



Jeffries' policeman friend Doyle (Wendell Corey) refuses to take his suspicions seriously.

Ultimately, Jeffries is forced to engage in a physical struggle against Thorwald which results in breaking his other leg. Thus, when we last see Jeffries, both of his legs are in casts and his back is turned to the window. As he has now responsibly accepted his commitment to Lisa, he can sleep contentedly even though, with both legs broken, all thoughts of escape have been destroyed. Through his involvement in the Thorwald case, Jeffries has been forced to face up to his fears and overcome them. This overcoming is demonstrated at the end of the film by his acceptance of his love for Lisa.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Francois Truffaut, Hitchcock (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), pp. 12-13.

<sup>2</sup>See also Robin Wood, Hitchcock's Films (Cranbury, N.J.: A. S. Barnes and Co., Inc., 1977), p. 69.

<sup>3</sup>An interesting discussion of this point and its emergence in other Hitchcock films, such as The Lodger and Psycho, may be found in Gabriel Miller's "Beyond the Frame: Hitchcock, Art, and the Ideal," PostScript, 5:2 (Winter 1986), pp. 31-46.

<sup>4</sup>Wood, p. 75.

<sup>5</sup>Truffaut, p. 162.

## VIRTUE AND VIOLENCE IN PECKINPAH'S *THE WILD BUNCH*

by Paul A. Roth

"Why does the Western movie especially have such a hold on our imagination?"

Chiefly, I think, because it offers a serious orientation to the problem of violence such as can be found almost nowhere else in our culture. One of the well-known peculiarities of modern civilized opinion is its refusal to acknowledge the value of violence . . . . And in the criticism of popular culture, where the educated observer is usually under the illusion that he has nothing at stake, the presence of images of violence is often assumed to be in itself a sufficient ground for condemnation.

--Robert Warshow, "Movie Chronicle: The Westerner"

I wish to explore two interrelated problems in this essay. One is the problem broached by Warshow: How can the depiction of violence possibly have any aesthetic appeal? Can it enhance one's appreciation of the artistic merit of a movie or any work of art? The second problem takes Sam Peckinpah's 1969 release, The Wild Bunch, to be a special case of the problem. For this film, despite its infamous reputation, has prompted many thoughtful critics and viewers to conclude that Peckinpah's band of outlaws is special. Yet even as thoughtful an analyst of popular culture as John Cawelti finds the reasons for this specialness difficult to articulate.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the critical literature runs a gamut from those who, like Cawelti, see the gang as reaffirming an ideal or heroic myth to those critics who declare the film is a work of art whose merits are ineffable. I propose an answer to the general question of how violence functions as an aesthetic device by providing an analysis of what is appealing about the violence which occurs in Peckinpah's film.

The "justification" proceeds by indicating how the violence is an integral and essential part of the social and political vision which is at the heart of Peckinpah's film. His film develops a vision of how human society originates and functions, a vision whose intellectual lineage stretches from Hobbes to Freud's

Civilization and Its Discontents.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the appeal of The Wild Bunch resides in its compelling depiction of the Hobbesian-Freudian vision of the nature and structure of society. The film is about the growth and generation of values which make society possible and tensions which are intrinsic to human relations. While one movement within the film depicts the development of values necessary for a human social life, the film also illustrates the bankruptcy of a vision of manhood. Thus, the film both speculates about the necessary basis of human relationships and concomitantly rejects prevailing American codes dictating economic and sexual roles. In short, the film reminds viewers of why human beings come together in a society and what, at this time, is unsatisfactory about the society actually formed.

The violence serves its aesthetic purpose by making the film compelling to viewers. But the violence is compelling because it forges the critical link to the moral vision which informs the film. Not the degree of violence but the role it plays in forming and defining group values gives it an aesthetic function and moral point. Like thinkers of an earlier tradition who did not disdain giving practical advice to their readers, Peckinpah mixes speculative philosophy and concrete criticism.

## I

How did society originate? Answers to such a question are purely speculative. One line of speculation which has received extensive attention in the Western philosophical tradition is "social contract" theory. Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau are thinkers associated with this tradition in social and political philosophy. The social contract view is that people originally agreed to surrender some of their liberty, which is greatest for individuals when no social constraints obtain, in return for the benefits which only a social structure allows. Why would people enter an arrangement which allows them less freedom than they would have otherwise? What motivates people to do this?

