

Copyright
by
Alexis Leigh Carreiro
2010

**The Dissertation Committee for Alexis Leigh Carreiro Certifies that this
is the approved version of the following dissertation (or treatise):**

**Script-to-Screen: Film Editing and Collaborative Authorship
During the Hollywood Renaissance**

Committee:

Janet Staiger, Supervisor

Tom Schatz

Mary Kearney

Don Howard

Barry Brummett

**Script-to-Screen: Film Editing and Collaborative Authorship
During the Hollywood Renaissance**

by

Alexis Leigh Carreiro, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2010

Dedication

To Paulianna.

(And Madison, too.)

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the Radio-TV-Film department at the University of Texas. In particular, I would like to thank Joesph Strabhaar for taking me under his wing during my first semester in 2002. With his help, I received a teaching assistant position as a first-year Masters student and, for me, that sealed the deal. That semester, I fell in love with teaching and have never looked back. (Thanks Joe!) Also, Michael Kackman courted me to work on Flow (both the on-line media studies journal and the inaugural conference) for several months before I finally agreed. His passion and persistence won me over, and I am so grateful for the experience. Flow opened up a world of opportunities for me, and I have Michael (along with co-founders Avi Santo and Chris Lucas) to thank for it.

Several other faculty members have been instrumental to my success as a graduate student. My advisor, Janet Staiger, supported my research for years. Her ability to compassionately provide insightful, constructive criticism is an art form. I have greatly benefited from her accessibility, scholarship, and encouragement and I cannot thank her enough. Throughout the years, Mary Kearney and Tom Schatz have been incredible mentors and gracious friends. They have pushed me harder and farther than where I originally wanted to go as a graduate student, but I am forever grateful for it. To think

that we are now colleagues is an honor. I also appreciate Don Howard's contributions my dissertation. As an editor, he provided me with practical advice and insight on the craft. And, I would like to offer a very special thank you to Barry Brummett for participating on my dissertation committee. Although I don't think I ever told you in person, I enjoy you Dr. Brummett. I really do.

In addition to the stellar faculty at UT-Austin, the Radio-TV-Film department has some of the most extraordinary graduate students on the planet. To Avi Santo, Jennifer Peterson, Hector Amaya, David Uskovich, Allison Perlman (our adopted RTF'er), Elliot Panek, Matt Payne, Peter Alilunas, Elissa Nelson, Carolyn Cunningham, Jean Lauer, Holly Custard, Chris Lucas, Alisa Perren, Kyle Barnett (and Lisa, too) - I am happy to stand among you and call you my friends.

I would also like to thank everyone at The Omelettry. Being a graduate student and writing a dissertation is damn hard work, but waiting tables is no easy task. You all have my utmost admiration and respect. Believe it or not, our crazy-busy Sundays kept me grounded and sane, and sometimes I laughed more with you on that one day than I did all week. It was a really special time in my life, and I'll never forget it. (Also, I would like to offer a very special thank you to Angeles and The Carpenters. Angeles: thanks for all the love. Kenny: thanks for taking me in all those years ago. And Jesse: thanks for keeping me around. You have no idea how much it means to me.)

Finally, I would like to offer a very humble thank you to my family and friends back home and across the country. Your love, encouragement, friendship, laughter, and kindness have carried me through the loneliest and toughest parts of this process. So, in

case I have not said it enough – thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you. I truly appreciate your generosity and support, and I could not have done it without you.

Script-to-Screen: Film Editing and Collaborative Authorship During the Hollywood Renaissance

Publication No. _____

Alexis Leigh Carreiro, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2010

Supervisor: Janet Staiger

Abstract: Hollywood film editing remains on the theoretical margins of contemporary film scholarship, and the cause of this is three-fold. First, despite advances in collaborative authorship studies, the Hollywood film director is still largely regarded as the sole creative lynchpin upon which the film's success or failure ultimately lies. Second, Classical Hollywood film editing—commonly referred to as the continuity aesthetic—is considered successful if it remains unnoticed, *if it remains invisible*. Therefore, within this continuity aesthetic, the editor's ultimate goal is to hide his or her own labor. Third, determining exactly how and where a film editor contributed to a film text during post-production is an incredibly difficult task. So, what is the solution?

This dissertation explores how film archives can contribute to knowledge about the cinematic post-production process. My central research questions are: what kinds of information do film archives contain regarding the creative collaboration between the director and the editor? And, what does available archive material tell us about the

changes and creative revisions in post-production? To answer these questions, I conducted original archival research on the following Hollywood Renaissance films: *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967), *The Conversation* (1974), *Annie Hall* (1977), and *Raging Bull* (1980). These films reflect a highly creative era in the Hollywood industry and are well-known for the collaborative relationship between the directors and the editors.

To determine how and where collaborative authorship occurred in these films, I compared archival documents such as the storyboards and shooting scripts to the final film texts. These documents contain explicit instructions about how the scenes should be lit, decorated, and shot and how the film itself should be edited together. Therefore, I argue that any editing discrepancies between these documents and the final films were the result of a creative collaboration between the director and the editor. Ideally, this model of “script-to-screen” archival research will inspire other academics to investigate how and where a film’s creative revision occurs during post-production—and to what effect.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	1
Hollywood Editors' Work Roles	6
The Auteur Theory.....	16
Auteur Cinema and the Hollywood Renaissance.....	22
Theoretical Framework and Methods	32
Methods of Historical Analysis	38
Chapter Outline.....	40
CHAPTER TWO - BONNIE AND CLYDE	44
<i>Bonnie and Clyde's</i> Production History and Collaborative Authorship.....	45
Bonnie and Clyde's Script-to-Screen Differences	53
Summary	67
CHAPTER 3 – THE CONVERSATION	74
Francis Ford Coppola.....	75
Walter Murch.....	83
<i>The Conversation</i> : Context, Collaboration, and Claims.....	86
Archival Evidence.....	90
Summary	104
CHAPTER 4: ANNIE HALL	107
Allen and Rosenblum: From <i>Anhedonia</i> to <i>Annie Hall</i>	110
Rosenblum's Claims Versus Archival Evidence	114
Summary	125

CHAPTER 5 - RAGING BULL	128
Scorsese and Schoonmaker: Biography and History	128
<i>Raging Bull</i> : History and Production Context	133
Claims and Archival Evidence.....	137
The Cerdan Fight	140
The Dauthuille Fight.....	144
The Robinson Fight.....	151
Summary	170
CONCLUSION	174
APPENDIX A	183
APPENDIX B	185
APPENDIX C - The Conversation Case Study -- Final Script vs. Film Scenes	190
APPENDIX D The Conversation Deleted Scenes from the Final Script	198
APPENDIX E - Annie Hall Screenplay Verses Film Comparison	200
APPENDIX F – Annie Hall Film – Basic Classroom Scene	212
APPENDIX H – Annie Hall Screenplay – Extended Cocktail Party Scene	218
APPENDIX I - Raging Bull Fight Scenes Breakdown	220
APPENDIX J - Raging Bull Climax – Shot-By-Shot Analysis (Jake’s final fight against Sugar Ray)	223
APPENDIX K - Raging Bull Sugar Ray Robinson Fight: Round 13 Master Script Cutting Sequence Versus Film	229
Works Cited	236
VITA	246

Chapter One - Introduction

Making a Hollywood film is a complicated, collaborative process. A screenwriter starts with an idea or concept and proceeds from there. If it is a Hollywood studio film, he or she will usually write the basic spec script according to the three-act structure.¹ The story will contain a clear introduction, conflict, rising action, complication, a climax, and finally, resolution. If a major film studio options the script, the screenwriter will work with the studio on story revisions. Should the project continue on toward production, the studio will hire a producer to manage the overall production and a director to manage the overall creative process. Then together, they will negotiate the film budget with the studio. Once the budget is in place, and pending studio approval, the producer and director will hand-pick key members of above (actors) and below the line talent (film editor, sound engineer, cinematographer, composer, wardrobe and make-up artists, etc.) to work on the film. These individuals will then hire a team of assistants to work with them in their respective production departments. During this time, the producer and director also works with the screenwriter on the shooting script. The shooting script is a detailed account of everything that occurs in the story and has to be completed during the production process. It may include information and instructions on scene numbers, storyboards, location shooting, camera angles, and editing transitions. The shooting script is the primary blueprint from which the entire production and post-production crew (such

¹ A spec script is written on speculation of a future sale.

as the location scout, cinematographer, set designer, costume designer, sound designer, and editor) work to create the film.

Despite the magnitude of people who work on and contribute to a major Hollywood film, the director is most often hailed for a film's success. Depending on his or her critical reputation, he or she is also invoked alongside the celebrity actors within the marketing campaign as part of the box office appeal. But if film is such a collaborative art, why is the director invoked as its sole author? How did this occur?

Literary studies was the precursor and inspiration for film studies, and within literary studies, authorship is a key concern. In fact, the question of authorship is central to any artistic endeavor. In literature and the studio arts, authorship is usually attributed to one person, one author or artist. However, anyone who has ever sat through the closing credits knows that it takes a small village of people to create a major Hollywood film. Therefore, in film studies, a central question has been: How do we understand authorship of the film text?

In the 1950s and 1960s, auteur theorists (François Truffaut, André Bazin, Andrew Sarris) posited that great films are the result of great directors. They claimed great directors have a recognizable signature style (visual and/or thematic) across their films. The emergence of the auteur theory represented a critical moment in film studies. It moved film analysis into an analogy with literary and art analysis, where it became firmly entrenched in popular and academic discourses. It helped establish film studies as a legitimate academic discipline in the United States because it moved films from social product to art. It also helped establish formal criteria for understanding film as art.

Authorship studies has undergone significant criticism and revision over the last fifty years. One strand of revisionist theory is collaborative authorship studies. These analyses recognize that the director is not the sole artistic visionary during the film production process. Collaborative authorship studies explore Hollywood cinema as a process among key workers (directors, screenwriters, producers, cinematographers, production designers, etc.) within the Hollywood industry. However, despite significant contributions to the field, collaborative authorship scholars have not examined every significant member or collaborative team of a Hollywood production.

Today, film editors still remain on the scholarly margins of authorship research.² Additionally, editing remains on the theoretical margins of contemporary film scholarship. The cause of this is three-fold. First, despite advances in collaborative authorship studies, the Hollywood film director is still largely regarded as the sole creative lynchpin upon which the film's success or failure ultimately lies. Therefore, each individual crew member often minimizes his/her own personal style, or vision, in order to enhance the director's creative vision.

Second, Classical Hollywood film editing—commonly referred to as the continuity aesthetic—is considered successful if it remains unnoticed, *if it remains invisible*. This continuity aesthetic refers to the style in which a narrative appears to unfold seamlessly before the audience. The Classical Hollywood style privileges a linear development of the narrative. The narrative (and each narrative event: the inciting incident, first and second turning point, etc.) should be motivated by the story's logic, and

the editing should support the narrative's psychological realism. A Classical Hollywood film privileges the story itself. It does not draw attention to the way it is constructed. In other words, the goal of the Classical Hollywood style is to make it *appear* invisible via continuity editing. Therefore, within this continuity aesthetic, the editor's ultimate goal is to hide his or her own labor. In order to broaden our understanding of editing and editors, it is necessary to make its invisible aesthetic visible. One way to do this is to examine specific instances of how and where a film editor contributes to a film in the post-production process.

Third, determining exactly how and where a film editor contributed to a film text during post-production is an incredibly difficult task. Scholars are not often allowed into Hollywood editing rooms during post-production in order to document the arduous step-by-step editing process. And, even if they were, it is impossible to travel back in time and sit in on editing sessions from movies previously released. Therefore, based solely on the film itself, it is nearly impossible to determine exactly who did what during post-production. Since first-hand post-production experience is difficult to obtain, film scholars must settle for the next best thing: documents, interviews, oral history, and archival evidence. Yet this evidence is inherently inadequate. It is unrealistic to assume that a director or editor will be able to recall accurately specific details about the post-production process for a twenty—or thirty—year-old film. And, as well, memory is subjective. Should the director and editor recall different versions of their contributions to a particular film, whose version—whose memory—should be privileged? Whose

² I would also include cinematographers, sound designers, set designers, and costume designers in this list,

memory should be ignored? These questions, although difficult to answer, should not be ignored because doing so marginalizes the film editor's role in the production process and obfuscates the editor's creative contributions to the Hollywood canon. So, what is the solution?

Film archive materials provide scholars with some evidence of the behind-the-scenes production process. This dissertation explores how film archives can contribute to knowledge about the post-production process. Archive materials provide scholars with a rich, but limited, field of information. Archives usually contain documents such as film scripts and correspondence between the director and producer but do not always include correspondence between the director and lower-level talent. As a result, film scholars often focus their research on the screenwriter, director, and producer because they have more access to materials and information about them. In turn, film archives collect and maintain more information about these production roles as a way to reflect and support dominant practices within film scholarship. As a result, lower-level talent is marginalized from both film scholarship and film archives.

My central research questions are: what kinds of information do film archives contain regarding the creative collaboration between the director and the editor? And, what does available archive material tell us about the changes and creative revisions in post-production particularly with regard to editing? To answer these questions, I conducted original archival research on the following films: *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967), *The Conversation* (1974), *Annie Hall* (1977), and *Raging Bull* (1980).

as well. However, a complete analysis of all these production roles is beyond the scope of this project.

For my purpose here, I situate editors' basic work roles in a historical and industrial context to shed light on their contributions to Classical Hollywood cinema and their subsequent collaborative role within the Hollywood Renaissance. The directors of these films (Arthur Penn, Francis Ford Coppola, Woody Allen, and Martin Scorsese)—inspired by European art cinema—challenged the invisible continuity aesthetic and often revealed the films' own illusory construction, thus highlighting the author (or authors) as a visible, creative presence in the text. These films reflect a highly creative era in the Hollywood industry and are well-known for the collaborative relationship between the directors and the editors. During the Hollywood Renaissance, the directors' intentions were to call attention to their films' style and technique, as my intention here is to call attention to the editors who helped create it. To accomplish this, I use archive documents, such as the shooting script, director's notes, and storyboards, in conjunction with published interviews and the films themselves as a way to enhance our understanding of the post-production process and as a creative strategy to move editing away from the margins of film scholarship.

