prepared to shed blood, sweat and tears, if this country and the free world are to survive."

David Halberstam, The Fifties (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1994), p. 702.

9. Dwight Macdonald, quoted in Gerald Forshey, American Religious and Biblical Spectaculars (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1992), p. 90.

10. Gerald Forshey, American Religious and Biblical Spectaculars, pp. 88-91; 103-104.

11. Metro-Goldwin-Mayer, King of Kings program book, quoted in Gerald Forshey, American Religious and Biblical Spectaculars, p. 88.

12. Forshey, p. 89.

13. See Walt Rostow, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Foreign Aid (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985), pp. 14-21; 33-49. I would note in passing as well the degree to which Kennedy's rhetoric about the Peace Corps equated it with war. As Leroy G. Dorsey has noted in "The Myth of War and Peace in Presidential Discourse (Paper presented Speech Communication Association, 1996), Volunteers were to "fight for world order"; they were to suffer, to sacrifice, and even die for their country, and for the "high cause of peace."

14. I will add as well the thought that these films might also have as part of their context the image the White middle-class had of the Civil Rights movement. Black militancy during the time these films were made was relatively minor, but present as a possibility. Hallmark Hall of Fame's repeated showings of Green Pastures in 1957 and 1959, with their African-American casts portraying Israel under oppression, from several Old Testament books, indicates that Martin

Luther King's religious rhetoric drawing just such parallels was indeed resonating with a significant television audience.

15. Forshey, pp. 101-102.

16. Hallmark Hall of Fame broadcast "Give Us Barabbas!" in 1961, presumably on the basis of the pre-publicity the feature film received.

17. The Eisenhower administration suffered a scandal as a result of a secret directive issued in 1958 by the National Security Council "to make use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of Communism." Cited by Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right (Anchor Books: 1964), p. 5. Whatever the reason was for issuing the order, in practice it became a license for radical Right sympathizers in the military to give Fundamentalist Christian leaders and members of the John Birch Society an official forum for promulgating their views. These leaders attacked Modernist church leaders as "collectivists", and warned military personnel against falling victim to the "moral decay, political apathy and spiritual bankruptcy" that had already corrupted the country. Eisenhower's administration disavowed this activity when it was reported, but it helped to bring to public awareness the extreme paranoia of such groups.

18. Edwin Walker, quoted from Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed," Daniel Bell (ed.), The Radical Right (New York: Anchor Books, 1964), p. 10.

19. This information is derived from Richard H. Campbell and Michael R. Pitts, The Bible on Film (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981), and Cobbett Steinberg, TV Facts (New York: Facts on File, Inc, 1980). Amahl and the Night Visitors might well have been repeated, however, and network Sunday afternoon religious programming continued. This network religious programming continued to be Modernist, however. ABC's Directions, for example, concentrated on modern archaeological and theological research to illuminate events, narratives, and people from the Bible, predominantly the New Testament. "I, John" (10/8/67), for example, was on the Book of Revelations. The program showed the Island of Patmos, to which the Apostle John had been exiled by Rome. The program explicates Revelations as a book about John's belief in the imminent fall of Rome, which he believed would coincide with Jesus's return. As Revelations plays such a prominent role in the eschatology theories of Premillennialists and conservative Postmillennialists, I suspect most conservatives would regard programs like Directions as something worse than honest paganism.

20. Arnold J. Toynbee, America and the World Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 16ff.

21. Stringfellow Barr, The Mask of Jove (New York: Lippinicot, 1966), dust-jacket.

22. This is hardly to say that the Left abandoned it, as I will discuss further. The explicit references to Rome by the Left are rare today, however, and significantly confined to figures who had come of age in the early Cold War years. Gore Vidal is a particular instance. In much of his political writing about the United States, Rome has been Vidal's reference for the battle of republic against empire. A recent series of such critiques was gathered and published under the title The Decline and Fall of the American Empire (Berkeley, Calif.: Odonian Press, 1992).

23. John Dickenson, Death of a Republic, ed. George Lee Haskins (New York: Macmillan, 1963)

24. Raymond Moley, "Caesar the Destroyer," Newsweek (Sept. 2, 1963), p. 84.

25. Sargent Shriver, Point of the Lance (New York: Harper and Rowe, 1964), pp. 59-61.

26. Arnold J. Toynbee, America and the World Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 134. Sargent Shriver also quotes Toynbee in his book:

> Here is a movement whose express purpose is to overcome the disastrous barriers that have hitherto segregated the affluent Western minority of the human race from the majority of their fellow men and women. I believe that, in the Peace Corps, the non-Western majority of mankind is going to meet a sample of Western man at his best.

Arnold Toynbee, quoted in Sargent Shriver, Point of the Lance, p. 65.

27. Given the content of Cymbaline, this was somewhat an ironic citation for Liberal commentators to choose. Of course, their Shakespearean alternatives, Julius Caesar or Coriolanus, were hardly better.

28. Murray Kempton and James Ridgeway, "Romans," The New Republic, 149 (Dec. 7, 1963), pp. 9-11, reprinted in Edward Quinn and Paul J. Dolan, The Sense of the 60's (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 64.

29. Kempton and Ridgeway, "Romans", p. 67.

30. William S. Schlamm, "Whose Decline?", National Review Vol XVIII, No. 18 (May 3, 1966), p. 427.

31. Thomas Molnar, "Imperial America," pp. 410-411. Molnar presumably makes reference to James MacGregor Burns' book, The Deadlock of Democracy (1963), in which Burns argued for a "Jeffersonian" model of government in which the majority political party that controls congress and the presidency follows the leadership of its president. Molnar exaggerates Burns' argument somewhat. It is of interest to me to note that President Clinton seems to have had the "Jeffersonian" model as the template for his presidency in the first two years, but (in Burns' reckoning) failed both to communicate his programs effectively to the nation, and to be accepted as the party leader by Senators Boren and Kerry. By Burns' reckoning, Clinton has now returned to the "Madisonian" model.

32. Molnar, "Imperial America," p. 411.

33. The New York Times some years ago published an article which mentioned the "Toynbee ideas" stencils, which alerted me to look for them in New York. The Times author apparently did not notice the 47th and 5th stencil, however. As it is hard to imagine these sort of things being stencilled during the daytime, presumably the author lived near the Tudor City area of the East Side Midtown--ominously close, given his views, to the United Nations building and the threat of collectivization it represented.