Hobbes's answer is that fear of violence both motivates people to originally form societies and justifies the surrender of freedom which social organization requires. People give up freedom in an attempt to enhance survival prospects. The protection of the well-being of its citizens is the initial and ongoing purpose of the state. The social contract originates in fear and is maintained for the purposes of protection.



"Army" men (William Holden, Ernest Borgnine, Warren Oates, and Ben Johnson) riding into San Rafael, Texas, en route to holding up the railroad paymaster's office.

Prior to the formation of any social contract, human beings reside in a "state of nature." Locke sometimes writes as if this presocial state were an Edenic one; Hobbes entertains no such illusions (p. 34). Yet even Hobbes's grim scenario is not sufficient reason for explaining why human beings come to join in social organizations. Hobbes also notes the acceptance of social restraints is "contrary to our natural Passions" (p. 38). What prompts people to act against their natural desires to dominate and possess others is the overriding need for self-preservation (p. 3). The Hobbesian view, in sum, is that the human being's natural state is aggression and fear; in this state, however, none of the characteristic advantages or pleasures of human existence are possible. Accepting the limitations on freedom imposed by society is, although unnatural, understandable, given the pleasures promised. The question of how to cope with actual and threatened violence, then, is at the core of the Hobbesian account of statehood and justifies the sweeping powers which Hobbes is willing to confer on a monarch.

The account of social origins which Freud outlines in Civilization and Its Discontents is of a piece with the story Hobbes tells (CD p. 42). In addition, the relation of a person to the society is said by Freud to be inherently tension-ridden because social restraints are contrary to our "natural passions." On the view of both Hobbes and Freud the conflict is exacerbated because people are apt to emphasize the restraints and

ignore the benefits which a society provides (Hobbes p. 45; CD pp. 43, 44, 69). Coming together to form a society is an unnatural act which people are motivated to perform because of fear of violence. Social life exhibits these tensions, and the unnatural state is maintained only by surrendering a fair portion of individual liberty to an individual or group.

Another shared aspect of the Hobbesian and Freudian account relevant to an informed viewing of The Wild Bunch is that both thinkers emphasize the need to surrender power to some individual or group. This is not to invest the chosen ruler with any mantle of moral respectability. But without such a surrender of individual freedom, which means relinquishing autonomy to another, society could not exist. Hobbes baldly asserts, "the only way to erect such a Common Power, as may be able to defend them from . . . the injuries of one another . . . is to conferre all their power and strength upon one Man, or upon one Assembly of men" (p. 39). Similarly, Freud speaks of replacing the power of the individual by "the power of the community." He does not, however, specify what form this power should take. Freud does not speculate on the issue of what forms of government are legitimate. In Peckinpah's development of this theme, despite his rejection of contemporary economic and sexual mores, he



The railroad company organizer of the ambush (Albert Dekker) standing over the body of an innocent victim.

strongly endorses the idea that social organization involves personal self-sacrifice and central command.

The foregoing suggested list of necessary conditions for civilized existence does not make explicit reference to moral notions. Freud and Hobbes claim that what we deem to be morally worthy is, largely, whatever is believed to enhance the conditions of social existence. Moral worth is imputed to whatever is taken to be the socially necessary. The more important a value is for social cohesion, the greater its moral title.

Consequently, in viewing The Wild Bunch, one is apt to see the gang--the Wild Bunch--as embodying values which are more praiseworthy than those of any other group portrayed in the film. Yet the individuals in the gang do not appear, in any serious respect, to be morally admirable. Thus, viewers of the film are caught in a paradoxical experience. On the one hand, many viewers perceive the title gang as a moral cut above others in the film. Yet the actions of individuals in the gang--viewed atomistically--manifest no clear moral content. They do not perform actions which fit any conventional notion of moral goodness. The overall impact is inexplicable if one seeks, scene by scene, for an explanation of this impact. This paradox is resolved if one distinguishes between those values which contribute to group solidarity and those which govern the relations of individuals. The film operates at the level of concern for groups and not of concern for individuals. Viewers respond to the fact that the gang is a true social unit bound by the values which a social unit needs to survive. This is their morally distinguishing trait. "To this warre of every man against every man, this also is consequent; that nothing can be Unjust. The notions of Right and Wrong, Justice and Injustice, have there no place. Where there is no common Power, there is no Law; where no Law, no Injustice . . . . They are Qualities that relate to men in Society, not in Solitude" (pp. 35-36). Freud concurs. "The first requisite of civilization, therefore, is that of justice--that is, the assurance that a law once made will not be broken in favor of an individual. This implies nothing as to the ethical value of the law" (CD p. 42). One must distinguish between what is necessary if justice is to exist at all and what laws are just. Freud, Hobbes, and Peckinpah address the former question and not the latter.