In this first chapter I will provide a brief survey of what editors do, the auteur theory and its relation to the Hollywood Renaissance, an explanation of collaborative authorship theory, and a preview of the rest of the dissertation.

Hollywood Editors' Work Roles

Filmmaking and editing technology have changed greatly over the last seventy-five years. However, relative to other production technology, editing technology was

slow to develop and simple at first. Working throughout the teens and early 1920s, the editor was not required to master complicated technology. Editing involved the film, a clamp, a table, light box, scissors, and cement. To edit, or cut the film, editors would hand wind the film across a lightbox, then clamp, cut, and glue the negative print to transition between the desired shots. As films increased in length, editors needed a mechanized and more effective way to view film. Hollywood engineers remedied this through technological advances in editing equipment. By the mid-1920s, most Hollywood editors traded in their scissors and glue for the Moviola. According to Kristen Thompson:

As part of the general move toward automated assembly of the film, automatic splicing machines came into use in the industry . . . Workers, mostly women, sat making splices in a preordained order. Since they were making no decisions, they needed no time to consider options; automation would increase efficiency . . . it permitted an experienced worker to do four or five times as many splices as by hand. (296)

In addition to technological advances in picture editing, editors were also responsible for mastering sound technology.³ The advent of sound in 1927 complicated an editor's job. The editor was now responsible for the complicated task of synching the sound to the picture in addition to selecting the best shots, constructing sequences, and telling the best possible story with the available footage. Despite technological advances and increased productivity, editors in the mid-1920s still had little agency. They were long-term

³ For a more comprehensive analysis of the transition to sound technology see Walker; Salt; Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson.

contract workers with the major studios and cut according to a director's or producer's specifications. They were technicians hired for their ability to follow orders.

The move toward automation helped establish the Classical Hollywood continuity aesthetic. According to Thompson, by the mid-1920s, the Moviola

was in widespread use in studios and exchanges; as in its use with negatives, it added quality by making splices that would be less noticeable on the screen. Since a splice line on the screen calls attention to the cut, invisible splices helped the continuity system of editing. (296)

Techniques designed to hide the cut (glance-object cuts, the 180-degree rule, eye-line match-cuts, match-action cuts, etc.) are well documented (Fairservice; Dmytryk; Crittenden; Dancyger; Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson). These aesthetic techniques pre-determined in pre-production by the screenwriter, director, and cinematographer reveal as much about the film's direction as they do about the film's editing. They reveal how shots and sequences are constructed to appear invisible in the continuity aesthetic.

Once the film is shot, working within the Classical continuity aesthetic, the editor works on various levels: deciding what shot to use, where to begin it and where to end it, how long to hold each shot, and whether to recreate or reposition scenes or eliminate subplots which effect the film's narrative economy. The editor must also focus the audience's attention and interest across cut points. The editor's job is to reveal enough information to engage the viewer in the beginning of the film but also to withhold enough information to entice the viewer to stay and watch the end of the film. In addition, the editor determines pacing and tone of a film. According to Hollywood editor Walter Murch, editors' work roles fall into three categories: logistics (systematically managing footage), performance (selecting the right takes, intuiting how long to hold each take,

etc.), and structure (how to organize the overall structure of the story; when to reveal information, when to delay information, etc.) (Koppleman 204).

Hollywood editors' work roles have remained much the same from the Classical Hollywood era through the Hollywood Renaissance of the 1960s and 1970s and up until today.⁴ According to David Bordwell, Janet Staiger, and Kristen Thompson, the Classical Hollywood production era refers to a period of full vertical integration, detailed division of labor, long-term contracts, continuity scripts and editing, hierarchical management, and efficient production cycles (Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson). The Classical Hollywood studio system developed as a mass production system by 1917 largely as a function of economics and capitalism to produce films (Staiger 1985, 89). In order to maximize profit and efficiency, the classical mode of production included several key features: interchangeability, standardization, and assembly (Staiger 1985, 90-1). It created a detailed division of labor in order to ensure an efficient and cost effective production process. Within the studio system, each worker controlled a separate piece of the production process; the work separated into specific labor categories including those of producer, director, cameraman, and editor. This created a segmented but efficient and specialized labor force. The mode also involved a hierarchical system of production. From about 1910 until today, five management systems operated within Hollywood: director, director unit, central producer, producer unit, and package unit. Each system represented a different way to create a Hollywood film and privileged a different creative position within the production process. Historically, directors and producers had much

more agency—more individual influence and artistic control—than other workers within the hierarchical Hollywood mode of production. The lower-level labor force, (cinematographers, sound and lighting designers, and editors) had limited agency.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, an important distinction existed between cutters and editors.⁵ Cutters and editors working within the Classical Hollywood studio system had varying degrees of agency. Head editors chose which shots would be in the final film. Cutters assisted the editors in the physical act of cutting the celluloid, but they made no decisions about where or how to cut the film narrative. Cutters were perceived as technicians who executed the head editor's or director's decisions. According to Hollywood director and editor Edward Dmytryk, the Wagner Labor Relations Act in 1935 marked the transition from the term "cutter" to "editor" (1). He writes:

In an attempt to raise the status of the craft, which was considered by the less knowledgeable executives of Hollywood to be five or six rungs from the top of the filmmaker's ladder . . . beneath that of a director, the writer, the top actors, the producer, the photographer, the composer, and sometimes the set designer . . . it was decided that *film editor* had a more imposing sound than *film cutter*, and henceforth that became the official terminology. (1-2).

Despite the more prestigious title, however, film editors (unlike directors, producers, writers, and actors) are still considered lower-level talent. They do not command the

⁴ For a more information about the history and development of the Hollywood industry—and Classical aesthetic—see Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson and Salt.

⁵ For a detailed account of the differences between the terms editor, cutter, joiner, and projectionist see Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson (278). Throughout this project, I will use the general term "editor" to describe any worker who cuts the directed celluloid and assembles the footage into the finished film text.

same salaries as other talent, are not named in a film's marketing campaign, and are assumed to have little agency in the filmmaking process.⁶

Today, Hollywood film editors have varying levels of individual agency within their individual editorial departments but not within the overall production. This is due, in large part, to the industry union rules and labor contracts.⁷ Members of a Hollywood film editing department must first pay their dues before becoming part of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, or IATSE. They must establish a solid body of work and are then eligible to apply for union membership. However, according to Hollywood editor Bernard Balmuth, this is a Catch-22. He states that a

company cannot hire you unless your name is on the roster, and you cannot get your name on the roster until you are hired! But it is not as impossible as it may seem. . . . When you have worked for thirty days of a 365-day period for one signator employer or for ninety days of a 365-day period for more than one employer, you can file application with Contract Services and your last employer files a verification of your employment and the quality of your work. If you are approved, your name will entered on the roster and you then become a member of the Editors Guild, Local 776. (2)

IATSE was created in 1926 to protect the production crew regarding contracts and safe working conditions and to standardize work roles and processes. IATSE's union rules and regulations outline which members of the production team are responsible for each specific part of the production and post-production process.

⁶ For more information about marginalized production staff, see John Caldwell's *Production Culture* (2008). In it, he examines the trade images, imagined communities, and manufactured identities of "below-the-line" talent. *Production Culture* (2009) by Vicki Mayer, Miranda Banks, and John Caldwell also argues for the importance of "below- the-line" work and workers.

⁷ For a detailed account of the history of labor unions in Hollywood, see Nielsen and Mailes.

Under IATSE and the Editors Guild rules, the editor is contractually allowed to make the film's first, or rough cut. This is the editor's cut and it is typically the longest, most crude, version of the film. Generally, this version does not contain music or special effects. Instead, the editor quickly cuts it together as a general version of the future final cut. An editor typically works on the first cut simultaneous to principal photography and during the production phase. So while other crew members are rigging lights, constructing and decorating sets, and filming the individual shots, the editor is arranging the available footage into coherent scenes and sequences.⁸ During principal photography, the director will review the raw footage with an editor at the end of every day, discuss progress on set, and give the editor notes about preferred takes.⁹ However, during this phase the editor is contractually allowed to decide which takes to use and in what order to use them. Obviously, an editor works with the director (and producer) during all phases of editing to tell the best possible story but, at this time, the editor has first cut.

During production and throughout post-production, the editor also works with film editor apprentices and an assistant editor. An editing apprenticeship is by no means a glamorous job but a great way to learn the craft with hands-on experience. The film apprentice transports film, rewinds and cues film, runs errands for the editing department, and assists the assistant editor with organizing the overall film project. The assistant editor's job begins well before the director finishes shooting principle photography. The

⁸ It is important to note here that films are shot out of order. In other words, during principle photography, the editor only receives random, non-sequential pieces of a scene at a time. Therefore, the first cut is truly a rough cut. While it should resemble the shooting script, it is not uncommon for it to undergo serious revision in the months that follow.

⁹ This material, typically called the "dailies" refers to the amount of raw footage a director films by the end of each day.

assistant editor is responsible for setting up the cutting room. This includes ordering supplies and equipment and arranging the physical work space. The assistant editor is also responsible for managing many of the technical details (Ash). He, or she, attends screenings and keeps track of the director's (and the producer's) administrative notes and suggestions. He or she also organizes the footage and manages the film library. Then, the assistant editor works with the film editor to cut the dailies together, as they receive them, according to the shooting script. Other members of the editorial team also include the dialogue editor, sound effects editor, and the music editor. However, while these workers may be involved in the early stages of production, their primary work occurs during the post-production phase.

Once principle photography ends, the bulk of the post-production process begins.¹⁰ At this point, the director often moves into the editing room and works with the editor. Assuming that the editor is finished with his or her rough cut, they move on to the director's cut. Under union rules, motion picture directors have ten weeks after the completion of principle photography to finish this version of this film. According to The Director's Guild of America's contract

No one shall be allowed to interfere with the Director of the film during the period of the Director's Cut... The Director shall see the assembled sequences as soon as the Editor has assembled them in accordance with the Director's instructions during the photography of the picture, provided this will not delay the time and preparation of the assemblage of the sequences. If the Director does not give such directions, the Editor may proceed with the assemblage of the sequences without them. The Director shall then make whatever changes he or she deems necessary.

¹⁰ For a detailed description of individual post-production duties, please refer to the Motion Pictures Editors Guild.

During this time, the director may sit with the editor in the editing room everyday to supervise the entire post-production process. Or, he might instruct the editor on how he wants a particular scene or sequence cut and then check in with the editor periodically. The editor will manage his or her department members as they begin to edit sound, dialogue, music, and optical or special effects into the film. The goal here is for the director and editor to work together and shape the film into the best possible version before submitting it to the producer for his or her final approval.

The producer is involved throughout the post-production process. According to the Producer's Guild of America, a producer is contractually obliged to consult "with the director and the editor during the preparation of the first cut that is shown to the studio/financial entity" (Producer's Guild of America). As part of their "Code of Credits" the producer must also participate on the final cut, as well. Hollywood studio films are a blend of art and commerce, and it is the producer's job to seamlessly combine these elements. As a result, he or she acts as the middle man (or woman) between the post-production team and the studio executives. Therefore, it is important to note that producers often have authority over the "final cut."¹¹ As a result, the producer assists in the post-production process to create a film that—ideally—pleases both the creative team (the filmmakers) and their financial supporters (the executives).¹²

¹¹ This is mostly--but not always—true. According to Article 7 Section 505 of the Director's Guild of America "Basic Agreement" contract, "The Director shall prepare the Director's Cut of the film for presentation to the individual Producer and to the person designated in the Director's deal memo as having final cutting authority, in the ordinary course of business, over the motion picture" (69-70). Therefore, it is possible for someone besides the producer to have authority over the final cut.

¹² Whereas it may be compelling to argue that producers deserve collaborative authorship status because of participation throughout the production process and their authority over the final cut, that is beyond the scope of this project. Also, it is important here to distinguish between a film's collaborative authorship and

Before the final version is distributed to film audiences, the director and editor receive feedback from the producers and test audiences. Then, based on this feedback, they collaborate on the final cut. Together, and with the help of the editorial team, they re-work sequences and scenes to enhance the film's emotional impact and overall coherency and fine tune every element of the post-production process including, but not limited to, sound, dialogue, music, special effects, color correction, special effects, and the credit sequences. Once the producers approve every element of the final cut the editor locks the picture and sound and sends it to the studio for distribution.

Of course, these technical details and jobs have varied greatly over the years as editing and post-production technology have evolved. However, the post-production hierarchy remains consistent. Most film production departments contain apprentices, assistants, and department heads. In the film editing department, the apprentice answers to the assistant editor who answers to the editor. And similar to the other production departments, the department head answers to the director. This is a function of standardization and union regulations. The director oversees all creative areas of production. Within an industrial context, this is one reason why the director is usually invoked as the primary author of the text.

its production constraints. Although it is a delicate distinction, I would argue that collaborative filmmakers aim to create art within Hollywood's industrial and financial production constraints, whereas Hollywood producers and studio executives aim to create profit from Hollywood film art. One group warrants the "auteur" status, whereas the other does not.

The Auteur Theory

In 1943, André Bazin referred to the director's critical role in crafting a film, but it took over ten years before "auteurism" emerged as a force within French film theory and criticism. In 1948, Alexandre Astruc coined the phrase *camera-stylo* (camera pen). He referred to a filmmaker's ability to translate his abstract thought into cinematic expression. He claimed that film, like essays and novels before it, allowed the filmmaker to capture and share his ideas with the public. According to David Gerstner, "Astruc's emphasis on *la camera-stylo* functioned as a critical intervention to break the then current model of cinema's reliance on literature as its primary source of storytelling" (6). It was Astruc's attempt to elevate filmmaking to art, the filmmaker to author. *La camera-stylo* also expressed the individual filmmaker's *personal* vision and helped lay the foundation for the *cinema d'auteurs*.