34. Marshall Windmiller, The Peace Corps and Pax Americana (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1970), p. 37.

35. Windmiller, pp. 89-93.

36. Windmiller, p. 151.

37. Tom Cornell, "Not the Smallest Grain of Incense," Alice Lynd (ed.), We Won't Go (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 39.

38. Marjorie Swann, "The Resistance," Alice Lynd (ed.), We Won't Go, p. 242.

39. Tom Cornell, "Not the Smallest Grain of Incense, Alice Lynd, We Won't Go, p. 41.

40. I would note in passing a smaller amount of Modernist activity in the 80's in opposition to the Salvadorian civil war, particularly in hiding refugees. The activities of conservatives however dwarf the relatively limited Modernist political interactions of this period.

41. Ambassador College, The Modern Romans, p. 93.

42. At the time Anderson was regarded as a strict conservative. In 1980 he ran for President as a compromise Independant, more conservative than Carter and more liberal than Reagan.

43. Quoted in James C. Hefley and Edward E. Plowman, Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1975), p. 195.

44. See Pat Robinson, "The New Millennium," Collected Works (New York: Inspirational Press, 1994 [1990]), pp. 16-19. In Robinson's interpretation, Pagan Rome collapsed because of immorality--apparently pervasive in spite of the later Empire's support of Christianity--and from 500 to 1500 a "Christian Empire" of Byzantium and Rome created a state where there was "one religion, one worship, and Jesus Christ was Lord of all: spiritual and temporal" (p. 18). Only after the Roman church became corrupted by power, and before Protestantism could assume its rightful place as successor to the Christian Empire, were "nonreligious, secular movements" able to "make their way into European thought through the writings of men like Rene Descartes and Baruch Spinoza. The most pernicious came to be known as `rationalism'" (p. 19). The United States, as the center of the Protestant Empire, either will pursue the historic task of Christianizing the world to bring about the fulfillment of the Empire, or collapse like Rome.

45. Pat Robinson, "The New World Order," Collected Works (New York: Inspirational Press, 1994 [1979]), p. 490.

46. See for example Pat Robinson on "The Christian Agenda," in "The New World Order," Collected Works, pp. 501-504.

47. A.D. Anno Domini (New York: Berkeley Books, 1985), pp. 376-377.

48. Pat Robinson, America's Dates With Destiny (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986), inside dust-sleeve.

49. Lindsey Williams, To Seduce A Nation (Kasilof, Alaska: Worth Publishing Co., 1984), pp. 79-82. Here is the complete parable:

> Once There Was A Great Nation--
> THAT HAD A GOVERNMENT...
>
> It was founded by the pilgrims who decided to leave their own country, which didn't encourage freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the individual. So they migrated to an uncivilized land inhabited only by savages. The rock where they landed was to become a national shrine--and one of the most famous monuments in the world.
>
> They drove off the natives, built rude shelters and houses of worship, meanwhile setting aside a special day to give thanks.
>
> These pilgrims--all stern, austere men--believed in their God, but they also believed in work. They established schools under religious leaders that, in a way, became the first public, free education in the world.
>
> Through hard, determined labor they forged a colony while the rest of the world chuckled.
>
> But the pilgrims persevered. Intolerant of wrongdoing, they used gallows to punish criminals. In their day-to-day activities they had no patience for the weak and degenerate who, if pampered, became the cancer of a nation.
>
> Shortly, these pilgrims engaged in trade and commerce as their community grew. In the process, they became moderately prosperous.
>
> Other colonists came and established other communities. And some of the noblest words ever written began to surface. Facades of our modern government buildings bear some of the legends written back then: "liberty," "justice," "freedom of worship."
>
> Then one of the older nations sent tax agents to exploit the colonists. Alarmed, the colonists sent their greatest men as representatives to a general assembly, choosing a gentleman farmer as their leader. He united them and shook off the shackles of oppression as they won their fight against the "old world" and became a strong nation. That farmer is known as the "father of his country." Today, a famous U.S. city is named after him.

The new nation formed two houses of government. The more powerful was the Senate, whose members could be elected only if they were men of probity [integrity] {sic}, honor, patriotism, and religion. The nation became a republic, though it is a republic no longer.

Ultimately, a civil war divided the fledgling country. Its leader, who tried to keep the republic united, was assassinated in the shadow of government buildings.

Eventually, many of the nation's senators became ambitious for power. They began to make deals with leaders of important factions.

And the republic now became entangled in alliances with foreign nations. The alliances brought wars; the wars brought taxes. But the citizens didn't seem to mind. War, after all, also increased trade and industry. And, besides, the taxes affected only the rich.

The farmers rebelled, sending petitions for subsidies, price supports. Government, wanting support for its own schemes, bought up the surplus crops and stored them in warehouses, where they rotted. Not to be outdone, industrialists were next to ask for tax benefits.

Finally, the government became all-powerful. It guaranteed to protect the people from all forces of nature. And taxation grew and grew. Bureaucracy thrived as free housing, free food, free entertainment came next. The middle class declined under the added tax burdens. And crime became so commonplace that it was dangerous to walk the streets at night.

A crippled man led the nation into more wars and foreign entanglements. Patriots became known as radicals.

A general, who had been victimized by the government, pleaded with the nation to remember her past, to return to honor, to decent government, to the principles of the founding fathers. The people scoffed, and he died bitterly thinking his anguished thoughts.

An honest senator dared to speak out for a halt to foreign subversion and to constant foreign aid and draining away from the people's money. The public at large rebelled, branding him a reactionary.

The nation fell deeper into debt. It joined a league of the world with enemies that exploited her. She increased taxes to send her wheat to these enemies. And she devalued her currency, substituting base materials for precious metals in her coins.

She became allied with powerful barbarians in still another stupid war. She sent "experts" to school the barbarians in the latest scientific discoveries.

The nation was now totally corrupt. Its middle class was finally dead. The barbarians moved in...and took it over. And they destroyed the civilization.

That nation's name? Ancient Rome.

50. Lindsey Williams, p. 172.

51. quoted in John Hess, "Godfather II: A Deal Coppola couldn't Refuse," in Bill Nichols (ed.), Movies and Methods (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), p. 82.