## II

The Wild Bunch shall be viewed against this back-

ground of social contract theory and the concomitant myth of the state of nature as propounded by Hobbes and Freud. State of nature theory, in the writings of Hobbes and Freud, emphasizes fear of violence as the critical motivating force in bringing people together in social groups. Values are defined in terms of one's willingness to relinquish individual desires and to promote chances of the group's survival. What distinguishes right from wrong in this stark context is not the usual notions of respect for individual rights, etc. On the contrary, celebrated in such environments is the suppression of the individual for what the group demands. Demands for autonomy re-emerge, and are given moral credence, only after the consciousness of the threat of violence has receded. This tension between what is necessary for social survival and what is necessary for individual liberty gives renewed force and point to Freud's claim that civilization is built on repression (CD p. 44).

One can now formulate an explanation of the gang's appeal. But the movie is not simple, and a reminder of a leading theme of social and political philosophy begins but does not complete an exploration of the levels of this film. For the film, beginning with its title, is based on a series of inversions. The putative outlaw gang is the only group in the film which will be seen to embody socially admirable values. Moreover, the diverse agents of society which do appear in the film--the railroad posse, the American army, Mapache's army--are devoid of any shared commitment to values, of discipline, or of leadership. Yet all these factors are necessary, on the Hobbesian-Freudian view, if one is to have a social organization and not just a mob. The film is nothing less than a depiction of the evolution of a true society from the muck of materialist mob rule to the "high" ground of sublimation; we see people who are able to overcome their "natural passions" and so form a truly human society.

The film is about a notorious gang operating in Texas around 1913. William Holden plays the gang's leader, Pike Bishop; his chief lieutenant, Dutch, is played by Ernest Borgnine. The action of the film opens as a well-planned bank robbery by the gang turns out to be a trap staged by railway agents intent on putting an end to the gang. The ambush has been engineered by a former gang member, Deke Thornton (Robert Ryan). Thornton has been promised release from prison in return for helping to eliminate the Wild Bunch.

After a bloody shootout, the gang escapes to Mexico. They are pursued there by Thornton and a crew of bounty hunters. Desperate for money and seeking refuge from Thornton, the Wild Bunch agrees to rob a shipment

of U.S. Army guns for a Mexican general. This Mexican general, in turn, is seeking to crush a local rebellion. The central focus of the latter part of the movie concerns the tension which develops because of the threat to the gang from, on the one hand, Thornton and the bounty hunters, and on the other hand, from the general's seizure of one of the gang members, Angel. Angel falls afoul of the general because he is identified as having aided the rebels against whom the general campaigns. The movie culminates in a shootout of epic proportions between the four remaining gang members and the general's army. The film thereby opens and closes with scenes of graphic and extensive violence; it is punctuated throughout with murders and robberies.



"The Wild Bunch" about to confront Mapache and his troops.

Part of the stock Western myth is that the "taming of the West" involved eliminating outlaw gangs. The movie appears to work one more variant on this stock view in which lawless (unrepressed) individuals are purged in order to make civilization possible. The stunning irony embedded in Peckinpah's cinematic vision turns this stock account on its head and, to borrow Cawelti's phrase, constitutes a brilliant case of generic transformation.<sup>4</sup> For the film reveals from first scene to last that the socially necessary values

are incarnate only in this outlaw gang; the "civilized" people are motivated by crass individual needs--greed--or by values which are repressive without being socially binding, for example, the temperance marchers shown at the beginning of the film.

From the opening scene, the Wild Bunch is contrasted with society's formal agents. The irony of the gang's disguise as soldiers is not immediately apparent; yet as the movie progresses, the gang members obviously possess the skills of true warriors while the other groups do not. If anything corresponds to the



Trying to survive a ferocious attack.

popular image of a primitive society, a group of nomadic warriors does. The myth evoked by Peckinpah's gang is of a primal tribe wandering free in a land where no power is yet supreme. That the country is America and the time 1913 is irrelevant. As the initial shootout, replete with its slaughter of innocent townspeople, makes plain, this is still the Hobbesian state of nature. A man with a gun is law unto himself. As the railroad agent says to the protesting townspeople, "I am the law."