François Truffaut extended Astruc's conception of the 'filmmaker as artist' in 1953. Truffaut was one of the *Cahiers du cinéma* critics—a group that included the film critics and eventual French New Wave film directors (Jean Luc Godard, Eric Rohmer, Jacques Rivette, and Claude Chabrol) who largely opposed French quality cinema but embraced some commercial, American cinema. These critics watched Hollywood films and applauded American directors such as Douglas Sirk, Alfred Hitchcock, Nicholas Ray, Vincent Minnelli, and Howard Hawks. Truffaut's seminal 1954 *Cahiers du cinéma* essay, "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema," attacked the French "quality" cinema. This tradition centered writers at the heart of the creative film process. Their primary job was to adapt quality novels to the screen. The director's job was to translate

the novel's psychological realism to film. Truffaut argued that cinema should be created and understood on its own merits, not as the bastard step-child of literature. He refused to privilege films based on their source matter. Instead, Truffaut emphasized cinema's visual aesthetic (*mise-en-scène*) as a way to disengage it from literary-based analysis. According to John Caughie, "the attention to *mise-en-scène*, even to the extent of a certain historically necessary formalism, is probably the most important positive contribution of auteurism to the development of a precise and detailed film criticism" (13). Truffaut called the directors of whom he approved "auteurs" to leverage film's cinematic possibilities by opening up the text beyond the written word to privilege its visual and radical possibilities. He also made the critical distinction between *auteurs* (as gifted artists) and *metteurs-en-scène* (as mere technical craftsmen). For Truffaut, *les auteurs du cinéma* mastered *mise-en-scène* and wrote themselves and their stories in images across their body of work.

The *Cahiers'* notion of auteurism is now labeled "Romantic Auteurism." It supposes the individual genius of the lone artist. In his 1957 *Cahiers* essay "La Politique des Auteurs," Bazin adopts Rivette's definition of an auteur as "someone who speaks in the first person" (45). According to Bazin, "The *politique des auteurs* consists, in short, of choosing the personal factor in artistic creation as a standard of reference, and then of assuming that it continues and even progresses from one film to the next" (45). This is a major difference between Truffaut and Bazin. Truffaut claimed the worst work of an *auteur* director was better than the best work of a *metteur-en-scène*. Bazin, on the contrary, believed that a work should be judged on its own merit, not on the basis of who

made it. He pointed out that auteurism was not a theory but a polemical policy set forth by some writers at *Cahiers*.

In 1962, Andrew Sarris brought auteurism to the United States when *Film Culture* published “*Notes on the Auteur Theory*.” In the article, Sarris extended the *Cahiers* auteur policy and coined the term “auteur theory.” His theory centered on three concentric circles correlating to technique, personal style, and interior meaning. The outer circle represented the director’s “technical competence.” The middle circle represented the director’s “distinguishable personality.” “Personality” referred to the director’s ability to display “certain recurring characteristics of style” within his films. According to Sarris, this referred to an auteur director’s “signature style.” “Interior meaning,” the inner circle, represented the director’s ability to shine within Hollywood’s restrictive industrial conditions (the studio system, hierarchical management, etc.). He saw the tension between the individual director and the Hollywood industry as an opportunity for an artist, an auteur, to emerge within and through the film text. According to Bill Nichols:

a frequent tenet of *auteur* criticism is that a tension exists between the artist’s vision and the means at his disposal for realizing it: studio pressure, genre conventions, star, demands, story requirements. These constraints are also seen as a source of strength, imposing discipline and prompting cunning subversions. (rpt. in Gerstner and Staiger 306)

Despite the restrictive industrial and commercial structures working against him, an auteur director would master and exert himself within the text through his visual mastery (rather than literary mastery of the script) of the *mise-en-scène*. For Sarris, the auteur theory celebrated the director’s ability to reveal his personality through repeating stylistic

or thematic elements within his body of work despite the industrial and commercial constraints.

Popular film critic Pauline Kael disapproved of Sarris's theory of evaluating movies. In her 1963 article "Circles and Squares," she skewered Sarris's auteur theory. One of Kael's main critiques against the auteur theory is that it is too reductionistic. She critiqued the idea that repeating elements reflect an auteur. According to Kael "it may be necessary to point out to auteur critics that repetition without development is decline" ("Circles and Squares" 13). For Kael, repeating elements within artworks was commonplace and did not guarantee great art. According to Kael, Sarris's "ideal *auteur* is the man who signs a long-term contract, directs any script that's handed to him, and expresses himself by shoving bits of style up the crevasses of the plots" ("Circles and Squares" 17).

Kael also critiqued the emphasis on *mise-en-scène* over story and criticized auteur critics who marginalized writer-directors "who are in the *best* position to use the film medium for personal expression" ("Circles and Squares" 18). She worried that the auteur theory provided a model for aspiring filmmakers that was anti-art and pro-mass-produced cinema. She believed that the auteur theory was a way to mobilize support for commercial cinema but would marginalize art and independent cinema because if the filmmaker was not faced with working with the tension that the industry created, then he was not truly an auteur. In fact, she went so far as to label the auteur theory "a dangerous theory—not only because it constricts the experience of the critics who employ it, but because it offers nothing but commercial goals to the young artists who may be trying to

do something in film” (“Circles and Squares” 25). Based on auteur theory, if that “something” involved unique (non-repeating or recurring) stylistic or thematic elements, was produced outside of Hollywood’s commercial and industrial constraints, and did not produce a distinguishable personality, then whoever created it is not an auteur. For Kael, the auteur theory was not a liberating, progressive way to approach film analysis. It was, instead, as reductive and constrictive as the commercial industry it supported.

Scholars continued to revise the auteur theory throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Peter Wollen and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith drew on the work of Ferdinand de Saussure and Claude Lévi-Strauss. Wollen’s and Nowell-Smith’s auteur-structuralist analyses combined linguistics and anthropology. Auteur-structuralism represented an attempt to make film criticism and analysis more objective, more scientific. According to Virginia Wright Wexman:

This approach identified the style of a given director with a series of structuring oppositions that recurred throughout his or her oeuvre. The scientific model behind such readings allowed the auteur-structuralist critics to practice a descriptive mode of analysis that moved them beyond impressionistic declarations of value that characterized Romantic auteurism. (4-5)

Romantic auteurism assumed the auteur director had cognitive agency during the filmmaking process. It assumed the director had full conscious knowledge of the consistent, recurring stylistic patterns throughout his films. As a result, it attributed sole authorship to the individual director. Auteur-structuralism, however, conceptualized the director’s agency and concept of “self” as a structure operating unconsciously within a text. According to Cahillie, in an auteur-structuralist analysis:

The author was the ‘bearer’ of the structure which emerged from the analysis, rather than its creator. (It has been foundational for structural linguistics and structural anthropology that users of language and myth were not conscious of the structures which they were reproducing.) The appeal to the ‘unconscious catalyst’ was a way of saying that the consistencies around which the film could be shown to be structures were the result of a particular and active set of relationships of which the author was one element—the principle of consistency which gave the compound its name—but which also included relations and conditions of production, ideology, technology, genre, etc. (126)

Auteur-structuralism was not without its critics. According to Robin Wood (1976) and Brian Henderson (1973), it was too reductive. It displaced the director too far from the details of the text by reducing him to a set of oppositional structures. It assumed only the structures give the text meaning. It also reduced the work of a film critic—what Caughie refers to as the “eureka” syndrome—to discovering the author through these oppositional patterns. The emergence of auteur-structuralism did, however, impact the direction of film scholarship. According to Caughie, “Its appropriation into film resulted not only in a break from *auteurism*, but a break also from empiricism and a resulting change in the way in which the function and activity of criticism is thought, particularly with respect to the position of the author” (129).

In recent years, film scholars have combined post-structuralism and auteur analysis. Post-structuralism, in contrast to structuralism, is not simply an attempt to locate scientifically the true meaning of a text based on its binary opposites. Instead, one strand represents “a new critical position . . . in which the reader of the text became its writer” (Gerstner 5). Drawing on Roland Barthes’s 1977 essay, “The Death of the Author,” this post-structuralist approach to authorship assumes the text’s meaning does not exist within

the text itself but within the individual reading the text. Or, to put it another way, the writer does not author the text; the reader does.

According to Janet Staiger in *Authorship and Film*, the poststructural death of the author approach is “a dodge” to the question of authorship. According to Staiger, “authorship does matter. It matters especially to those in non-dominant positions in which asserting even a partial agency may seem to be important for day-to-day survival or where locating moments of alternative practice takes away the naturalized privileges of normativity” (Gerstner and Staiger 27). Barthes’s essay coincided with the rise of auteur recognition for marginalized media producers: women, gay and lesbian auteurs, racial and ethnic minority auteurs. Barthes stripped agency away from the author as marginalized auteurs began to take center stage in the independent and avant-garde media productions.

Despite criticism against it, the auteur theory involved a new way of looking at cinema. It raised critical awareness about mise-en-scène to a new level. It provided a way to study the primary meaning (the dialogue, script) against the secondary meaning (mise-en- scène) in order to read the film subversively against the dominant or preferred meaning. It dislodged the visual text from the scripted text and opened up new possibilities for film analysis and criticism.

Auteur Cinema and the Hollywood Renaissance

To understand the historical significance of the auteur theory, it is also necessary to examine the social, industrial, and economic causes of the auteur director’s emergence

in the Hollywood Renaissance during the 1960s and 1970s when some directors attempted to stand out from the traditional norms of making Classical Hollywood films. According to David A. Cook, the Hollywood Renaissance “was an aberration in the film industry’s sixty-year history to date, one that came into being mainly by default at a time of economic and political crisis.” The period refers to “the European-style auteur cinema that prevailed briefly in America from 1967-1975” (xvii). Key factors in the emergence of the Hollywood Renaissance include: WWII, government intervention, the decline of the studio system and its producer-unit mode of production, suburban migration, the rise of television, the box office success of European art films, a financial recession, and the emergence of the youth market.

Post World War II represents a significant shift in the Hollywood industry. In fact, according to Thomas Schatz, “the postwar era soon proved to be the most turbulent and crises-ridden period in the industry’s history” (Schatz 1997, 3). Pre-WWII, the Classical Hollywood studio system enjoyed relative stability and economic success. Post WWII, however, the film industry became unstable. According to Schatz, “1946 marked the culmination of a five-year ‘war boom’ for Hollywood, with record revenues of over \$1.5 billion and weekly ticket sales of 90 to 100 million” (Schatz 1993, 11). Two years later, however, the industry faced a major setback. In 1948, the Supreme Court passed the Paramount Decree which forced the five major studios (Paramount, Loew’s Inc. which owned MGM, Warner Bros., Twentieth-Century Fox, and RKO) to divest their theater chains. This, and several other financial changes, effectively split up the vertically-integrated and financially stable studio system. In the mid to late 1940s, the industry

suffered other setbacks as well. Senator Joe McCarthy launched an anti-communism investigation of the industry. It caused divisions within the ranks and crippled over one hundred careers of the Hollywood elite. The industry also struggled with post-war regulations in Europe which prevented it from easily exporting films to key foreign markets.

Film attendance also declined. Postwar suburban migration negatively affected the film industry. As servicemen returned from the war overseas, they began to settle down with their expanding families in the suburbs, outside of major city centers and away from downtown, first-run theaters. The popularity of television continued to increase. According to Janet Wasko, “The importance of television for the film industry during the 1950s cannot be overstated” (127). Movie audiences stayed home and became more selective about their filmed entertainment. As a result, box office revenues suffered.

Throughout the 1950s, the major film companies continued to struggle. Without guaranteed exhibition profits to rely on, the studios were forced to adjust their operations. In order to avoid financial ruin, some majors leveraged their studio properties as financial assets. Television’s increasing popularity demanded film entertainment content so the majors leased studio space to independent producers. By the late 1950s, independent productions became the norm not the exception. The industry received another setback as union members waged major strikes against the companies until they dissolved long-term studio contracts. Year-to-year contracts took their place. Directors, producers, writers, and actors were now free to work with different companies, on multiple projects. This shifted film production to an emphasis on “packaged” films. According to Geoff King:

The necessary ingredients of production were assembled film by film, or in small portfolios. A producer or increasingly frequently an agent would take responsibility for the organization of a project. A script would be written or rights secured for the adaptation of a property in another form. A director, stars and other key personnel would be assembled. These would constitute the basic 'package,' for which finance would then be raised. (28)

With the dissolution of long-term labor contracts and the rise in independent, package productions, the freelance market increased. Directors were no longer bound to a one studio for an extended length of time. Instead, they contracted with individual studios on a film-to-film basis. As a result, the market for talented and innovative film directors increased—ultimately shifting power from the studios to the better director.

Several factors contributed to the emergence of the Hollywood Renaissance including, first, the shift in power from the studios to some directors and, second, the decline in movie attendance. By the 1970s, the industry was in a major financial decline. According to G. King, "In 1946, weekly cinema attendance in the United States was about 90 million. By 1950 it had plunged to 60 million. In 1960 the figure was 40 million. A low of some 17 million was reached in the early 1970s" (24). The industry was desperate. Third, the success of the French New Wave shook the Hollywood box office because it stripped money away from Hollywood productions. But more significantly, its prestige was greater than that of Hollywood which seemed to be entertainment and not art. Although the New Wave was partly to blame for the industry's financial crisis, it pointed toward a potential solution: a new style of filmmaking. Hollywood considered aesthetic experimentation a tactic to boost poor ticket sales.

Fourth, throughout the 1960s, *cinema d'auteurs* gained momentum on U.S. soil. According to Peter Biskind, “The new power of directors was legitimized by its own ideology, ‘auteurism’” (16). This discourse introduced the concept of an auteur director’s “signature style” into American consciousness and, coupled with the newfound power, paved the way for a new generation of filmmakers. This combination—the European, art-cinema influence and the emergence of the American auteur director—represented a crucial break within the industry. It transitioned Hollywood films away from the purely classical and continuity aesthetic toward a more modernist and visible one. Instead of hiding their own construction, some Hollywood films began to reveal—and revel—in display instead. This also helped legitimate these Hollywood films as an art.

Fifth, studios were scrambling to meet the needs of the newly discovered “youth market”: urban and suburban, middle-class teenagers with significant discretionary income and a penchant for repeat viewing of the favorite films (Cook 65). The convergence of these five factors resulted in the period known as the Hollywood Renaissance. In order to pull itself out of the decline, Hollywood turned to a new, younger, flashier generation of filmmakers in order connect to the youth market and boost ticket sales.