52. This of course was one of the themes of Spartacus--the transformation of Republic to imperial oligarchy or dictatorship by the wealthy. John Hess, one of the editors of Jump Cut, notes this general theme in the two Godfather films without commenting on the use of the Roman metaphor, or the linkage of the film to a genre of analogical analysis. To him, the film lacked "the conceptual equipment--a marxist analysis of society--to carry [an analysis of U.S. society] out clearly" (Hess, "Godfather II," Movies and Methods p. 83.). Hess was looking for a rational analysis, and missed the Vygotskian Complex Thought narrative activity. Seen in this light, and as part of a genre, the implications of the Rome frame are more subtle than Hess perceived. Movies like Hard to Kill (1990) have used the same theme, though contradictory intentions of creative personnel in these films usually obscures the point. The most comprehensive use of the republic to empire theme to date are the Star Wars films, which blend both Christians in Rome with Republic to Empire. Elaboration of this theme may be found in Douglas Williams, In Search of the Grail: The Films of George Lucas (Masters Thesis, San Francisco State University, 1991).

53. See Allen Asherman, The Star Trek Interview Book (New York: Pocket Books, 1988), p. 8.; Olaf Stapledon, Last Men and First Men & Star Maker (New York: Dover Publications, 1968 [1931 and 1937]), pp. 51-59; see also pp. 342-386 of Star Maker, in which many recognizable precursors of Star Trek, including the "Galactic Society of Worlds." Several other books, many of them also reflecting empire themes, democratic or otherwise, also influenced Roddenberry. They include Isaac Asimov's Foundation trilogy; Robert A. Heinlein's "Future History" series of stories; Arthur C. Clarke's Profiles of the Future (1962); and of course the C.S. Forester Horatio Hornblower novels. See David Alexander, Star Trek Creator (New York: Roc, 1994), pp. 119; 188.

54. Gene Roddenberry, quoted in David Alexander, Star Trek Creator, p. 421.

55. Gene Roddenberry, in Allen Asherman, The Star Trek Interview Book, p. 6.

56. Roddenberry's formal education was limited, though he read widely, had remarkable experiences as a pilot and police officer, and corresponded with Erle Stanley Gardner about writing, in addition to some college literature and writing courses. See David Alexander, Star Trek Creator, pp.34-41; 80-81; 110-116; 119-124.

57. Karen D'Sousa, "Keep on Trekkin'", The Oakland Tribune (Wednesday, Nov. 20, 1996), p. Cue-6.

58. Northrop Frye, "The Times of the Signs," Spiritus Mundi, p. 89, had the following comment on the role of literature in the world:

> It is obvious that the basis of the world we want to live in is mythological. That is, the world we construct is built to the model of a common social vision produced by the imagination. Poetry, which is at the heart of all mythology, finds its function in providing verbal imaginative models for human civilization, and seeing reality in terms of human desires and emotions. In the science that studies nature there is, of course, an essential place for the imaginative and creative powers, but still the ultimate end of science is verification, coincidence with an external reality. Similarly, in the mythology that expresses human vision, there is an essential place for reality: We do not believe the poet as such, but we applaud him for producing something credible. Yet the end of mythology is the conceivable, not the real, or as Aristotle said, the impossible made probable.
>
> We have to separate these two worlds in our minds, rigorously and completely, before we can address ourselves to the next question, of how to unite them again. of course everything we do is in one aspect an attempt to unite them, but unless we distinguish them first we shall not know what we are trying to unite. On one side is the wold of vision, the world presented to us by poetry and myth, which has being but not existence; it is real but it is not there. On the other side is the world that is there, presented to us in the constructs of science. This world has existence, but it is, so far as we can see, a sub-human, sub-moral, sub-intelligent world, with nothing in it that directly responds to human desires or ideals. In between is the world that we create, or try to realize, out of the merely internal reality of the one and the merely external

> reality of the other. We want a human community that will conform to our hopes and ideals and our sense of what might be; we need a knowledge of our environment that will give it foundations and keep it from being a castle in the air.
>
> It seems clear that the uniting area must be something like an area of belief.

59. William O. Aydelotte, "Notes on Historical Generalization," in Louis Gottschalk, Generalizations in the Writing of History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 156.

60. Some examples of these are: 1) Rome: The United States "Senate;" the Roman dome and columns of the Capitol building; the fasces that is carried in at the beginning of each session of congress, and echoed on wall decorations in the building; the American eagle emblem; the Vice President (conceived of as the out-of-power Proconsul of the Polybian constitution). 2) The Bible: One can point to the "In God We Trust" coins, the "so help me God" every president has added to the constitutional oath of office, and other material signs. The more profound marks of the Bible on the United States' identity are harder to find in material form, but perhaps more deeply embedded in the social rituals that collectively create the United States' identity.

REFERENCES

Adams, Brooks. The Law of Civilization and Decay (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895).

Adams, Brooks. The New Empire (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902).

Adams, Henry. The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1920).

Adams, John. Defence of the Constitutions of the United States Vol. 1-3 (New York: Da Capo Press, 1971 [1787-1789]).

Adorno, T. W. "How To Look at Television", Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television Vol. 8, No. 3 (Spring 1954), pp. 213-235.

Alexander, David. Star Trek Creator (New York: Roc, 1994).

Alpert, Hollis. "The Abuse of Greatness," The Saturday Review (June 6, 1953), pp. 26-28

Amahl and the Night Visitors. Hallmark Hall of Fame, NBC. Dec. 14, 1958.

Ambassador College Editorial Department (H. Armstrong Roberts). "The Modern Romans: The Decline of Western Civilization" (Pasadena, Calif.: Ambassador College Press, 1971).

Ambrose, Stephen E. Rise To Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Penguin Books, 1983).

Anderson, Maxwell. Barefoot In Athens (New York: William Sloane and Assoc., 1951).

Andrew, Geoff. The Films of Nicholas Ray (London: Letts, 1991).

A.D. Anno Domini. NBC, Mar 17-20, 1985

Asherman, Allen. The Star Trek Interview Book (New York: Pocket Books, 1988).

Atkins, Irene Kahn. Henry Koster (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1987).

"Atlantic Union: 7 into One." Time Vol. 55, No. 13 (March 27, 1950).