The opening scenes, from the way the gang enters to the way it leaves, emphasize the salient characteristics of this gang. Even during the chaotic gunfight

scene the gang's gunfire, unlike that of the railway agents, is always directed and controlled. What the Wild Bunch has is discipline; it has a leader (Pike Bishop) who enforces the rules and members who, despite their natural passions, manage to conform to the agreed-upon rules. Note the contrast between the leadership exercised by Bishop and that exercised by the other leaders in the film: the railway agent, Deke Thornton, the U.S. cavalry officer, and General Mapache.

One may ask what natural passion people must overcome in order to enter into a meaningful social contract. The answer, in a word, is greed. The general inversion of expected roles is seen, for one expects the outlaws to be greedy and rapacious. However, the gang members exhibit a loyalty to the group and a trust that transcends basic covetousness. The other groups, on the contrary, are held together solely by their lust for individual gain. This is explicit with the bounty hunters, but it is implicit in the case of the cavalry--men hired to serve just for pay--and in the inducements the gang is offered by Mapache, all of which are material. What drives people, Hobbes believed, is desire; and desires are limitless in number, and so insatiable. Indeed, the credo of the Wild Bunch is forcefully articulated by Pike Bishop in the memorable scene where he declares, "When you side with a man you stick with him. Otherwise you're nothing better than an animal." That the bounty hunters are no better than animals is graphically suggested in the final scene where the shots of vultures hovering over the corpses are intercut with the looting of the bodies by the bounty hunters. From the beginning of the film, where the erstwhile agents of civilization can hardly refrain from opening fire and when they do, it is into a group of innocent bystanders, to the end where like vultures they tear the corpses apart digging out gold teeth, the contrast between the discipline and the restraint of the Wild Bunch and the lack thereof in the others is apparent.

Consider an exchange between Deke Thornton and the railway agent. Thornton complains that he "needs some good men." What is wrong with the ones he has? They are clearly willing and able to kill. What they lack is discipline; "good" men, people worth having, are those who can discipline themselves and take orders. Fear and greed unite the bounty hunters. Their ultimate failure to survive is a direct consequence of not understanding the need for and the value of leadership and restraint.

The gang members, as the film reveals, enjoy an

uneasy unity. However, despite many disappointments, starting with the realization they were "set up" during the robbery at Starbuck, through the discovery that they have not netted anything of value from the robbery, to the final command by Pike which leads them all to certain death, their discipline does not fail them. They are, from first to last, governed by a commitment to those values which have all along enhanced their chances of survival. Unity is maintained until the end; the Wild Bunch is the paradigm of a social unit.

The gang's activities are those of a prototypical Freudian community. Freud imagines that the "communal life of human beings had . . . a two-fold foundation: the compulsion to work, which was created by external necessity, and the power of love, which made man unwilling to be deprived of his sexual object" (CD p. 48). The gang does nothing but "love" and work. When not in the process of planning or of committing a robbery, they chase women. Peckinpah's critique of capitalist mores consists in his celebration of the nonmaterialistic values which bind the Wild Bunch and give them, whether they realize it or not, their edge in dealing with other forces in the state of nature.

In addition to economic values, Peckinpah critiques sexual mores, though the only women who appear in the film are whores or women who occupy conventional social roles. Further, the portrayal of women, even in these standard guises, is neither flattering or benign. Peckinpah's portrayal of women is thoroughly misogynistic. Women do not enhance the values being celebrated; they only appear to threaten the unity of the gang. For example, Angel jeopardizes the group by murder of his former lover (while she sits on the general's lap). And in a scene available only on the uncut version of the film, Pike is almost killed by a vengeful husband. He let down his guard when with a woman. Thornton is captured in a brothel. During the climactic shootout, Pike is critically wounded, in the back no less, by a woman, and fatally shot by a child. Angel is betrayed to Mapache by Teresa's mother.