The Hollywood Renaissance was largely a strategic aesthetic initiative. The turbulent post-WWII society (the baby boom, suburban migration, the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, the sexual revolution) affected the Hollywood industry. Hollywood negotiated the contextual turbulence through adaptation and experimentation. According to G. King:

The Hollywood Renaissance is often understood as a response to, or part of, a range of social upheavals in the United States in the late 1960s and early 1970s ... The films of the Hollywood Renaissance have been celebrated for offering some degree of radical political potential, in both content and departures from classical style. (8)

The domestic box office success of the French New Wave and its directors—Godard, Truffaut, Rohmer, Rivette, Resnais—influenced Hollywood Renaissance’s response. The New Wave’s art cinema aesthetic often called attention to the film’s narration, and its commercial success in the U.S. paved the way for young, artistic, American directors to emulate the Europeans. Hollywood sought out new directors with big ideas, innovative techniques, and a fresh perspective to connect with younger film audiences. In return, major studios promised them artistic freedom. It was a calculated risk at a critical moment in film history. The industry turned to the “movie brats”—“a film-school educated and/or film-critical generation who began making commercial American cinema with an élan that, for some, recalled the emergence of the French New Wave” (Elsaesser 20). The directors included Martin Scorsese, Francis Ford Coppola, George Lucas, Stephen Spielberg, Robert Altman, Woody Allen, and Arthur Penn. These directors were able to enter the industry and, yet, maintain creative control over their films, and Hollywood was able to market the directors as auteurs to spark new interest (and profit) in studio-financed films.

Film scholars often point to Penn’s *Bonnie and Clyde* and 1967 as the start of the new wave in Hollywood cinema (Schatz; Biskind; Kramer; G. King; Cook). But consensus about what to call the new wave ends there. The Hollywood Renaissance and

the term “New Hollywood” are often used interchangeably to describe Hollywood production during the mid-to-late 1960s and 1970s. According to Schatz, the term “New Hollywood” generally “applies to the American cinema after World War II, when Hollywood’s entrenched ‘studio system’ collapsed and commercial television began to sweep the newly suburbanized national landscape” (Schatz 1993, 8- 9). For Schatz, key factors within New Hollywood include: auteur cinema, the emergence of ancillary markets, mergers and conglomeration, the majors’ shift from film production to distribution, the explosion of home video and cable markets, and the blockbuster syndrome. Cook’s definition of the Hollywood Renaissance is more specific. According to Cook, the Hollywood Renaissance refers to “the European-style auteur cinema that prevailed briefly in America from 1967-1975” (2000 xvii). Peter Kramer, however, refers to 1967-1975 as New Hollywood. Alexander Horwath also uses the term New Hollywood, but for him it occurred between 1967 and 1976 (10). Noel King’s general definition of the New Hollywood era is:

a brief window of opportunity . . . when an adventurous new cinema emerged, linking the traditions of classical Hollywood genre filmmaking with the stylistic innovations of European art cinema. This concept of ‘the new’ is predicated on the new audience demographic making its aesthetic preferences felt by opting for a new kind of cinema, alliteratively described by Andrew Sarris as a cinema of ‘alienation, anomie, anarchy, and absurdism’. (20)

Robert Kolker concurs with Sarris’s sentiment about alienation as a characteristic.

Kolker’s *A Cinema of Loneliness* explores the 1960s and 1970s as the modernist era in Hollywood cinema—when the formal aesthetic was transparent and alienation was a recurring theme.

Despite the lack of agreement on labels, the terms “New Hollywood” and “Hollywood Renaissance” are not mutually exclusive. In fact, I would argue that the Hollywood Renaissance occurred during the New Hollywood era. These terms may not be at odds with one another but serve to complement each other and our understanding of American cinema during the 1960s and 1970s. For my purposes here, I combine Cook’s definition of the Hollywood Renaissance (“the European-style auteur cinema that prevailed briefly in America”) and Biskind’s periodization of New Hollywood between 1967 and 1980. Both Biskind and Kolker point to Michael Cimino’s *Heaven’s Gate* as the movie debacle that ended that period of intense auteur cinema in the United States. According to Kolker, it “proved that directors who once made money (as Cimino did with *The Deer Hunter* in 1978) would not necessarily do it again, despite all their pretensions” (xiii). For Biskind, *Heaven’s Gate* ended an era. He writes in 1998:

The thirteen years between *Bonnie and Clyde* in 1967 and *Heaven’s Gate* in 1980 marked the last time it was really exciting to make movies in Hollywood, the last time people could be consistently proud of the pictures they made, the last time the community as a whole encourage good work, the last time there was an audience that could sustain it. (17)

Although that assessment of the post-1980s is debatable, I define the Hollywood Renaissance as the European-style auteur cinema that prevailed briefly in America from 1967-1980 during the New Hollywood era. I have situated my research within this period (1967-1980) because the Hollywood Renaissance represents a critical moment in film aesthetics and film scholarship. It represents a time when Hollywood’s invisible or illusionist aesthetic changed somewhat and celebrated the director but continued to conceal the editor. Despite the French New Wave’s influence on Hollywood, film

scholarship continued to ignore the film editors' critical contributions to this new aesthetic. According to Ralph Rosenblum and Robert Karen:

there are some questions about film editors that no one knows and no one may ever know . . . How instrumental was editor Henri Colpi in the revolutionary techniques initiated by Alain Resnais's *Night and Fog*, *Hiroshima Mon Amour*, and *Last Year at Marienbad*? What do filmmakers Jean-Luc Godard, François Truffaut, and Eric Rohmer owe to their collaboration with editor Cécile Decugis? . . . The producers, directors, and the editors themselves have all maintained almost total silence on these questions. (4)

In this dissertation, I use the available archive materials and attempt to answer these questions about aesthetic contributions for *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967, Penn/Dede Allen), *The Conversation* (1974, Coppola/Walter Murch), *Annie Hall* (1977, Allen/Rosenblum), and *Raging Bull* (1980, Scorsese/Thelma Schoonmaker.)

I chose these case studies for a variety of reasons. First, as I mentioned earlier, film scholars often point to *Bonnie and Clyde* (and 1967) as the start of the new wave in American cinema.¹³ Therefore, these films effectively span the Hollywood Renaissance era (1967-1980). Second, these editors serve as a small but representative sample of Hollywood Renaissance editors working with now famous directors. Allen's, Murch's, Rosenblum's, and Schoonmaker's participation in creative editing styles helped define the 1970s as an innovative aesthetic period in Hollywood history. These films effectively challenge Classical Hollywood's invisible continuity aesthetic, and as a result, the editing is more visible here. Third, access to materials (book chapters, interviews, and DVD

¹³ *The Graduate* (1967) and its editor Sam O'Steen is another possible case study due to its box office success, appeal to the youth market, and alienation theme. *Jaws* and editor Verna Fields (often credited with "saving" *Jaws* in the cutting room) would also be a good case study, but I did not choose *Jaws*

commentaries) is a major factor in choosing these particular films. I chose films and editors about whom I could find information. The materials provide anecdotal insights and textual evidence about their work. Fourth, access to archival material is another reason why I chose these films as my case studies. The Harry Ransom Center (HRC) in Austin, Texas, contains key *Annie Hall* archive materials that corroborate Rosenblum's claims about *Annie Hall*'s creative evolution during the post-production process. The Harry Ransom Center also houses the Robert DeNiro collection and, specifically, the *Raging Bull* storyboards. The Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences archive in Los Angeles, California, has available archive materials from *Bonnie and Clyde* (an unpublished script dated September 6, 1966) and *The Conversation* (a revised draft from November 13, 1972, and a final draft from November 20, 1972).

Finally, a strong director-editor, multi-film collaboration marks each case study. Allen and Penn worked on five films together—*Bonnie and Clyde*, *Alice's Restaurant*, *Little Big Man*, *Night Moves*, and *Missouri Breaks*. Murch and Coppola worked on four films together—*The Conversation*, *The Godfather*, *The Godfather Part II*, and *Apocalypse Now*. Rosenblum and Allen worked on five films together—*Bananas*, *Love and Death*, *Sleepers*, *Annie Hall*, and *Interiors*. Schoonmaker and Scorsese have worked on twenty-five films together—*Street Scenes*, *Raging Bull*, *The King of Comedy*, *After Hours*, *The Color of Money*, *Bad*, *The Last Temptation of Christ*, *New York Stories*, *Made in Milan*, *Goodfellas*, *Cape Fear*, *The Age of the Innocence*, *Casino*, *Kundun*, *Mio Viaggio in Italia II*, *Bringing out the Dead*, *Gangs of New York*, *The Aviator*, *The*

because it marks a significant shift away from the auteur-inspired Hollywood Renaissance toward the New

Departed, The Key to Reserva, Shutter Island, The Invention of Hugo Cabaret, Silence, The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt, and Sinatra. These long-standing director-editor pairings point toward the importance of a strong director-editor relationship.

These directors repeatedly chose these specific editors to work with on several occasions. Therefore, these repeated partnerships suggest a deliberate post-production relationship that is creative and mutually supportive. However, for my purposes here I have limited my scope to four early films in each collaboration. This dissertation examines what information is available about these particular cinematic collaborations. In the end, however, I hope to open up a critical dialogue about editing and collaborative authorship in the New Hollywood.

Theoretical Framework and Methods

Collaborative authorship is the theoretical model I will use to frame my discussion. Unlike the classic romantic-auteur theory that claims the director is a film's creative force, collaborative authorship recognizes that Hollywood film production is a collaborative process. Hundreds of people work together to produce one film. As a result, privileging the director as the primary author of the text marginalizes the other laborers who work on the film. It ignores the complexity of inter-organizational relationships (within the simple film production and Hollywood industry in general) and discounts individual workers' creative contributions to the film text. In addition, it "does not recognize the idea of collective authorship or creative synergy: the possibility that two

Hollywood blockbuster mentality and a return to invisibility.

people (say, a director and editor) can achieve more working together than in a fixed hierarchy of artist/director and technician” (Perkins and Stollery 8).

In recent years, several scholars have attempted to broaden the concept of authorship to include other laborers besides the director as key components within the authorship process (Carringer; Gaut; Lane; Lev 1998 , Perkins and Stollery; Caldwell, Mayer, and Banks 2009; Schatz 1998). According to Berys Gaut:

Rather than rigidly categorizing films by their directors, films should be multiply classified: by actors, cameraman, editors, composers, and so on. The career paths of all cinematic artists need to be traced, showing how their work adapts to new contexts, demonstrating how each interaction alters the ingredients and flavours of the cinematic pot-pourri. Sometimes the trail of a non-director’s career will be the best way to follow significant developments in film history. (165)

Robert Carringer provides a detailed account of multiple-person, cinematic authorship. In the article “Who Really Wrote *Citizen Kane*?” Carringer explores the production history and popular discourse surrounding the authorship of *Citizen Kane*. He outlines the debate about who is creatively responsible for key moments within *Citizen Kane*. Director Orson Welles claims that he was responsible for basing the story on William Randolph Hearst. However, according to film critic Pauline Kael and Sara Mankiewicz (*Kane* screenwriter Herman Mankiewicz’s widow), this was Herman Mankiewicz’s idea. In fact, according to Carringer, Kael’s article “Raising Kane” was “a classic piece of journalistic exposé. Kael brought two principal charges: that Welles conspired to deprive Mankiewicz of screen credit and that Mankiewicz wrote the entire script” (48-9). To investigate these claims, Carringer does archival research and charts the film’s evolution. In order to assign specific instances of collaborative authorship,

Carringer uses lawyer's letters, contracts, radio broadcasts, multiple screenplay drafts, the final screenplay, production notes, budget reports, Screen Writers' Guild proposals, trade press documents, and interviews. Based on this evidence, Carringer claims that Mankiewicz contributed "the story frame, a cast of characters, various individual scenes, and a good share of the dialogue . . . Welles added the narrative brilliance" (Carringer 70). Carringer concludes that *Citizen Kane* is, indeed, a strong example of collaborative authorship.¹⁴

Carringer's analysis broadens the concept of singular authorship and reframes it in terms of collaborative authorship. This useful methodology attempts to complicate the classic question: Who is the author of the text? The question implies singular authorship. The collaborative authorship approach reframes the standard question of who authored a text to ask: who *are* the authors of the text? How many? What kinds of agency are available to them within the mode of production? Where have they authored the text and how did they do it?

One limitation of this approach, as a model of reworking the auteur theory, is that it only accounts for one film. Carringer only accounts for *Citizen Kane*. Classic auteur theory, however, tries to account for an array of films. It examines a director's entire body of work in order to describe authorial status as the consistent factor across the oeuvre. Classic auteur theory accounts for one director whereas a collaborative model may account for several authors for only one film. Carringer, however, is not trying to re-

¹⁴ Carringer also wrote a more detailed account of this film entitled *The Making of Citizen Kane*. In it, he examines Welles's collaboration on scripting, art direction, and cinematography. Another excellent example of a collaborative authorship is Peter Lev's analysis of *The Big Sleep* (1988). In his essay

write auteur theory. His specific analysis is not an attempt to provide a general claim about authorship. It does, however, highlight the complexity of collaborative film authorship within the Hollywood industry.

A different approach to collaborative authorship than the single-film study is to examine multiple films with similar collaborators to sort out individual agency. In the essay "Stepping out from Behind the Grand Silhouette: Joan Harrison's Films of the 1940's," Christina Lane provides a detailed account of Joan Harrison's collaborations with Alfred Hitchcock. She charts Harrison's evolution in the Hollywood film industry from solo screenwriter to producer and key Hitchcock collaborator. The questions that Lane asks are: How did Harrison's particular interests and concerns influence Hitchcock's work? At what points did she rewrite the director's narrative contributions and at what point did he rewrite hers? In order to answer these questions, Lane examines Harrison's solo projects and her work with Hitchcock. According to Lane, "By placing her work in the multiple contexts of historical period, industrial environment, and authorship debates, this chapter will identify various textual points at which Harrison either did or did not have filmmaking agency" (99). Lane examines the way that Harrison was able to insert her preferences for transgressing 1940s gender norms within Hollywood films. Using Harrison's solo projects and archival documents as evidence (interviews, production files, PCA files, the *Phantom Lady* pressbook, etc.), Lane is able to isolate recurring themes within her work. Lane then compares Hitchcock's work without Harrison to his work with her and concludes that Harrison did, indeed, influence

examines the film's authorship as the related contributions among the novelist, producer-director,

his films. According to Lane, Harrison's "authorial agency provides a much needed microhistory as a counterpoint to the imposing master-history associated with Hitchcock's legacy" (113).