Bailey, Kenneth K. Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

Bailey, Thomas A. The American Pageant, 3rd. ed. (Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1967).

Barefoot in Athens. Hallmark Hall of Fame, NBC, Nov. 11, 1966.

Baron, Dona (ed.) The National Purpose Reconsidered (New York:

Columbia University Press, 1978).
Barr, Stringfellow. The Mask of Jove (Philadelphia: Lippinicot, 1966).
Basinger, Jeanine. Anthony Mann (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979).
Baxter, John. Science Fiction In the Cinema (New York: Paperback Library, 1970).
Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex (New York: Knopf, 1957).
Behlmer, Rudy (ed.) Memo From David O. Selznick (New York: Viking Press, 1972).
Bell, Daniel (ed.) The Radical Right 2nd. Ed. (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1964).
Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (San Francisco: Perennial, 1986).
Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Anchor Books, 1967).
Bloom, John Morton. The Republican Roosevelt (New York: Athenium, 1972).
Blumenthal, Sidney. The Rise of the Counter-Establishment (New York: Perennial Library, 1988).
Boorstin, Daniel. "Our Unspoken National Faith," Commentary Vol. 15 No. 4 (April 1953).
Boorstin, Daniel. The Genius of American Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).
Borzage, Frank, dir. The Big Fisherman. Centurion, 1959.
Botsford, George Willis. A History of the Ancient World (New York: Macmillan, 1916).
Bowersock, Glen W. "The Vanishing Paradigm of the Fall of Rome," Bulletin of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences Vol. XLIX, No. 8 (May 1996).
Boysen, Sarah T., and Gary G. Berntson. "Responses to Quantity: Perceptual vs. Cognitive Mechanisms in Chimpanzees (*Pan Troglodytes*)," Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes 1995, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 82-86.
Bruner, Jerome. Actual Minds, Possible Worlds (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).
Bruner, Jerome. Acts of Meaning (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

University Press, 1990).
Bruner, Jerome. "The Narrative Construction of Reality," Critical Inquiry 18 (Autumn 1991), pp. 1-21.
Burge, Stuart, dir. Julius Caesar. Commonweath United, 1969.
Burke, Kenneth. The Philosophy of Literary Form (New York: Vintage, 1957).
Burns, Edward McNall. The American Idea of Mission: Concepts of National Purpose and Destiny (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press, 1957).
Burtness, Paul S., Warren U. Ober, and William R. Seat. Contemporary University Reader (New York: American Book Company, 1963).
Campbell, Richard H., and Michael R. Pitts. The Bible on Film (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981).
Carey, James W. Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
Carrington, Henry B. Beacon Lights of Patriotism (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 [1894]).
Cavell, Stanley. Pursuits of Happiness (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981).
Chukovsky, Kornei. From Two to Five tr. Frances Clark Sayers (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963).
Cicero. De Oratore in two volumes II Book III together with De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria tr. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1955).
Cogley, John. Report on Blacklisting (New York: Fund for the Republic, 1956).
Cohen, Morris Raphael. American Thought (New York: Collier Books, 1962).
Collins, Richard, James Curran, Nicholas Garnham, Paddy Scannell, Philip Schlesinger and Colin Sparks. Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1986).
"Colonialism." Commonweal Vol. 61: pp. 301-302 (Dec. 17, 1954).
Combs, Richard (ed.) Robert Aldrich (London: BFI, 1978).
Commager, Henry Steele. The Empire of Reason (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).
Cook, Blanche Wiesen. The Declassified Eisenhower (New York: Penguin Books, 1984).

Cooper, Duncan. "A Second Look--Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. VI, No. 3 (1974), pp. 30-31.
Cooper, Duncan. "Dalton Trumbo Vs. Stanley Kubrick," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 34-37.
Cooper, Duncan. "Who Killed Spartacus?", Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 18-27.
Cooper, Duncan. "Spartacus: Still Censored After All These Years," manuscript made available to author.
Corvo, Frederick Baron. Hadrian the Seventh (New York: Dover, 1969 [1904]).
Cowell, F. R. "A Republic and Its Natural Diseases" The Saturday Review (January 12, 1957), pp. 9-11+.
Criterion Collection (Voyager Company Laserdisc). Spartacus (1960) 1991 restored print, Robert A. Harris.
Crowther, Bosley. "Screen: `Spartacus' Enters the Arena", The New York Times, Friday, October 7, 1960, L 28.
Davies, Delmar, dir. Demetrius and the Gladiators. Twentieth Century-Fox, 1954.
DeMille, Cecil B., dir. Samson and Delilah. Paramount, 1949
DeMille, Cecil B., dir. The Ten Commandments. Paramount, 1956
DeMille, Cecil B., dir. The Sign of the Cross. Paramount, 1932 (reissued 1944 with 16 minutes cut, and a 9 minute prologue drawing parallel between Nazis and Romans.)
DeMille, Cecil B. The Autobiography of Cecil B. DeMille, Donald Hayne (ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1959).
Dewey, John. Art as Experience (New York: Capricorn Books, 1958 [1934]).
Dewey, John. The Public And Its Problems (Chicago: Gateway Books, 1946 [1927]).
Dewey, John. Reconstruction in Philosophy Rev. Ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957).
Dickenson, John. Death of a Republic, ed. George Lee Haskins (New York: Macmillan, 1963).
Dieterle, William, dir. Salome. Columbia, 1953.
Donald, David. Lincoln Reconsidered (New York: Vintage Books, 1961).
Douglas, Kirk. The Ragman's Son (New York: Pocket Books, 1988).