Is one to attribute a deep-seated misogyny to Peckinpah, who coauthored the screenplay? Does the Hobbesian-Freudian view of women in this context posit a conflict between social and familial values, with women representing the latter? No, for the pervasive portrayal of women as whores in the film is a device used to stress their basic equality with men. A "whore" is anyone, male or female, who sells himself or herself for money. And selling himself for money is what every man in this film does. Material gain, especially in the case of the putative social agents, is valued above human life. In the Hobbesian state of

nature, selling oneself is a means of survival. By participating actively in this form of economic exchange, the film suggests that women are no better or worse than men.

What then of the threat which women pose to the gang? This threat is consistent with the general point regarding economic equality; women are no safer to consort with than men. Yet, taking our cue from Freud, women are to be understood as an inherent threat to our archetypal primitive society. That a woman and a child combine to do in Pike is no accident; they pose, from the outset Freud believes, the greatest obstacle to the work of civilization, much greater, to be sure, than an entire ragtag army. Women are a more serious threat because they are a challenge to the gang's secret of success, discipline, and restraint (CD pp. 50-51).

This conflict is played out in several scenes. For one, just before he leaves in the final attempt to free Angel, Pike looks with undisguised longing and sadness at the young woman and child--the normal family he has never been able to have. Similarly, members of the gang are ridiculed if they propose taking seriously a woman, as when one of the Gorch brothers introduces his playmate as his fiancée, or if their natural family ties and affections get in the way of the gang's purposes, as when Angel is forced to choose between avenging his father or staying with the gang.

Angel, in this regard, is a key figure in the film. Initially, Angel is torn between his loyalty to the gang and more primitive passions. Both pose serious threats to the group. Angel is the youngest member of the gang. Yet Angel grows as a character, and his allegiance transcends, finally, the limits of the gang. His development recapitulates the general social otogeny postulated by Freud. "We have already perceived that one of the main endeavors of civilization is to bring people together into large unities. But the family will not give the individual up . . . . Detaching himself from his family becomes a task that faces every young person" (CD p. 50). And the gang provides the appropriate baptism of fire for the values which Angel finally embraces.

In the end, both the earthly emissary of the Divine (Bishop) and the messenger from above (Angel) are reincarnated in the person of Deke Thornton. For Thornton assumes the mantle of the fallen Bishop (he takes Pike's gun) and throws his lot with the new and greater community which is emerging (the rebels). The spirit of Angel thus also remains. As Hobbes and Freud would picture it the evolution of society continues, with the old gang metamorphosing into an even more general social unit. As the old man remarks to Thorn-



ton, "It ain't what it was, but it'll do." Clearly, as far as the values involved go, he is right.

The final scenes are a magnificent summation of the various themes discussed so far. Pike's final command, "Let's go," is ambiguous. It could be understood as either an invitation to abandon Mapache's camp or as an order to go get Angel. Yet the latter interpretation is the understood one both for the gang members and the audience. Why is the command seemingly unambiguous?

Paul Seydor, author of a book-length study of Peckinpah, suggests the following reading of this scene. "Pike is finished anyway, but his decision to reclaim Angel represents his decision to become a human being, and it is the full weight of what this choice means that confers upon the carnage to follow its terrifying dimension of tragic irony."<sup>5</sup> Just how is Pike's decision to reclaim Angel tied to his (and our) conception of a human being? If this question could be answered, then the air of irony and paradox which attends Seydor's reading--how does the decision to be a human being entail the destruction of a great many human beings?--might be dispelled.

The final action is inevitable. Mapache has raised the sort of challenge which Pike cannot ignore, a challenge to Pike's commitment to protecting the group. "The Obligation of Subjects to the Sovereign is understood to last as long, and no longer, than the power lasteth, by which he is able to protect them" (p. 45). Moreover, the group has no other viable option. Although several group members earlier gave voice to a desire to disband after completing one last successful robbery, the notion that they could exist independently of one another is seen for the fantasy it is. Alone in the state of nature, their one advantage would be lost. As the film constantly reminds its viewers, a peaceful solitary existence is not to be found. Hobbes remarks, "If one plant, sow, build, or possess a convenient Seat, others may probably be expected to come prepared with forces united, to dispossess, and deprive him, not only of the fruit of his labour, but also of his life, or liberty" (p. 33). In short, as both the gang members and the audience implicitly realize, to abandon the camp and so renege on their commitment to Angel involves a denial of the values which are responsible for their success and survival.