In the chapter "Editing, Authorship, and Collaboration," Roy Perkins and Martin Stollery position themselves among recent books that highlight film editors (LoBrutto; Oldham; Ondaatje). The other books rely on interviews with editors as a way to establish their contributions to a film. Likewise, Perkins and Stollery highlight specific instances in which an editor's labor contributed to the director's auteur status.¹⁵ According to Perkins and Stollery:

The purpose of emphasizing collaboration is not to downgrade the role of the director, but to identify and understand the significance of each role within a complex interactive process. An efficient system of film production is based on the differentiation of skills, and the principle that specialization enhances competence. (9)

Throughout the book, Perkins and Stollery attempt to contextualize the editor and editing within the mode of production. They highlight individual instances of "the editor as author" and also point to how the editor (and editing) functions as a specific production component within the larger film industry. In this regard, Perkins and Stollery's book is a sociology of production. It is concerned with analyzing how workers are socialized into work and roles. According to Paul DiMaggio and Paul Hirsch, there are three approaches for studying "artistic production systems" (737). The first approach is to examine functions, roles, and careers. The second is to emphasize industries and processes. And

screenwriter, actors, and specific industry/business arrangements.

¹⁵ See also Rosenblum, and Koppleman.

the third approach is to emphasize total systems and complex interrelations among culture-producing systems. Perkins and Stollery combine the first two approaches within their analysis of film editors within the film industry. They examine an editor's specific day-to-day functions and roles and contextualize editors within the larger industry.

Carringer, Lane, and Perkins and Stollery all provide useful models for studying collaborative authorship. Carringer provides a model for a close reading of collaborative authorship on one text. Lane provides a model for identifying collaborative authorship (and non-directorial agency) across a variety of texts. And Perkins and Stollery provide a strong argument for an organizational and sociological model for highlighting the often invisible authorship of film editors. And while these texts may be read in isolation from one another, reading them together points toward a valuable intersection of ideas about collaborative authorship. For example, what are the various ways that these models of collaborative authorship may be used to establish the editor as a collaborative author? Using Carringer's model, it is possible to examine the production history of one specific text to determine its collaborative, post-production authorship. If the archival documents are available as evidence, it is possible to compare a shooting script to the finished, edited film to determine how a director and editor re-structured—or re-wrote it—during the post-production process. Or, using Lane's model, it would be possible to study an editor's work to determine if he or she had any authorial agency or were collaborative authors on certain films. For example, it would be possible to study a director's films with various editors and then compare those films to a variety of films the director made with a specific editor. Were certain recurring editing and stylistic devices to occur repeatedly in

the films on which the director worked with the specific editor (but not occur in the films on which worked with other editors), it would be possible to argue for attributing agency and authorship of those features to the editor.

According to Caughie, understanding the “author, as one level among several which produced meaning in the text” is “liberal *auteurism*” (Caughie 14). It is applying authorship to a wide variety of factors, not only to the director of the film text. But does liberal *auteurism* weaken the *auteur* theory? Does it destroy the idea of a director’s or other key worker’s signature style? No. I do not think so. Another way to think about Caughie’s use of the word “liberal” is to think of it as progressive or democratic. It is a way of moving marginalized production laborers into the center of the Hollywood industry and to the forefront of film scholarship. It is a way of highlighting their vital effort, craft, skill, creativity, innovation, and artistic contributions to film texts. Additionally, it provides the opportunity to expand the possible answers to a question that just will not go away: Who is/are the author/s of a film text?

Methods of Historical Analysis

To analyze the features of the case-study films, I use Neo-Formalism and Neo-Aristotelian critical methods.¹⁶ I outline their plot structure and examine the aesthetic practices within the texts, particularly their narrational methods involving editing choices. I have also reviewed the editors’ and directors’ interviews about the post-production process and the available archival materials (storyboards, scripts, etc.) at The Harry

Ransom Center in Austin, Texas, and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in Los Angeles, California.

My research examines how the storyboards and shooting scripts compare with or deviate from the final film text. The shooting script is the film's overall blueprint. It contains explicit instructions about how the scenes should be lit, decorated, and shot and how the film itself should be edited together. Therefore, I argue that any editing discrepancies between the shooting script and the final film were the result of creative revisions during post-production. As far as the evidence permits, I try to consider whether attributing agency to specific members of the collaborative post-production team is possible.

There are, of course, limitations to this approach. First and foremost, I was not present in the editing room during the post-production process. Therefore, without a first-hand blow-by-blow account, it is impossible to determine exactly who did, or suggested, what creative editing alteration during post-production. As a result, part of my analysis is guesswork, at best, but it is also an educated hypothesis based on my own real life experience as an editor and on studying many accounts of what happens during editing. Even when the archive material does reveal editing discrepancies between the shooting script and the final film text, it usually does not reveal which specific member of the editorial department was responsible for it. Was it the director? The editor? The assistant editor? The film editor apprentice? Or some combination, thereof? It may be possible that any member of the editorial department suggested creative changes to the films.

¹⁶ See Staiger's *Media Reception Studies* as a source for describing these textual methods.

However, when this information is not explicit, I invoke the film's primary editor as the departmental figurehead responsible for making these decisions or agreeing with them since the editor heads the hierarchy of the division of labor. Of course, in the analysis that follows, I will highlight when this information is able to be determined. However, individual contributions to the post-production process are not always easy to know. Therefore, when this information is not explicit, I attribute editing decisions to the collaboration of the director and the editor.

Chapter Outline

The following case studies examine the relationships, specific cinematic contributions, and collaborative authorships between key Hollywood Renaissance directors and editors. The central guiding questions throughout the chapters are: what kinds of information do film archives contain regarding the creative collaboration between the director and the editor? And, what does the available archive material tell us about the changes and creative revisions in post-production particularly with regard to editing?

Chapter two explores Arthur Penn and Dede Allen's collaborative authorship on *Bonnie and Clyde*. It explores literature (in the popular and academic press) about *Bonnie and Clyde*—its production history, critical reception, and socio-historical context within the Hollywood Renaissance—and Penn's directorial reputation. Using *Bonnie and Clyde*'s final script and Warner Bros.'s archival materials, this chapter investigates where and how Penn and Allen altered the narrative in the post-production process. The three

main differences between *Bonnie and Clyde*'s final script and the film itself occur in the main titles, the opening sequence, and the climax. According to Allen, *Bonnie and Clyde*'s pacing and energy should be attributed to Penn (LoBrutto) yet he credits her with some of the film's success (Academy).

Chapter three details Francis Ford Coppola and Walter Murch's collaborative relationship. It explores their early days together as co-founders of Zoetrope Studios in San Francisco and, in particular, pays special attention to their collaboration on *The Conversation* (1974). It outlines *The Conversation*'s production history and archival materials and explores literature (in the popular and academic press) about *The Conversation* and Coppola's authorship status. Using archive copies of the script (a revised draft from November 13, 1972, and a final draft from November 20, 1972) from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences this chapter confirms Murch's major claims about his contributions to *The Conversation* that the post-production process: 1) made the main character more sympathetic, 2) enhanced the suspense plotline, 3) clarified the narrative's incoherence through his editing, and 4) provided audio production skills. Murch is credited as the supervising editor on *The Conversation*. He supervised the overall post-production process, including both sound and picture. Richard Chew, however, is credited as the film's principal film editor and remains largely absent from scholarship about this film.¹⁷ This chapter inserts him—as a collaborative author--into *The Conversation*'s critical discourse.

¹⁷ Murch himself mentions Chew in Koppleman and Ondaatje, yet Chew is virtually absent from the discussions in Schumacher and Cowie. Also, Julie Zales, the assistant editor, is entirely absent from all the

Chapter four examines Woody Allen and Ralph Rosenblum's collaborative authorship on *Annie Hall* (1977). It outlines *Annie Hall's* production history and explores literature (in the popular and academic press) about *Annie Hall* and Allen's authorship. In his book *When the Shooting Stops... the Cutting Begins*, Rosenblum claims the final version of *Annie Hall* was not the film Allen intended to create. According to Rosenblum, the first cut of the film focused on Allen's character (Alvy Singer), not on the Alvy-Annie love story. Rosenblum's claim is that he and Allen re-cut and, ultimately, re-structured the film from the surreal and non sequitur exploration of Alvy's joyless life into a successful love story between Alvy and Annie Hall. This chapter explores *Annie Hall* archive materials at the Harry Ransom Center which supports Rosenblum's claims.

Chapter five outlines Martin Scorsese and Thelma Schoonmaker's collaborative relationship with particular attention to *Raging Bull* (1980). It outlines *Raging Bull's* production history through archival materials and explores literature (in the popular and academic press) about *Raging Bull* and Scorsese's directorial status. This chapter contradicts Scorsese's claim that his detailed storyboards directly correspond to the film's final editing scheme. The storyboards do correspond to many identical shots and sequences in the film. However, he and Schoonmaker deviate from the storyboards throughout the film—especially during the film's climax. During the climax, they rearrange key moments, use non-continuity editing, and insert jump cuts into the scene

literature and the archive materials. As such, I am unable to expand on her contributions—if any—to the film, but want to acknowledge her here, none the less.

where none were originally planned. In the end, this chapter argues that their post-production collaboration helped secure Scorsese's status as an auteur director.

My conclusion, chapter six, highlights the major themes that unite these case studies in terms of both their possibilities and limitations. While acknowledging the limits of my analysis, I reinforce the value of script-to-screen, collaborative authorship research that centrally locates the director and editor's post-production collaboration as part of the authorship process. I expect this research will be of particular interest to film scholars, film editors, and other marginalized practitioners within the Hollywood industry. In the end, I hope this project inspires a new way of looking at authorship and moves editors from the margins of authorship studies, giving them a more prominent and well-deserved place within film scholarship.

Chapter Two - Bonnie and Clyde

No discussion of the Hollywood Renaissance would be complete without the inclusion of Warner Bros.'s *Bonnie and Clyde* because it is often referred to as *the* film to usher in a new age in Hollywood (Schatz 1993; Biskind 1998; Kramer 2005; Cook 2002). The film's pre-production coincided with the collapse of the original Warner Bros. studio. As a result, it represents a critical moment in American cinema and a changing of the old Hollywood guard. In 1967, it was out with the old, traditional studio system and in with the new European auteur-inspired directors and youth audience. According to Lester Friedman, *Bonnie and Clyde* "clearly marked a turning point in American film history, as movies made under the once powerful studio system gave way to more independent, experimental, and youth-oriented films" (7). Also, the socio-historical context surrounding *Bonnie and Clyde* is extremely important to the film's—and the Hollywood Renaissance's—overall significance.

In the late 1960s, America was still reeling from the civil rights movement, its continued involvement in the Vietnam War, and widespread, deadly political protests. The country was divided and its citizens' emotions were raw. *Bonnie and Clyde's* release in 1967 hit a cultural nerve. Its realistic depiction of sex and violence stunned audiences and critics alike. However, the youth audience identified with the attractive and subversive main characters. Like the 1930s, youthful, Depression-era gangsters before them on-screen, *Bonnie and Clyde's* primary audiences were also reacting against restrictive and hostile cultural conditions. According to Friedman:

The film stood at a profoundly significant cultural crossroads: a point where American values veered from a comfortable fifties' mentality to a more complicated reconfiguration of the world; where the old Hollywood system cracked under the impact of new ideas and technologies . . . where visual styles incorporated European aesthetics; where film became as intellectually legitimate as literature and painting; where sex and violence replaced romance and innuendo; where revolutionary political fervor overcame moderate activism; where a youthful film audience took possession of America's sensibilities. All this is important for understanding the context that generated the film as well as the central role that the film played in bringing these conflicts and transformations into clear focus. (3)

The film made a huge impact on Hollywood as a political statement, a nostalgic timepiece, and a work of art.

***Bonnie and Clyde's* Production History and Collaborative Authorship**

Five main individuals responsible for *Bonnie and Clyde's* collaborative authorship are screenwriters Robert Benton and David Newman, producer/star Warren Beatty, director Arthur Penn, and editor Dede Allen. Benton and Newman had the idea to fictionalize the lives of real-life gangsters Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow while working at *Esquire Magazine*. They co-wrote the screenplay over several months and then began to fantasize about whom they could convince to direct it. They both loved European cinema and viewed *Bonnie and Clyde* as a possible auteur film. They believed its stark violence alongside its youthful and controversial subject matter (Clyde's sexuality, in particular) mandated the necessity for a creative and independent director.¹⁸

¹⁸ According to Newman and Benton, in the original screenplay, Clyde was bisexual. The screenplay also included a ménage à trois scene between Bonnie, Clyde, and another man. However, Penn cautioned them against alienating their audience so they made Clyde impotent instead (Newman and Benton "Lightning in a Bottle" 28).

Also, they sought an auteur director for it because, according to them, *Bonnie and Clyde* “is about style and people who have style. It is about people whose style set them apart from their time and place so that they seemed odd and aberrant to the general run of society” (Newman and Benton, “Lightning in a Bottle” 13). For them, it was important that whoever directed *Bonnie and Clyde* truly embody and showcase an alternative film style outside of the Classical Hollywood norm.