Durant, Will. Caesar and Christ: A History of Roman Civilization and of Christianity from their beginnings to A.D. 325 (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1944).
Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (New York: The Free Press, 1965 [1915]).
D'Sousa, Karen. "Keep on Trekkin'", The Oakland Tribune (Wednesday, Nov. 20, 1996), p. Cue-6.
Eadie, John W. (ed.) Classical Traditions in Early America (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976).
Eaton, Howard O. (ed.) Federation: The Coming Structure of World Government (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944).
Edman, Irwin (ed.) Marcus Aurelius and His Times (Roselyn, N.Y.: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1945).
Ehrensaft, Philip, and Amitai Etzioni (eds.) Anatomies of America: Sociological Perspectives (London: Macmillan Company, 1969).
Eisenhower, Dwight D. Crusade in Europe (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1948).
Eisenstein, Sergei. Film Form and The Film Sense: Two Complete and Unabridged Works ed. and tr. Jay Leyda (New York: Meridian Books, 1957).
Eisenstein, Sergei. The Film Sense, ed. and tr. Jay Leyda (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974 [1947]).
Ely, Richard T. "Social Aspects of Christianity", Congregationalist Leaflet No. 2 (Boston: W. L. Greene & Co., 1888).
"Evangelism." Time Vol. 56, No. 20 (November 13, 1950), p. 61.
Farmer, Francis (ed.) The Wilson Reader (New York: Oceana Publications, 1956).
Fairlie, Henry. The Kennedy Promise (New York: Dell, 1974) .
Fast, Howard. Spartacus (New York: published by the Author, 1951).
Fast, Howard. The Naked God (New York: Praeger, 1957).
Fast, Howard. Moses, Prince of Egypt (New York: Crown, 1958).
Fast, Howard. Being Red (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990).
Fast, Howard. Letter to Duncan Cooper. April 22, 1991.
Fiedler, Leslie. An End to Innocence: Essays on Culture and Politics (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).
Fleischer, Richard, dir. Barabbas. Columbia/Dino de Laurentiis,

1962.
Forshey, Gerald E. American Religious and Biblical Spectaculars (Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger, 1992).
Frank, Tenny. Roman Imperialism (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914).
Franklin, Benjamin. Autobiography (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co, 1931).
Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique (New York: Dell, 1964).
Fry, Christopher. The Bible (New York: Pocket Books, 1966).
Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1971 [1957]).
Frye, Northrop. The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance (New York: Harvard University Press, 1976).
Frye, Northrop. Spiritus Mundi (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983 [1976]).
Fulbright, J. William. The Arrogance of Power (New York: Vintage, 1966).
Gabler, Neil. An Empire of their Own (New York: Crown, 1988).
Gaer, Joseph, and Ben Siegel. The Puritan Heritage, America's Roots in the Bible (New York: Mentor Books, 1964).
Gallagher, Buell G. "Hope and History," The Saturday Review (July 4, 1953), pp. 24-25.
Gardner, Lloyd. Imperial America: American Foreign Policy Since 1898 (San Francisco: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976).
Gentles, Frederick, and Melvin Steinfield (eds.) Dream On, America (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971).
Gilbert, James. Another Chance: Postwar America 1945-1968 (New York: Knopf, 1981).
Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures (New York: Basic Books, 1973).
Geertz, Clifford. Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology (New York: Basic Books, 1983).
Gibbon, Edward. The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (New York: Heritage Press, 1946).
Gibney, Frank. "Syngman Rhee: The Free Man's Burden," Harper's Vol. 208, No. 245 (February 1954).
Giddings, Franklin Henry. Democracy and Empire: With Studies of

Their Psychological, Economic and Moral Foundations (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1912).
Gilbert, James. Another Chance: Postwar America, 1945-1968 (New York: Knopf, 1981).
Gilbert, James. Cycles of Outrage (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
"Godlike Conqueror." Life Vol. 54 (May 3, 1963).
Goldman, Eric F. The Crucial Decade and After: America 1945-1960 (New York: Vintage, 1960).
Gornick, Vivian. The Romance of American Communism (New York: Harper Colophon, 1977).
Gottesman, Ronald, Francis Murphy, Laurence B. Holland, Hershel Parker, David Kalstone, and William H. Pritchart (eds.) The Norton Anthology of American Literature Vol. 1 (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1979).
Gottschalk, Louis (ed.) Generalizations in the Writing of History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).
Graham, Billy (ed.) America's Hour of Decision (Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1951).
"Greece, Part IV: Golden Age of Athens." Life (March 8, 1963), pp. 60-73.
Greene, David, dir. Godspell. Columbia/Lansbury/Duncan/Beruh, 1973.
Gregory, Horace. "Becket's Dying Gladiators," Commonweal (October 26, 1956), pp. 88-89.
Hadden, Jeffrey K., and Anson Shupe. Televangelism: Power and Politics on God's Frontier (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1988).
Halberstam, David. The Fifties (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1994).
Hamilton, A. C. Northrop Frye: Anatomy of his Criticism (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison, and John Jay. The Federalist Papers (New York: Mentor Books, 1961).
Hanson, Russell L. The Democratic Imagination in America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).
Hardt, Hanno. Critical Communication Studies: Communication, History and Theory in America (New York: Routledge, 1992).

Harrington, Michael. "Myths of U.S. Liberalism," Commonweal Vol. 61, No. 11 (December 1954).
Harvey, Brett. The Fifties: A Woman's Oral History (New York: Harper, 1994).
Hathaway, Henry, dir. Prince Valiant. Twentieth Century Fox, 1954.
Haskell, H. J. The New Deal in Old Rome (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947 [1939]).
Haskell, H. J. This was Cicero: modern politics in a Roman toga (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1942).
Haskell, H. J. "Meeting of East and West: Act One," Saturday Review of Literature Vol. 30, pp. 7-9+ (July 12, 1947).
Haskell, H. J. "It Happened in Rome", The Saturday Review Vol. 31, pp. II-12 (Dec. 18, 1948).
Havelock, Eric A. Preface to Plato (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963).
Havelock, Eric A. and Jackson P. Hershbell. Communication Arts in the Ancient World (New York: Hastings House, 1978).
Hawks, Howard, dir. Land of the Pharaohs. Warner/Continental, 1955.
Haworth, Paul. The United States In Our Own Times (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924).
Heckscher, August. Woodrow Wilson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1991).
Hefley, James C., and Edward E. Plowman. Washington: Christians in the Corridors of Power (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1975).
Hellman, Lillian. Scoundrel Time (New York: Bantam, 1977).
Herodotus. The Persian Wars tr. George Rawlinson (New York: The Modern Library, 1942).
Hertzberg, Sidney. "The Crisis in U.S. Foreign Policy" Commentary Vol. 17, No. 6 (June 1954).
Heston, Charlton. The Actor's Life: Journals, 1956-1976, ed. Hollis Alpert (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1978).
Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. "The Hundred Years' War", Harper's New Monthly Magazine No. 396, Vol. 67 (June 1883), pp. 20-32.
Hiller, Arthur, dir. Man of La Mancha. United Artists/PEA, 1972.
Hinckley, Barbara. The Symbolic Presidency (New York: Routledge, 1990).
Hill, Christopher. The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas

During the English Revolution (New York: Penguin, 1975).
Hill, Samuel S. (ed.) Religion in the Southern States (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1983).
Hiller, Jim (ed.) Cahiers du Cinéma: The 1950's (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1985).
Harrington, Michael. The Accidental Century (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966)
Hofstadter, Richard. American Political Tradition (New York: Vintage Books, 1948).
Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform (New York: Vintage Books, 1955).
Hofstadter, Richard (ed.), Great Issues In American Hostory Vol 2 (New York: Vintage Books, 1958).
Hoberman, J. "Giant," The Village Voice (May 7, 1991), p. 51.
"Hope and History." Saturday Review 36: 24-25 (July 4, 1953).
Houston, John, dir. The Bible. Twentieth Century-Fox/ Dino de Laurentiis, 1966.
Horwitz, Robert H. (ed.) The Moral Foundations of the American Republic (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986).
Howard, Robert H. (ed.) The Moral Foundations of the American Republic 3rd ed. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986).
Ilton, Paul, and MacLennan Roberts. Moses and the Ten Commandments (New York: Dell, 1956).
"Invaluable 10%." Time Vol. 56, No. 18 (October 30, 1950), p. 71.
Ingwalson, Kenneth W. (ed.) Your Church--Their Target (Arlington, Virginia: Better Books, 1966).
Janeway, Eliot. "The Midwest's Mood: Part One," Life V. 15, No. 11 (Sept. 13, 1943), pp. 11-14.
Jelin, Ted G. (ed.) Religion and Political Behavior in the U.S. (New York: Praeger, 1989).
Jessup, John K., "America and the Future." Life Vol. 15, No. 12 (September 20, 1943), pp. 104-110+.
Jewison, Norman, dir. Jesus Christ, Superstar. Universal, 1973.
Johnson, Ian, "Merely Players: 400 Years of Shakespeare." Films and Filming Vol. 10, No. 7 (April 1964), pp. 46-47.
Johnsen, Julia E. (ed.) International Federation of Democracies

(Proposed) (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941).
Jones, Gordon S. and John A. Marini. The Imperial Congress: Crisis in the Separation of Powers (New York: Pharos Books, 1988).
Jones, Tracy K. Jr. Our Mission Today: The Beginnings of a New Age (New York: World Outlook Press, 1963).
Kaplan, E. Ann (ed.) Women in Film Noir rev. ed. (London: BFI, 1980).
Karini, A. M. Toward a Definition of the American Film Noir (1941-1949) (New York: Arno, 1976).
Karmiloff-Smith, Annette. Beyond Modularity (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992).
Kemler, Edgar. The Deflation of American Ideals (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967 [1941]).
Kenneally, Thomas. Moses the Lawgiver (New York: Harper and Rowe, 1975).
Keyssar, Helene, and Vladimir Pozner. Remembering War: A U.S.-Soviet Dialogue (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990).
Keyssar, Helene. Robert Altman's America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
King, Henry, dir. David and Bathsheba. TCF (Darryl F. Zanuck), 1951.
Kitses, Jim. Horizons West (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1969).
Knoor-Cetina, K., and A.V. Cicourel. Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-sociologies (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981).
Koster, Henry, dir. The Robe. Twentieth Century-Fox, 1951
Koster, Henry, dir. The Story of Ruth. Twentieth Century-Fox, 1960.
Koury, Phil. Yes, Mr. DeMille (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959).
Kubrick, Stanley, dir. Spartacus. United International/Bryna, 1960.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. Metaphors We Live By (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980).
Lakoff, George. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. More than Cool Reason (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989).
Lakoff, George, Jane Espenson, Adele Goldberg and Alan Schwartz. Master Metaphor List (unpublished draft, Berkeley Cognitive Linguistics Group, 1991).

Langacker, Ronald. Concept, Image, and Symbol (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990).
Larrabee, Stephen A. Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece, 1775-1865 (New York: New York University Press, 1957).
Larson, David (ed.) The Puritan Ethic in United States Foreign Policy (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1966).
Lean, David, dir. Lawrence of Arabia. Columbia/Horizon, 1962.
Leon, Daniel De Two Pages From Roman History (New York: New York Labor News Company, 1935 [1903]).
Le Roy, Mervyn, dir. Quo Vadis. MGM, 1951.
Lester, Richard, dir. A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum. United Artists/Quadrangle, 1966.
Levitin, Karl. "The Best Path To Man", Soviet Psychology Vol.18, No.1 (1979), PP. 3-66.
Linden, Carl A. Khrushchev and the Soviet Leadership: With an Epilogue on Gorbachev (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
Lindsey, Hal, and C.C. Carlson. The Late Great Planet Earth (New York: Bantam, 1973).
Lindsey, Hal, and C.C. Carlson. The Terminal Generation (New York: Bantam, 1977).
Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion (New York: The Free Press, 1965 [1922]).
Lippmann, Walter. "The American Destiny," Life (June 5, 1939), pp. 72-73.
Logan, Joshua, dir. Camelot. Warner, 1967.
Luria, A. R. The Making of Mind, ed. Michael Cole and Sheila Cole (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979).
Luria, A. R. The Man with a Shattered World, tr. Lynn Solotaroff (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987 [1972]).
Lynd, Alice (ed.) We Won't Go (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).
Macksey, R., and E. Donato (eds.) The Structural Controversy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1972).
Manchester, William The Glory and the Dream: A Narrative History of America 1932-1972 Vol. 2 (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1974).
Mankiewicz, Joseph L., dir. Julius Caesar. MGM, 1953.
Mankiewicz, Joseph L., dir. Cleopatra. Twentieth Century-Fox, 1963.