The scene which follows the shooting, with the dejected and bestraggled survivors streaming out from the encampment, is the most powerful evocation of Hobbes ("and the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short") of which I know. With the leaders gone,

the result is a return (a fall?) to the state of nature.

What of the rebels, who are an apparent counter-example to the claim that the Wild Bunch is the only morally worthy group which appears in the film? The rebels do not appear as a cohesive group until the very end of the film, until they pick up the legacy of the Wild Bunch. Recall that when the gang is first surprised by the rebels, Dutch remarks (in the only admiring comment ever made about another group), "I'd say that those boys know how to handle themselves." Indeed, while the Indians are noted to have many admired skills, what they lack, as the dialogue makes plain, are guns and leadership. Part of the evolutionary development we witness is that the destruction of the Wild Bunch provides the rebels with both of their missing ingredients.

The further course of cultural development seems to tend towards making the law no longer an expression of the will of a small community . . . which, in its turn, behaves like a violent individual towards other, and perhaps more numerous, collections of people. The final outcome should be a rule of law to which all--except those not capable of entering a community--have contributed by a sacrifice of their instincts, and which leaves no one--again with the same exception--at the mercy of brute force. (CD p. 42)

The cinematic vision which Peckinpah conveys is neatly completed with the union of Thornton and the rebels. The film does not have a vision of what to be moral means so much as a view of how morality and culture become possible.

The appeal of the concrete, the sensual, is direct and immediate. The value of civilization, especially at what one imagines to be a remove from the state of nature, is abstract. The payoff of civilization is just the hope of being something better than an animal. However, to lose sight of this fact is easy. One may then question the value of controlling natural passions. A related error is to readily assume that disquieting cinematic exercises such as The Wild Bunch convey no positive social message. The answer why the film, despite its graphic violence, elicits the admiration of many viewers is that it serves to remind us of how our society evolved and which values we ought to respect and cherish if we hope to retain the benefits of civilization.

<sup>1</sup>A version of this paper was presented to the St. Louis Psychoanalytic Reading Group. I thank the members of the group for their helpful comments. Other friends and colleagues, especially Stephanie Ross and Henry Shapiro, have aided me with their suggestions.

<sup>2</sup>John Cawelti, "'Chinatown' and Generic Transformation in Recent American Films," Film Theory and Criticism, eds. G. Mast and M. Cohen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 576-577.

<sup>3</sup>All references to Hobbes in A. Gewirth, ed., Political Philosophy. References to Civilization and Its Discontents (designated CD) are to the Strachey translation, Standard Edition (W. W. Norton, 1961).

<sup>4</sup>In his otherwise admirable essay, "'Chinatown' and Generic Transformation in Recent American Films," Cawelti mistakenly suggests that The Wild Bunch affirms the myth of heroic values of the Western genre (p. 576). However, The Wild Bunch is properly seen as an instance of what Cawelti calls the "use of traditional generic structures as a means of demythologization" (p. 572). What is being demythologized is the view of the settling of the West, and so the establishment of traditional economic and social relations as civilizing (or humanizing) experiences. Peckinpah's genius is that he avoids celebrating the (totally mythic and unreal) "noble savage" and asks us to perceive the value in the "noble group." The myth to be destroyed is the view that the settling of the West was coeval with the establishment of morality. Peckinpah is urging us to see the locus of value in its original setting.

<sup>5</sup>Paul Seydor, Peckinpah: The Western Films (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1980), p. 98.

## THE DESIRE FOR EMBODIMENT IN WELLES'S *CITIZEN KANE*

by William Bywater

### I

David Bordwell reminds us that Citizen Kane combines "in fluid, fascinating suspension" the duality of a cinematic tradition. For Bordwell the power of the film arises from the play of tension between two elements in a duality.<sup>1</sup> Bordwell is correct. However, he is unclear about the nature of the duality. At first Bordwell identifies the duality as between film giving a detailed reproduction of external reality (an objective realism flowing from the tradition of Lumiere) and film transforming reality to suit the creator's imagination (theatrical stylization and cinematic sleight-of-hand from the tradition of Méliès). Yet, when Bordwell comes to discuss the important opening sequence of the film he speaks of the penetrative power of film: "the driving force of cinema is to trespass, to relentlessly investigate, to peel back what conceals and confront what reveals."<sup>2</sup> The dualism formed by the poles of detailed reproduction of external reality and penetration into reality is different from the dualism formed by detailed reproduction of reality and the transformation of reality which reveals a creator's imagination or subjectivity. The second of these dualities is that between Lumiere and Méliès. The first is a duality to be found within realism itself.