Benton and Newman originally approached François Truffaut to direct the picture (Wake and Hayden). They gave Helen Scott (an *Esquire Magazine* contact who ran the French Film Office in New York) a copy of the treatment, and, after reading it, she recommended it to Truffaut. One month later, Truffaut arrived in New York to meet with Benton and Newman. They discussed the treatment and the schedule. According to Mark Harris:

some of [Truffaut’s] ideas were so fully thought through that it became clear he was already shooting and editing at least some sequences from the treatment in his head. His suggestion to cut from Bonnie scribbling out her self-aggrandizing poem for the newspapers to the newspaper itself in the hands of the Texas Ranger, then back to Clyde reading the paper delightedly to Bonnie, made it into the finished film virtually intact. (36)¹⁹

¹⁹ This is one of the best examples of cross-cutting in *Bonnie and Clyde*. In this scene, Bonnie reads her poem (“The Story of Bonnie and Clyde”) to Clyde. When she reads the beginning of the poem, the two lovers are together in the back of the car. Later, by the time she finishes reading the poem, they are lying on a blanket in a big open field. Throughout the scene, the footage (and Bonnie’s voice-over) is cross-cut with footage of Texas deputy Frank Hammer reading the poem in a newspaper at his desk in the police station. It would be easy to assume the decision to cut the scene like this happened in the editing room but that would be a mistake. This example points to the various ways that collaborative authorship can occur not only among members working on a single film but from outside influences (in this case, Truffaut) as well.

Although Truffaut was very supportive of the project, he was unsure if he would be able to commit to it because he was tentatively scheduled to make Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*.

After they met with Truffaut, Benton and Newman went to East Texas to research Bonnie and Clyde's old stomping ground. There, they scouted locations for the film, met old acquaintances of the couple, and studied local dialects to ensure the film's (and the characters') authenticity. Then they returned to New York, completed the screenplay, and sent it to Truffaut. According to Truffaut, *Fahrenheit's* financing came through so he was unable to work on it with them, but he sent it to Jean-Luc Godard on their behalf. Benton and Newman were thrilled with the prospects of working with the acclaimed (and notoriously difficult) European auteur, but their producers were not as enthusiastic. They all met to discuss the project, but it did not come to fruition. Godard was ready and available to shoot the film, but he wanted to start in only three weeks. The original producers refused because they had no studio and no financing attached to the picture yet.

According to Newman and Benton:

At this point, an emotion that can only be accurately described as total despair set in. We had this script. We had, fortunately, this contract which contained very little cash in it but two important clauses—that of director approval and that of the producers' option expiring in eighteen months, at which point the script reverted to our ownership. ("Lightning in a Bottle" 24)

Toward the end of the eighteen months, Truffaut told Beatty about the film, and Beatty himself contacted the screenwriters. He told them he was interested in making the film but that he would wait out their initial contract because he wanted to produce it. One day after the initial contract expired, Beatty purchased the script and agreed to produce

the film. Beatty worked for months to secure financing and finally settled with Warner Bros. Studios. According Finstad, by “the end of August 1966, Beatty, by whatever histrionics, had a deal memo in place to make *Bonnie and Clyde* at Warner Brothers [sic] for \$1.8 million, at a salary of \$200,000 plus 40 percent of the profits, which Jack Warner assumed would be non-existent” (365). Beatty’s complete control of the film—from pre-production through the final cut—was a critical part of this deal. However, memos from the *Bonnie and Clyde* archive collection at the University of Southern California’s School of Cinematic Arts California²⁰ stipulated that if Beatty did not deliver the film on time and on budget, Jack Warner would take control over the final cut (Warner).

One of Beatty’s primary responsibilities as producer was to secure talent, and he solicited Newman and Benton’s advice about who they wanted to direct the film. Penn was on everyone’s short list. In fact, Newman and Benton had sent the script to Penn even before Truffaut saw it, but Penn originally declined. Beatty was hopeful that he could change Penn’s mind because they had worked together on *Mickey One* (1965). However, once again, Penn declined.

In the weeks that followed, Beatty spoke with several directors about *Bonnie and Clyde*: George Stevens, William Wyler, Karel Reisz, John Schlesinger, Brian Hutton, and Sydney Pollack. Pollack was excited about the prospect, but Beatty admitted to him that Penn was still his first choice as director. So Beatty returned to New York and tried to persuade Penn one last time. Beatty assured Newman and Benton that he would convince Penn to commit to the film. He said, “Don’t worry. If I have to, I’ll lock myself in a room

²⁰ The *Bonnie and Clyde* collection is part of the Warner Bros. archive in Los Angeles, California.

with him and I won't let him out until he says yes" (Newman and Benton, "Lightning in a Bottle" 26). This time, apparently without the final threat, Penn said yes. Once Penn signed on to the film, he immediately began working with Beatty, Benton, and Newman on the script. According to Benton and Newman:

Some people bristle at the idea of collaboration. But we had been doing it ourselves for a few years now and had learned the give and take routine and its benefits. . . The halls of the Writers Guild have rung for decades with the anguished cries of screenwriters concerning directors who "butchered the screenplay." Sometimes the charge is true. But if you get lucky, you find a director who understands what you saw and what you intended, who reacts to the best of the work in exactly the way you hoped he might, who searches out the flaws and weakness and suggests the way to fix them. That's if you're lucky, if you are Very Lucky, you get Arthur Penn. ("Lightning in a Bottle 30, 27)

Bonnie and Clyde was Penn's fourth feature film as a director. He was initially reluctant to direct *Bonnie and Clyde* because he had previous bad experiences in Hollywood. In 1958, Penn directed *The Left Handed Gun* (1958, starring Paul Newman), but Warner Bros. took the film away from him and finished it without his consent. Penn never saw the final cut of the film and had no control over its outcome. In 1963 a similar situation occurred. Penn and star Burt Lancaster clashed on the United Artists's film *The Train*, and Penn lost control of the picture. He also lost his job. Lancaster had Penn fired from the set. In 1964 Penn produced and directed *Mickey One* with Beatty. During filming, Penn and Beatty's relationship on the set was both collaborative and volatile. They often argued on set, but, ultimately, they had the same goals: to make the best possible film and to tell the best possible story. As a result, they worked together but wrestled for control of the picture. This happened again to Penn in 1966. He lost control

over *The Chase* (1966) when the producer, Sam Spiegel, took “*The Chase* away from Penn and edited it himself, to the satisfaction of almost nobody involved” (Harris 106).

Despite their previous on-set struggles, Beatty assured Penn that no one would take the picture away from them during postproduction. Beatty knew that Warner anticipated he would fail to deliver the film on time and on budget and that Warner was waiting to take control of the production. So Beatty moved the production outside of Los Angeles and away from Jack Warner’s eagle eye (Harris). Beatty and Penn shot it in Texas and set up an editing suite in New York where they shipped the dailies to film editor Dede Allen.

Allen began her career as a messenger at Columbia Pictures. At Columbia, she befriended Carl Lerner. He took her under his wing and mentored her. She worked on several TV series before achieving her first major break. In 1959, Lerner recommended her to Robert Wise as an editor for *Odds Against Tomorrow* (1959). Wise had a background in sound and appreciated her knowledge of audio production. He gave her the job. According to Allen, he gave her a lot of freedom to experiment in the cutting room. As a result, she developed a personal editing style that privileges character and performance. According to Allen:

I don’t cut the old way I was taught at Columbia, when pictures editors would say ‘Now, young lady, I’ll tell you how to start. You always cut from a master to a closer shot, then you go over-the-shoulder, to close-ups.’ Well, that’s bullshit. You don’t always do that... You go where the performance is. (LoBrutto 80)

Beatty had seen her work on *The Hustler* (1961) and liked her edgy style. In fact, in a memo dated September 30, 1966, Beatty “absolutely refused to entertain the thought of

having anyone else but Dede Allen cut his production of *Bonnie and Clyde*” (Fehr). So, as Beatty and Penn continued to work in Texas, Allen began the first cut with her assistant editor Jerry Greenberg in New York. After they wrapped production, both Beatty and Penn went to New York. There, Penn and Allen worked side-by-side in the editing room, and Beatty supervised the post-production (Friedman).

Although Allen herself does not make claims about her specific contributions to *Bonnie and Clyde*, several other individuals do so in her behalf. Also, according to Harris, by the time they arrived in New York:

Dede Allen was giving them both [Penn and Beatty] a master class in what can be accomplished—and rectified—in postproduction. The skills of a great editor are almost always invisible, and when Allen’s work on *Bonnie and Clyde* is discussed, the focus tends to be on her split-second cross-cutting in the shoot-out that ends the movie or the breakneck robbery getaway scenes. . . . Allen cut *Bonnie and Clyde* with an eye and ear for the accelerating pace of the story, making the building of its panicky momentum her priority. (258)

Allen’s work on *Bonnie and Clyde* is so influential that she is often credited alongside Penn with its success (Kolker 1988, Kael 1967, LoBrutto 1991). According to film critic Pauline Kael, “The editing of this movie is . . . the best editing in an American movie in a long time, and one may assume that Penn deserves credit for it along with the editor, Dede Allen” (Kael, “*Bonnie and Clyde*” 196.) In fact, Penn himself has said that their relationship on *Bonnie and Clyde* “was everything.” According to Penn:

It’s a relationship of two arguably committed people to the material before us and we were trying to mutually extract the most important moments and put them together in a rhythm that was nourishing to the central narrative. And that’s where Dede is superb. (Academy)

Allen, however, is reluctant to accept any individual praise for the film. During an interview with freelance writer and editor Vincent LoBrutto, he tells her “many editors have told me that they consider your work on *Bonnie and Clyde* to be a landmark in film editing . . . [and] Many people have credited you as the founder of the New York school of editing. How do you feel about that” (LoBrutto 78)? Allen, however, uses the opportunity to praise Penn. She replies:

I call it the Arthur Penn school... There was a vitality and an independence in being away from the studios . . . It's interesting because at the time, in Hollywood, a lot of what I did was considered bad editing. The first time Jack Warner saw a cut he said “You mean you're gonna fade out and cut in?” Arthur Penn said, “That's right.” “I never saw such stuff in my life!” That was ridiculous to him. It came about because I made a temporary fade and the other side wasn't ready. Arthur liked it, so we began using it. It went faster. A fade out and fade in had black in the middle which stops—it doesn't whoosh you into the next scene, which Arthur felt was important to the story. Arthur gave it a special energy... Every time I went in a certain direction and Arthur liked it, he'd want more. He wanted the film to propel the drives of their lives. He never intellectualized it. I got to the point where I was doing things in the spirit of it. He'd say “Go through the film, make it move faster.” I did that two or three times, so it began to move faster and faster and it got better. . . I broke all my own rigid cutting rules about story, character, and how a scene plays. I never got an Academy Award nomination for *Bonnie and Clyde*. I think it was truly because they thought it was badly cut. Later it became a mystique which everybody imitated. Even commercials have gotten into what's called the ‘energy cut,’ which *Bonnie and Clyde* supposedly help to start. Basically, they were all playing catch up to Arthur Penn; it was his rhythm. (LoBrutto 78)

Here, Allen reveals the crux of the collaborative relationship between a director and an editor during the post-production process. In the editing room, one idea often leads to another, and if the collaboration is creative and supportive, the final outcome will be even better than the original idea. In this instance, Allen initially made a “temporary fade” that Penn positively responded to, and they repeated it throughout the film. Then, as she cut

faster, Penn encouraged her to speed up even more. In order to examine Allen's claim, however, it is necessary to look at the archival materials as evidence.

The archive materials support Allen's assertion about Penn's decision to speed up *Bonnie and Clyde's* footage and the scenes during post-production. It occurs, quite prominently, in two important scenes—the opening sequence and the climax. It also occurs during the opening credits, but on a more subtle scale.

Bonnie and Clyde's Script-to-Screen Differences

The screenplay²¹ contains detailed suggestions about how to edit the film, but Penn and Allen who edited the film together creatively altered these ideas and enhanced the film's overall impact as a result. These differences between the screenplay and the film provide some clues about the collaborative (and ever-changing) nature of the post-production process.

The first main difference between the screenplay and the final film occurs during the title sequence. According to the screenplay:

The film begins with two title cards introducing the central characters, executed in the style of similar cards used to begin the serials of the late 1930's. The title cards show a photograph of the character looking straight ahead, posed against the plain white background. The words appear at the bottom of the frame . . . CREDITS should be simple and absolutely silent. No music should occur in the film until where first indicated in the script. (Newman and Benton, "Best American Screenplays" 253)

²¹ In the following analysis, I use Newman and Benton's final screenplay dated September 6, 1966. This version of the screenplay is printed in its entirety in *Best American Screenplays: First Series*. Sam Thomas, ed. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1986. 251-295. Any quotations from the screenplay are taken from this text.

The screenplay suggests that the story begin with two simple title cards (each with a brief description of Bonnie and Clyde) and then cut directly to the opening sequence with Bonnie inside her room, before she meets Clyde for the first time. The film, in contrast, begins with a series of seven quick, black and white, Depression-era photographs. Each aged, white-framed photograph stays on screen for approximately one second before an abrupt cut to black. Between each photograph is one second of black on screen. Although the script recommends the title sequence remain “absolutely silent,” the sound of a camera shutter accompanies the photographs. After the initial seven photographs occur (and their accompanying black slates), the words “Warren Beatty” appear in a large, white font centered across the screen. This text stays on screen for approximately four seconds, and during this time, the font color changes from white to light red to a dark, blood red before dissolving into the black slate. This technique foreshadows Clyde’s eventual violence and death in the film. Four more black-and-white photos, the camera sound effect, and the words “Faye Dunaway” in the same style and white-to-red color scheme follow. Three more black and white photos (and sound effects) occur between Faye Dunaway’s title card and the three co-stars Michael Pollard, Gene Hackman, and Estelle Parsons. These actors share one title card. Their names are vertically stacked on top of one another and also change colors like the title cards before them. Two photographs occur between their names and the title *Bonnie and Clyde*. The title text also turns from white to dark red before dissolving off screen. This technique reinforces the suggestion that the protagonists (Bonnie and Clyde) will eventually bleed off the screen in the inevitable climax. During the title dissolve, the 1930s’ love song “Deep in the

Arms of Love” begins to play faintly in the background. The inclusion of sound and music improves upon the screenplay’s basic suggestion to remain “absolutely silent” during the initial credits and, as a result, enhances the film’s overall mood and setting.