Mann, Anthony, dir. El Cid. Samuel Bronstein, 1961.
Mann, Anthony, dir. Fall of the Roman Empire. Samuel Bronstein, 1964.
Mann, Anthony. "Empire Demolition", Films and Filming (March 1964).
Mann, Anthony. "A Lesson in Cinema," interviewed by Jean-Claude Missiaen, tr. Donald Phelps. Cahiers du Cinema in English, No. 12 (December 1967)pp. 61-65.
Marty, Martin E. Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America (New York: Dial Press, 1970).
Maté, Rudolph, dir. The 300 Spartans. Twentieth Century-Fox, 1962.
Mathisen, Robert R. (ed.) The Role of Religion in American Life (Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1982).
Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).
Mead, George H. On Social Psychology (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1964).
Mead, Sydney E. The Old Religion in the Brave New World (Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press, 1977).
Melville, Herman. White Jacket (New York: Library Classics of the United States, 1983).
Mierow, H. E. "Some Admired Sparta," Catholic World No. 167 (July 1948), pp. 351-355.
Moley, Raymond. "Caesar the Destroyer", Newsweek (September 2, 1963), p. 84.
Molnar, Thomas. "Imperial America," National Review Vol. XVIII, No. 18 (May 3, 1966), pp. 409-411.
Moyers, Bill. The Secret Government (Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press, 1988).
Mulder, John M., and John F. Wilson (eds.) Religion in American History (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978).
Murray, Gilbert. "'Liberal' Civilization Wrecked by War," The New Republic 130: 17-18 (1954).
Nachbar, John G. Focus on the Western (Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974).
Nemecek, Larry. The Star Trek: The Next Generation Companion (New York: Pocket Books, 1992).
Neve, Brian. Film and Politics in America (New York: Routledge,

1992).
Nevins, Allan. The New Deal and World Affairs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).
Niebuhr, Reinhold, and Alan Heimert. A Nation So Conceived: Reflections on the History of America from Its Early Visions to Its Present Power (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983 [1964]).
Nichols, Bill (ed.) Movies and Methods (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).
Noll, Mark A. (ed.) Eerdman's Handbook to Christianity in America (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1983).
George Orwell. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Vol. 3, eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1968).
Ottoson, Robert. A Reference Guide to the American Film Noir: 1940-1958 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981).
Paley, Vivian Gussin. Boys and Girls (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
Pangle, Thomas L. The Spirit of Modern Republicanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).
Peckham, Morse. Beyond the Tragic Vision (New York: George Braziller, 1962).
Peckham, Morse. Man's Rage for Chaos: Biology, Behavior and the Arts (New York: Schocken Books, 1967).
Petro, Patrice, and Carol Flinn. "Dialogue", Cinema Journal Vol. 25, No.1 (Fall 1985), pp. 50-58.
Phillips, Cabell B. H. The Truman Presidency: The History of a Triumphant Succession (New York: Macmillan, 1966).
Phillips, David P. "Suicide, Motor Vehicle Fatalities, and the Mass Media: Evidence Toward a Theory of Suggestion," American Journal of Sociology Vol. 84, No. 5 (1979), pp. 1150-1174.
Phillips, David P., and John E. Hensley. "When Violence is Rewarded or Punished: The Impact of Mass Media Stories on Homicide," Journal of Communication (Summer 1984), pp. 101-116.
Pierard, Richard V., and Robert D. Linder. Civil Religion and the Presidency (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1988).
"Plans vs. Policy.", Life Vol. 15, No. 13 (September 27, 1943), pp. 36-37.

Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives, tr. Bernadotte Perrin. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948)
Podhoretz, Norman. "Our Changing Ideals, As Seen On TV," Commentary Vol. 16, No. 6 (Dec. 1953).
Poggi, Gianfranco. Calvinism and the Capitalist Spirit: Max Weber's Protestant Ethic (Amhearst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1956 (Washington D.C.: National Archives, 1958).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1960 (Washington D.C.: National Archives, 1961).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1961 (Washington D.C.: National Archives, 1962).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1962 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1963).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1963 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1964).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1963-1964 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1965).
Public Papers of the Presidents 1951 (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1965).
Quinn, Edward, and Paul J. Dolan. The Sense of the 60's (New York: The Free Press, 1968).
Ragni, Gerome, and James Rado. Hair: The American Tribal Love-Rock Musical (New York: Pocket Books, 1969 [1966]).
Ray, Nicholas, dir. King of Kings. Samuel Bronstein, 1961.
Real, Michael R. Mass-Mediated Culture (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1977).
Reinhold, Meyer. Classica Americana: The Greek and Roman Heritage in the United States (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984).
Riencourt, Amaury de. The Coming Caesars (New York: Coward-McCann, 1957).
Riencourt, Amaury de. The American Empire (New York: Delta, 1970 [1965]).
Robertson, James Oliver. American Myth, American Reality (New York: Hill & Wang, 1980).
Robertson, Pat. America's Dates With Destiny (Nashville: Thomas

Nelson Publishers, 1986).
Robertson, Pat. Collected Works (New York: Inspirational Press, 1994).
Robinson, Jr., C. A. "Rome's Last Chance," The Saturday Review (March 21, 1953), pp. 8-9+.
Rogin, Michael P. Ronald Reagan: The Movie (Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press, 1987).
Roosevelt, Theodore. American Ideals and Other Essays Social and Political (New York: AMS Press, 1969 [1897]).
Rosen, Marjorie. Popcorn Venus: Women, Movies, and the American Dream (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, 1973).
Rosenstone, Robert A. Protest From The Right (Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press, 1968).
Rossen, Robert, dir. Alexander the Great. United Artists, 1956.
Rostow, W. W. (ed.) The Economics of Take-Off Into Sustained Growth (New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 1963).
Rostow, W. W. Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Foreign Aid (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1985).
Rueckert, William H. Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations 2nd ed. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1982).
Sarris, Andrew. The American Cinema (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1968).
Saville, Richard, dir. The Silver Chalice. Warner, 1954.
Saxton, Alexander. The Rise and Fall of the White Republic (New York: Verso, 1990).
Schlamm, William S. "Whose Decline?", National Review Vol XVIII, No. 18 (May 3, 1966).
Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. The Cycles of American History (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1986).
Scott, James Brown. James Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 and Their Relation to A More Perfect Society of Nations (New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1918).
Seidel, Michael. Streak: Joe Dimaggio and the Summer of '41 (San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 1988).
Sienkewicz, Henryk. Quo Vadis?, tr. C.J. Hogarth (New York: Dutton, 1967 [1941]).
Sirk, Douglas, dir. Sign of the Pagan. United International, 1954.