It is a "tingling moment," as Bordwell says, when the camera moves past the "No Trespassing" sign and over Kane's fence. This moment tingles not because it reveals a creator's imagination or subjectivity, but because it constitutes a violation of privacy, an aggressive act which affects the self of the viewer. That is why we tingle. Once past the "No Trespassing" sign, we penetrate to observe Kane's death and last word. Deathbed confessions and statements are generally regarded as revealing the inner character or inmost thoughts of people. At this moment human beings are unmasked. Words and consciousness become one. Thus, when the swirling snowflakes fill the screen, our penetration into the privacy of Kane is complete. We can go no further, and we come away with the impression that "Rosebud," Kane's last word, reveals something fundamental about Kane.

The dreamlike or unreal atmosphere of this sequence is the visual correlate of our position as



FILM AND PHILOSOPHY



Essays in Film and The Humanities

Volume 7, Number 2

Winter 1988

# POST SCRIPT: Essays in Film and the Humanities

Volume 7, Number 2

Winter 1988

ISSN0277-9897

Institutional Co-Sponsors: Jacksonville University  
Georgia Institute of Technology

Co-Editors: Gerald Duchovnay, Jacksonville University  
J.P. Telotte, Georgia Institute of Technology

Editorial Staff: Charles Affron, New York University  
Leo Braudy, University of Southern California  
Ric Gentry, filmmaker  
Robert Ginsberg, Pennsylvania State University,  
Delaware County  
Wade Jennings, Ball State University  
Bruce Kawiñ, University of Colorado at Boulder  
Margot Starr Kernan, photographer and video maker  
Robert P. Kolker, University of Maryland  
Dana Polah, University of Pittsburgh  
Judy Riggan, Northern Virginia Community College  
T.J. Ross, Fairleigh Dickinson University  
Garrett Stewart, University of California, Santa Barbara  
Robert E. Waxman, Jacksonville University

POST SCRIPT welcomes manuscripts on film as language and literature; acting; film music; film as visual art (painting and cinematic style, set design, costuming); film and photography; film history; aesthetics; the response of film and the humanities to technology; interdisciplinary studies in theme and genre; film and American Studies; reappraisals of seminal essays; book reviews and interviews, responses to articles appearing in POST SCRIPT.

Please submit two copies of all manuscripts and a stamped self-addressed return envelope. All correspondence — manuscripts, subscriptions, books for review, inquiries, advertisements — should be addressed to Gerald Duchovnay, Co-Editor, POST SCRIPT, Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, FL 32211. POST SCRIPT is a refereed publication. The interval between acceptance of an article and its publication is 4-18 months. The editors reserve the right to amend the phrasing and punctuation in articles and reviews accepted.

POST SCRIPT is published three times a year. The annual subscription rate is \$10.00 for individuals and \$18.00 for institutions. Please add \$5.00 for subscriptions outside the United States and Canada, foreign subscriptions must be paid in U.S. dollars. Single copies are \$5.00; \$7.50 overseas.

POST SCRIPT is indexed by the Federation Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF) and its published listing, *The International Index to Film Periodicals; Film/Literature Index; MLA International Bibliography; Book Review Index*, and *An Index to Book Reviews in the Humanities*.

Signed articles represent the views of their authors. POST SCRIPT, INC., its editors and editorial board do not take responsibility for statements, either fact or opinion, made by contributors.

# POST SCRIP Essays in Film and the

Volume 7, No. 2

Winter 1988

FILM AND PHILOSOPHY

Guest

## CONTENTS

Introduction to Film and Philosophy  
ROBERT GINSBURG .....

Zen and Selfhood: Patterns of Eastern Thought  
STEPHEN PRINCE .....

Escape and Commitment in Hitchcock's *Rear Window*  
SANDER H. LEE .....

Virtue and Violence in Peckinpah's *The Wild Bunch*  
PAUL A. ROTH .....

The Desire for Embodiment in Welles's *Citizen Kane*  
WILLIAM BYWATER .....

The Intentionality of Consciousness: Subjectivity in  
*Last Year at Marienbad*  
FRANK P. TOMASULO .....