The remaining title sequence takes one minute and forty seconds to complete. During this time, the Depression-era, black and white photographs are intercut with secondary actors (Denver Pyle, Dub Taylor, Evans Evans, Gene Wilder) and key individuals from the production team such as Burnett Guffey (the Director of Photography), Dean Tavoularis (Art Director), and Theadora Van Runkle (Costume Design). The last four slates are reserved for Allen (Film Editor), Newman and Benton (screenwriters), Beatty (Producer), and Penn (Director). Immediately following Penn’s title screen, the film cuts to the individual title cards for Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow. The screenplay suggested these cards could open the film but, instead, they occur here after the photographs. According to the film’s first title cards “Bonnie Parker was born in Rowena, Texas, 1910 and then moved to West Dallas. In 1931, she worked in a café before beginning her career in crime” (Newman and Benton, “Best American Screenplays” 253). The title card also includes a black and white photograph, but this time Dunaway as Bonnie is the subject of the soft-focus photograph. Bonnie’s title card stays on screen for nine seconds. It dissolves into black and then Clyde’s title card appears on-screen. According to Clyde’s title card, “Clyde Barrow was born to a family of sharecroppers. As a young man he became a small-time thief and robbed a gas station. He served two years for armed robbery and was released for good behavior in 1931.” Clyde’s title card includes a black-and-white photograph of Beatty as Clyde. This title

card stays on screen for ten seconds and then cross-fades into the film's first shot—an extreme close-up of Bonnie's lips.

For the most part, the screenplay and film's opening credit sequence align quite well together. In other words, Penn's interpretation and realization of the screenplay effectively conveys the scene as it is written. Added, however, are quick-cut photographs, sound, and music to the scene. Therefore, this title sequence represents the first post-production revision in *Bonnie and Clyde*. The difference between the final screenplay and the film suggests a creative negotiation between key players involved in the production and post-production process. According to Cawelti:

As the concept of the title credits developed in the process of editing the film, these basic ideas led to a more elaborate development. . . . By adding period photographs and the popular song to Benton and Newman's original idea of the simple title cards, the final film version greatly augments the viewer's sense of personal contact with the world of the film without destroying the semidocumentary [sic] quality and the austere simplicity originally sought by the scriptwriters. Indeed, this is one of the major lines along which Penn sought to shape the film. (57 – 58)

The question here is not whether Cawelti is correct about Penn's creative intentions for the film. It is, instead, whose innovative idea was it to intervene here and author this specific moment of the film text? Penn? Allen? Penn and Allen? Penn, Allen, and Beatty? Or some combination, thereof? Although the archive material does provide insight into the differences between the screenplay and the film, it does not illuminate who exactly did what during post-production. Or, more importantly, how they collaborated during post-production to make it happen.

The title sequence revision occurred in the editing room. Allen, the primary film editor, was part of the logistical discussion, but whether she played a small or large part in this change is unknown. Cawelti, however, entirely omits her from his discussion. He refers to the screenwriters and the director but to no one else. He refers to the “process of editing” but not the editor. Since it is unclear who authored this particular decision in the film so I do not mean to argue that it was Allen simply because this occurred in the editing process. However, my goal here is to highlight how easily it is to marginalize (or completely ignore) the editor within the post-production process.

The second creative post-production revision between the screenplay and the film occurs after the title sequence during the film’s opening scene. The opening scene occurs in Bonnie’s bedroom. The audience is introduced to Bonnie through a series of close-ups and discontinuous cuts. According to the screenplay, the opening sequence is written as:

Fade in. Int. Bedroom. Close-up of BONNIE PARKER. Day. Blonde, somewhat fragile, intelligent expression. She is putting on make-up with intense concentration and appreciation, applying lipstick and eye make-up. As the camera slowly pulls back from the closeup we see that we have been looking into a mirror. . . The camera pulls back and continues to move very slowly throughout the first part of this scene. As the camera continues to move away, we see, by degrees, that BONNIE is naked. Her nudity is never blatantly revealed to the audience, but implied. . . BONNIE finishes admiring herself. She walks from the mirror and moves slowly across the room, the camera moving with her, until she reaches the screened window on the opposite wall. The shade is up. There are no curtains. She looks out the window, looking down, and the camera looks down with her. (Benton and Newman, “Best American Screenplays” 253-254)

The opening scene focuses on Bonnie’s beauty. The screenplay suggests that she “move very slowly” through the scene as if she were not in a rush to be anywhere but in her room, by herself. Bonnie puts on makeup “with intense concentration” and admires her

own naked reflection. Starting the story this way immediately suggests that Bonnie is egotistical and superficial. Then, according to the screenplay, the next shot is Bonnie's point of view out the window as she sees Clyde for the first time. She watches him start to steal her mother's car and then calls out to him. They exchange words (she, from her second-story bedroom window and he on the ground), and then she runs outside to meet him on the sidewalk.

The film's opening scene does not unfold according to the screenplay's basic suggestions.²² In the film, the title sequence cross fades into the opening sequence so that Clyde's title card cross fades with an extreme close-up of Bonnie as she licks her lips. Then, the camera pulls back and Bonnie is looking at and admiring herself in a mirror. In this shot, she is sitting down but the scene jump cuts just as she starts to stand up. In other words, the edit does not match the action from the previous shot. In the next shot, Bonnie is already standing up and turning away from the mirror. She briefly meanders around the room and then starts to sit down. However, before she sits down, the film jump cuts again as Bonnie collapses onto her bed. During this cut, the camera is placed in front of her bed frame, and she is tightly framed between two horizontal metals bars as she lies face up on the bed. She begins to hit the bars with her fists. She seems angry, frustrated, and trapped (like an animal) within the *mise-en-scène*. Then she pauses momentarily before she pulls herself up between the bars and rests her forehead on them. She pauses again. Then, she sits up on the bed, and the camera quickly moves into an extreme close-up on her eyes. The camera lingers there for a few seconds, and she moves to rise from the bed. Before

²² For a shot-by-shot breakdown of the opening scene, see the Appendix A.

her action is complete, the scene cuts to Bonnie standing up. She walks toward the back wall of her bedroom, and at this time, the shot reveals that she is naked: she is shot from behind from the waist up and her bare back is exposed. She grabs a piece of clothing and turns around to face the camera, strategically covered behind a changing screen. She sighs. She seems both bored and upset. Then, the scene cuts to the first glimpse of Clyde standing by her mother's car.

According to the screenplay the first shot of Clyde is from Bonnie's point-of-view, but Penn and Allen ignore this direction. In the film, the first shot of Clyde *could be* Bonnie's point-of-view, but it is not from her perspective. He is shot at a high angle from her bedroom window, but she is not standing at the window at this point in the scene. The scene then cuts back to Bonnie still standing behind the screen. In this medium shot, she walks out from behind the screen (her arms strategically covering her naked breasts) and stands at the window. Then, the scene cuts and the camera is placed outside the house at a low angle looking up at Bonnie in the window. However, this shot is not taken from Clyde's perspective because the camera placement (and/or the camera's focal length) is not at street level and therefore too close to Bonnie to be Clyde's literal perspective. During this shot, Bonnie initially stares straight ahead and does not notice Clyde but eventually looks down and sees him below her window. Then, the scene cuts to the earlier shot of Clyde except this time, it is from Bonnie's point-of-view. It cuts back to the low-angle shot of Bonnie in the window. She seems intrigued and amused by Clyde, and she calls out to him. The next shot is a wide shot of both characters. Clyde and the car are in the left foreground of the shot (on ground level), and Bonnie (still

naked but not revealed) is in the middle background (up in the second-story window) of the shot looking down at him. Next, the scene cuts to a medium shot of Clyde as he turns from the car and looks up to see Bonnie for the first time seductively framed in the window. The scene cuts back and forth between Bonnie and Clyde several times until Bonnie tells him to “Wait there!” Then, she rushes to put clothes on, rapidly descends downstairs, and runs outside to meet him on the sidewalk.

The film’s opening scene reinterprets the screenplay’s original suggestion—and changes the scene’s tone—in several ways. First, Bonnie is not, as the screenplay instructs, putting on make-up. She is already wearing make-up but the audience does not see her applying it. However, it is unclear whether or not Penn shot footage of Bonnie putting on make-up. This is one of the difficulties when it comes to analyzing film editing. It is just as important to consider how the visible footage is edited within the film as it is to consider all the potential (invisible) footage that did not ever make it into the film—or that was never originally shot during production. So it is not known whether Allen edited out this footage (so that it wound up on the cutting room floor) or whether this footage ever existed in the first place. In fact, it is difficult to analyze film editing without complete knowledge of the footage with which an editor had to work. In an ideal world, film scholars would have easy access to all of the existing footage and the initial rough cuts of a film in order to analyze the collaborative, post-production process. Yet, that is not the case here. As a result, I cannot surmise whether Penn neglected to shoot this footage or Allen omitted this footage from the film text. Nevertheless, its absence here reflects a difference between the screenplay and the film text. The difference is

significant, moreover, in its implications to an audience. Putting on makeup implies a sort of artificiality or egotism, creating a first impression of Bonnie as a shallow individual. Indeed, her beauty is undeniable but she is less interested in her own appearance in the film than in the screenplay. Instead, she is more interested in finding a way out of her surroundings. As I indicate here, the film scene portrays her as bored, trapped, and seeking excitement.

A second change is that, according to the screenplay, Bonnie moves from the mirror to the window. In the film, Bonnie moves from the mirror to the bed to behind the screen and then to the window. True, she eventually moves from mirror to window but several steps are in between on this journey. This diversion from the script reveals more about Penn's direction than Allen's labor in the editing room. Clearly, he staged and shot the scene to unfold in this way. He took Newman and Benton's basic concept for the scene, and he expanded it according to his vision of the story. Allen could have altered Penn's vision in the editing room (via extra jump cuts, etc.), but in the final film version, she likely cut it according to how Penn staged it since the footage seems easily matched into this sequence.

Third, the action throughout the scene (via the camerawork) is supposed to unfold *slowly*. According to the screenplay, "As the camera slowly pulls back from the closeup we see that we have been looking into a mirror. . . The camera pulls back and continues to move very slowly." The film violates these instructions in two ways. The camera does not slowly pull back to reveal Bonnie in the mirror. It moves at a normal speed. Also, later in the scene, the camera quickly pushes into an extreme close-up of Bonnie's eyes.

If Newman and Benton's intention was to have this scene play out slowly, Penn had different ideas. Also, the discontinuous, jump cuts quicken the pace of the scene.

According to Cawelti, "In terms of shots and editing, the method chosen by Penn is to use a variety of close-ups and rather sudden and impulsive cuts that do not slowly follow Bonnie's movements across the room as the script description suggests" (Cawelti 60).

Once again, however, Cawelti ignores Allen in his analysis.

Together, Penn and Allen—under Beatty's supervision—enhance the original screenplay in post-production. By cutting out footage of Bonnie applying makeup and instead revealing her within the mirror frame within the film frame (and later within the bars of the bed frame), they change the scene's tone. The film does not imply that Bonnie is merely superficial and obsessed with her appearance but instead is cornered and misplaced within the confines of her environment. Also, Penn and Allen abruptly jump between shots and do not always match the action between shots. Therefore, they speed up (instead of slowing down) time in the scene and, as a result, infuse the scene with energy and excitement not originally in the screenplay. This choice gives the film a style similar to the French New Wave directors, especially Godard's *Breathless*, which was notorious for introducing jump cuts as a technique. Penn and Allen's quick cut technique in this scene livens up the drama and reflects Bonnie's restlessness. Bonnie appears to long for a more exciting life because the one she lives in moves too slowly for her. It is too boring and predictable. The jump cuts mimic Bonnie's desire for the fast lane. They take her to the action (Clyde) quicker and more poignantly than the screenplay instructed.

The third set of creative post-production revisions in the film occurs during the film's climax. In this scene, Bonnie and Clyde drive down the road and see someone they know (Malcolm) by the side of the road. His truck is broken and they stop to help him. Then, the police ambush Bonnie and Clyde. Their bodies are riddled with bullets and they die a violent, brutal death. According to the screenplay, the scene should begin with a shot of Bonnie and Clyde's car driving down the road. The screenplay states "Camera sees from Clyde's P.O.V. Malcolm standing in the road, waving him down. The pickup truck, its back jacked up, is parked beside him on a shoulder of the road" (Newman and Benton, "Best American Screenplays" 295). When they see him, Clyde "pulls off the road and stops the car. He gets out. Camera pulls back. Clyde talks to the old man, Bonnie stays in the car. Cut to a shot down in the trench of the law, tense" (Newman and Benton, "Best American Screenplays" 295). Once Malcolm lures Bonnie and Clyde into position, he dives out of the way and the ambush begins. According to the screenplay:

The gun fight takes just seconds during which law [sic] fires eighty-seven shots at Bonnie and Clyde, giving them absolutely no chance. The sound is rapid, deafening. At *no point* in the gun fight do we see Bonnie and Clyde in motion. We see, instead, two still photographs cut into the sequence: one of Clyde, half out of the car, taking careful dead aim with his gun. . . one of Bonnie, in terror, a pack of cigarettes in her hand clutched tight, looking as fragile and beautiful as she can be. The noise stops at once. Utter silence. It has been a massacre. Bonnie and Clyde never had a chance to return the gunfire. We see the car, a complete shambles. We never see Bonnie and Clyde dead, though, for a moment we discern their bodies slumped in the car. (Newman and Benton, "Best American Screenplays" 295. Emphasis in original.)

The film scene is different in four ways.²³ First, unlike how the screenplay suggests, the scene does not begin with a shot of Bonnie and Clyde driving down the

road. Instead, the scene begins with a close-up shot of Malcolm disassembling one of his car tires in the rural countryside. Then, he looks up to see if anyone is coming down the road. The next shot is his point-of-view. The long, dusty road is empty. It cuts back to Malcolm, and he continues “fixing” his car. The scene cuts to a series of intimate shots between Bonnie and Clyde inside their car. She is eating a pear, and she shares it with Clyde. As he takes a bite, the juice runs down his chin and Bonnie smiles. The scene cuts back to Malcolm and his point-of-view. This time, he does see them coming down the road toward him. Only then do we see Bonnie and Clyde’s point-of-view of Malcolm.