Shriver, Sargent. Point of the Lance (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).
Sklar, Robert (ed.) The Plastic Age (New York: George Braziller, 1970).
Slaughter, Frank G. The Song of Ruth (New York: Permabooks, 1954).
Solomon, Aubrey. Twentieth Century-Fox: A Corporate and Financial History (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1988).
"Sparta's Iron Way." Life (March 8, 1963), pp. 75-76+.
Sperber, Dan. Rethinking Symbolism, tr. Alice L. Morton (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. Relevance: Communication and Cognition (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
Stapledon, Olaf, Last Men and First Men & Star Maker (New York: Dover Publications, 1968 [1931 and 1937]).
Stavely, Keith W. F., Puritan Legacies: Paradise Lost and the New England Tradition, 1630-1890 (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1987).
Stanley, Robert C. International Nickel Company, Inc., "What Industry Vitally Needs!", Newsweek (June 2, 1947), p. 12.
Starr, Jr., Chester G. "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire," American Historical Review Vol. LVII, No. 1 (October 1952).
Steel, Ronald. Pax Americana, rev. ed. (New York: The Viking Press, 1970).
Steel, Ronald. Walter Lippmann and the American Century (New York: Vintage, 1980).
Steinbacher, John. "A Christmas Story," Classic Images Vol. 246 (December 1995), p. 7.
Steinberg, Corbett. TV Facts (New York: Facts on File Inc., 1980).
Stevens, George, dir. The Greatest Story Ever Told. United Artists, 1965.
Stevenson, Adlai E. Call to Greatness (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954).
Stewart, James Brewer. Holy Warriors: The Abolitionists and American Slavery (New York: McGraw, Hill, 1976).
Streit, Clarence. Union Now (New York: Harper and Bros., 1940).
Strong, Josiah. The Next Great Awakening (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1902).

Stormer, John. None Dare Call It Treason (Florissant, Missouri: Liberty Bell Press, 1964).
Sellers, M. N. S. American Republicanism (New York: New York University Press, 1994).
Sworakowsky, Witold S. (ed.) World Communism: A Handbook, 1918-1965 (Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution, 1973).
Tacitus, P. Cornelius. "The Suspicious State," The Saturday Review (August 23, 1952), pp. 22-23.
"The Know-How We Haven't Got." Harper's Vol. 208, No. 245 (February, 1954).
"The Mystery that was Alexander." Life Vol. 39 (November 14, 1955).
"The Real Mafia," Harper's Vol. 208, No. 1249 (June 1954).
"The Suspicious State." The Saturday Review 35: 22-23 (Aug. 23, 1952).
Thorpe, Richard, dir. The Knights of the Round Table. MGM, 1953.
Thorpe, Richard, dir. The Prodigal. MGM, 1955.
Toynbee, Arnold J. A Study of History ed. D.C. Somervell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).
Toynbee, Arnold J. Greek Civilization and Character (New York: Mentor, 1953).
Toynbee, Arnold J. the World and the West (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).
Toynbee, Arnold J. "Lessons for Us from Athens and Rome," The New York Times Magazine (January 31, 1960).
Toynbee, Arnold J. America and the World Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962).
"Trend." Time Vol 56, No. 22 (Nov. 27, 1950), p. 54.
Trumbo, Dalton. "Report on Spartacus," Cineaste Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (1991), pp. 30-33.
Trumbo, Dalton. Dalton Trumbo papers. Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research, and UCLA Special Collections.
Trumbo, Dalton. Additional Dialogue: Letters of Dalton Trumbo, 1942-1962 ed. Helen Manfull (New York: Lippincott, 1970).
Turner, Victor. Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1974).
Ustinov, Peter, Dear Me (London: Heinemann, 1977).
Vance, William L. America's Rome, Vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale

University Press, 1989).
Van Dusen, Henry P. (ed.) The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).
Vidal, Gore. Homage to Daniel Shays: Collected Essays 1952-1972 (New York: Vintage, 1973).
Vidal, Gore. The Decline and Fall of the American Empire (Berkeley, Calif.: Odonian Press, 1992).
Vidor, King, dir. Solomon and Sheba. United Artists, 1959.
Vygotsky, Lev S. Mind In Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes, ed. Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, Ellen Souberman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).
Vygotsky, Lev S. Thought and Language (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986).
Wade, Wyn Craig. The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America (New York: Touchstone, 1987).
Wallace, Lew. Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ (New York: Harper and Bros., 1880).
Walsh, Raoul, dir. Esther and the King. Twentieth Century-Fox/Galatea, 1960.
Warshow, Robert. The Immediate Experience (Garden City, NY.: Doubleday, 1962).
Wartofsky, Marx W. Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding (Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1979).
Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism tr. Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribner, 1976 [1930]).
Wertsch, James V. Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).
Wertsch, James V. Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).
"What Communists Are Up To." Newsweek, June 2, 1947, pp. 20-29.
White, T. H. The Once and Future King (New York: Berkeley Medallion Books, 1966).
Williams, Douglas. In Search of the Grail: The Films of George Lucas (Masters Thesis, San Francisco State University, 1991).
Williams, Lindsey. To Seduce A Nation (Kasilof, Alaska: Worth Publishing Co., 1984).

Windmiller, Marshall. The Peace Corps and Pax Americana (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1970).
Wilstach, Paul (ed.) Correspondence of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson (New York: Capricorn Books, 1966 [1925]).
Wills, Garry. Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words that Remade America (New York: Touchstone Books, 1992).
Wills, Garry. The Kennedy Imprisonment: A Meditation on Power (Boston: Little, Brown, 1982).
Wittgenstein, Ludwig. On Certainty (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1972).
Wolfe, Tom. The Right Stuff (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1979).
Wolfenstein, Martha, and Nathan Leites. Movies: A Psychological Study (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950).
Wright, Louis B. The Cultural Life of the American Colonies (New York: Harper and Rowe, 1957).
Wyler, William, dir. Ben-Hur. MGM, 1959.
Wylie, Philip. A Generation of Vipers Rev. Ed. (New York: Rinehart, 1955 [1942]).
Zane, J. Peder. "What Would Andy Do? Griffith Show a `Moral Compass," San Francisco Chronicle (Dec. 10, 1991), B3.