Second, the film does not show the audience “the law” (the police) in the trench. Instead, a bush shakes, as if something—or someone—were hiding within it. Obviously, this change occurred after the screenplay was finalized. Penn (and perhaps with director of photography Guffey) decided to shoot the antagonists from within the bush instead of a trench. Whether or not this was a decision based on logistics (no trench was available or it would have delayed production to create one) or creative reasons is unclear. Yet the change is one that occurred in shooting.

Third, the film differs from the screenplay because according to the screenplay’s instructions “At *no point* in the gun fight do we see Bonnie and Clyde in motion.” The emphasis on the words “*no point*” occurs in the screenplay. With this emphasis, Newman and Benton indicate strongly that Bonnie and Clyde should not be in motion. Clearly, Penn disagrees. In the film Bonnie and Clyde are in motion as soon as the gunfire starts and stay that way until it ends. In fact, this imagery of Bonnie and Clyde being assailed

²³ For a complete shot-by-shot breakdown of the climax scene, see Appendix B.

by bullets is the most striking and memorable imagery in the entire film. According to Cawelti, “The ambush is another of those intricately edited sequences composed of an extraordinary number of short individual cuts that characterize most of the key scenes in the film” (82). Their death scene is inter-cut with footage that contains slow, normal, and high-speed footage. To achieve this effect, Penn used multiple cameras at varying speeds.

According to Penn:

I used four cameras, each one at a different speed, 24, 48, 72, and 96, I think, and different lenses, so that I could cut to get the shock and at the same time the ballet of death. There’s a moment in death when the body no longer functions, when it becomes an object and has a certain kind of detached ugly beauty. It was that aspect I was trying to get. (Cawelti 16)

Penn achieves this effect in the film’s climax. During the slow-motion footage, Bonnie and Clyde’s deaths occur gracefully. Their slow and fluid movements are balletic. Their bodies alternately fold in on themselves and expand between gun shots like a swan attempting (and ultimately failing) to take flight. In slow motion, their deaths are almost beautiful in the deliberate and poised brutality. In contrast, the high speed footage of their deaths is just brutal; it is ugly, shocking, and grotesque. During these shots their movements mimic violent, uncontrollable seizures. Their bodies, like the fast-paced cuts themselves, are quick and spastic. The film’s climax takes just over three minutes to complete and includes eighty-seven shots. On average, there is one shot every 2.3 seconds. In short, unlike the screenplay’s instructions, their bodies (and the editing itself) are *constantly* in motion throughout this scene.

This imagery ignores the screenplay’s suggestions in another way, as well. According to the screenplay, “We never see Bonnie and Clyde dead, though, for a

moment we discern their bodies slumped in the car” (Newman and Benton, “Best American Screenplays” 295). This, however, is not the case. The audience does see Bonnie and Clyde die during this scene. Their bodies go lifeless once the machine gun fire stops. Clyde lies motionless on the ground, and Bonnie hangs from the car.

Each of these changes occurred before Allen edited the footage. These were mise-en-scène choices Penn (and perhaps cinematographer Burnett Guffey) concocted during production. However, it would be incorrect to assume that Allen did not contribute to the scene’s success. According to Harris, the final ambush scene “took longer to film than anything else. Penn used four cameras for every setup, each one filming from the same angle but running at a different speed” (256). This amount of footage presents an editor with a vast array of editing options and shot-by-shot combinations. For example, during the final ambush sequence there are seven main set-ups during the gunfire: Clyde standing up (one medium and one close-up), Clyde on the ground, Bonnie in the car (two medium shots from different angles and one close-up), and a wide two-shot of both characters. So, for this scene Penn shot seven set-ups from four different angles. On the most basic level, this means Allen had twenty-eight possible options for every shot she chose to include in the film. Beyond that, her options in the editing room include which individual frame should start or end each shot, how each shot should join with another, which speed of film (twenty-four, forty-eight, seventy-two, or ninety-six) should be used for each shot, and how to balance the speed of the footage with the various shot selections to achieve and pace Penn’s vision of the protagonists’ simultaneous beautiful/grotesque death. According to Penn, in the editing room Allen is:

relentless. . . She goes to work and in some alchemistic way, she finds a capability and offers a pearl of wisdom *that was never there when we shot it*. So my gratitude to her . . . I wish it were expressable [sic]. (Academy Awards Salute to Dede Allen. Italics mine.)

As an editor, Allen's job is to use the existing footage according to the director's specifications and vision. Yet a good editor will also enhance the director's vision through skillful shot selection and placement. In this case, an editor will create particular moments in a film that a director did not anticipate. True, Penn anticipated intercutting the climax scene with slow, normal, and high-speed footage, but with seven set-ups and twenty-eight possible combinations of shot selections, it is highly unlikely that Penn could anticipate on which single frame to start and stop. However, through their careful, creative collaboration, it is clear Penn and Allen collaboratively edited one of the most compelling and dynamic climaxes in the history of American cinema.

Summary

Bonnie and Clyde was a source of cultural controversy because not everyone agreed on what it was, or what it was trying to accomplish on screen in 1967. Upon its initial release, *Bonnie and Clyde* met with immediate controversy. (In fact, few other films in American cinema have inspired such critical debate.) *The New York Times* film critic Bosley Crowther was the film's most notorious opponent. On August 14, 1967, the *Times* printed Crowther's scathing review of the film. According to Crowther:

A raw and unmitigated campaign of sheer pressagency [sic] has been trying to put across the notion that Warner Bros.'s 'Bonnie and Clyde' is a faithful representation of the desperado careers of Clyde Barrow and Bonnie Parker, a notorious team of bank robbers and killers who roamed Texas and Oklahoma in

the post-Depression years. It is nothing of the sort. It is a cheap piece of bald-faced slapstick comedy that treats the hideous depredations of that sleazy, moronic pair as though they were full of fun and frolic . . . This blending of farce with brutal killings is as pointless as it is lacking in taste, since it makes no valid commentary upon the already travestied truth. And it leaves an astonished critic wondering just what purpose Mr. Penn and Mr. Beatty think they serve with this strangely antique, sentimental claptrap. (177-178)

Crowther's assessment of *Bonnie and Clyde* was more of a polemic than a movie review. In fact, he felt so strongly about the film that he rallied against it in three separate *Times* reviews. The backlash against Crowther, however, was equally strong. His single-minded criticism irked many of the newspaper subscribers as they believed he was decidedly out of touch with the mainstream audience.²⁴ As a result, he eventually lost his job at *The Times*.

Yet he was not alone in his criticism of the film. The graphic depiction of violence took audiences and critics by storm. For example, Page Cook in *Films in Review* took issue with *Bonnie and Clyde*'s brutal themes and agreed with Crowther's scathing assessment of it. According to Cook:

Bonnie and Clyde is so incompetently written, acted, directed, and produced it would not be worth noticing were a claue not attempting to promote the idea that its sociology is art One final word: there is *evil* in the *tone* of the writing, acting, and direction of this film, the calculated effect of which is to incite in the young the delusion that armed robbery and murder are mere "happenings." (23 – 24 original emphasis.)

Not everyone felt about the film as Crowther and Page. According to Richard Schickel's *Life Magazine* review, *Bonnie and Clyde* is both "stylish" and "flawed," but above all "it is not worthy of either the terribly intense praise or the equally strident

damnation that have been visited upon it by critics and audiences alike” (Schickel, “Focus on *Bonnie and Clyde*” 25). Some critics were as strongly in favor of *Bonnie and Clyde* as other critics were against it. In fact, in contrast to Crowther’s ouster from the *Times* because of his unrelenting criticism against the film, Pauline Kael made a name for herself at *The New Yorker* due to her support of it. According to Kael:

Audiences at *Bonnie and Clyde* are not given a simple, secure basis for identification; they are made to feel but are not told *how* to feel But people also feel uncomfortable about the violence, and here I think they’re wrong. That is to say, they *should* feel uncomfortable, but this isn’t an argument *against* the movie Suddenly, in the last few years, our view of the world has gone beyond “good taste.” Tasteful suggestions of violence would at this point be a more grotesque form of comedy than *Bonnie and Clyde* attempts. (183,188)

Like Kael, Albert Johnson took critics and audiences to task for their criticism against the film. In his *Film Quarterly* review, he accuses them of entirely missing the point.

According to Johnson:

Bonnie and Clyde throws all of its dramatic weight into the realm of entertainment- above-all; its moral is the same as that of its predecessors in the genre of gangster films: the criminals die quite violently. The criticisms leveled against the film are chiefly based upon the writers’ constant utilization of laughter and farcical situation throughout the gore-laden story. However, it is this device that most distinguishes *Bonnie and Clyde* from all other gangster films and leaves one with a confirmed awareness that the director and the writers have deliberately created a unique pseudo-documentary style by which spectators could be entertained and astonished at the same time The legend crashes gently and movingly with the real. Arthur Penn’s backward glance is filled with beauty and affection for an era, and there is so much talent involved in this film that his *Bonnie and Clyde* will remain an outstanding piece of cinema art, recreating social history in terms of today’s acceptable myths. (32, 36)

²⁴ To see these reaction letters, see *The New York Times*, September 17, 1967, II, pp. seven and nine.

William J. Free is also another critic who supported the film. Also, according to Free, “here is an American film which deserves the close analysis usually reserved for literary works, more serious drama, and the films of European directors like Bergman, Fellini, and Antonioni. *Bonnie and Clyde* is undoubtedly a work of art” (99).

In 1968 *Bonnie and Clyde* was nominated for ten Academy Awards, including Best Picture (Beatty), Best Director (Penn), Best Screenplay (Benton and Newman), Best Actor (Beatty), and Best Actress (Dunaway). And, it continues to see critical praise forty years after its initial release. In 2007, the American Film Institute ranked *Bonnie and Clyde* forty-two out of the top 100 films of the last century.

When comparing *Bonnie and Clyde*'s screenplay to the film, it is impossible to tell who is directly responsible for the individual differences between the texts. However, it is clear that some of the changes occurred during the post-production process, in the editing room, with Allen present. As a result, it is important to insert the editor into our understanding of these changes as part of the creative process. Too often differences between the screenplay and the film are ignored altogether or exclusively (and mistakenly) credited to the director. The goal here is not to strip Penn (or Beatty, or Benton and Newman) of his authorial presence in *Bonnie and Clyde* but to widen our understanding of how Allen helped shape it in a collaborative authoring process. One way to accomplish this is to use the archive materials to fill in the gaps and expand our understand of the post-production process.

The Warner Bros. archive consists of approximately six boxes and sixty folders of material relating to *Bonnie and Clyde*. However, very little of that information pertains to

editing the picture and even less of it to Allen herself. In fact, she is referred to by name in only two documents. First, the producers thank her for her contributions to the film in an advertisement published in *The Hollywood Reporter*. Second, an internal memo states Beatty's insistence that she edit the film (Fehr). Beyond these two documents, however, any information directly relating to her is noticeably absent from the available archive materials.

Most of the Warner Bros. archival material related to cutting the picture has to do with editing logistics but not specifics. For example, the archive materials include documents and memos between Warner, Walter MacEwen, Rudi Fehr, Penn, and Beatty about cutting *Bonnie and Clyde* in New York instead of Los Angeles. Warner wanted it cut in Los Angeles in their existing facilities. However, Penn and Beatty wanted it cut in New York so they had more control over the picture. Keeping the production on location in Texas (and New York) was a constant struggle. Location shoots (and period films) are often more complex and time-consuming than other productions. In addition, Penn and Beatty's long discussions and preference for multiple takes often slowed production. By the end of the production (December 1966), they were over schedule and over budget.

In a memo from Warner's office dated January 13, 1967, Warner's disdain for the bi-coastal production is clear. He insists that MacEwen bring Allen to Los Angeles from New York to finish the film. Warner also acknowledges that he never would have financed the film had he known the production would be out of his control (Warner). This struggle for control of the picture is a recurring theme throughout the archive materials.

The abundance of archival materials on the battles over the post-production logistics, however, is in stark contrast with the lack of information about editing specifics.

Only two documents made specific reference as to how to cut the film. The first is a memo from Geoffrey M. Shurlock, an executive in the Production Code Administration. It warns Warner about some of the more explicit language (particularly the recurring use of “damn” and “hell”) and images in the film such as Bonnie’s nudity, the butcher’s pistol whipping, the banker who is shot in the face, and the sex scene (Shurlock). Shurlock gives Warner advice about how to tame the picture (in terms of mis-en-scène and editing) in order to meet the standards of the Production Code.²⁵ The second document that contains specific information about how to cut the film is an untitled document dated March 14, 1967. It gives specific instructions about how to edit the film to improve the third act (Unknown, N.P.). However, the document does not include any information about who wrote it or to whom it was written. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain how this information fits within the film’s editing matrix. Was it from Warner to Fehr? Warner to Beatty? Beatty to Penn? Penn to Allen? Allen to Penn? It is impossible to tell.

In this case, it is clear that Allen does not prominently figure into the archival materials. Instead, she is a tertiary figure. The absence of materials related to *Bonnie and Clyde*’s editing and Allen suggests a wider problem in film archiving and film scholarship. Archives represent a major component of a film’s institutional memory. The

²⁵ This document suggests an interesting connection between the MPAA and collaborative authorship. It raises the question: To what degree do industrial constraints—in this case, the Production Code—shape a film’s (or an auteur’s) content?

absence of this information reflects a general disregard for editing as an integral part of a film's production history. Also, it hinders scholars from more comprehensive, behind-the-scenes' knowledge about an editor's role in the production process from start to finish. My hope for the future is that archivists and scholars will recognize the importance of Hollywood editors and include editing within their research and materials.

Chapter 3 – The Conversation

This chapter outlines Francis Ford Coppola and Walter Murch's collaborative relationship. It examines their early days together as co-founders of Zoetrope Studios in San Francisco and, in particular, pays special attention to their collaboration on *The Conversation* (1974). *The Conversation* is largely a film about sound. According to Coppola, "As I was writing *The Conversation*, I had in mind that Walter would do the sound. So I wrote many scenes to be sound-oriented" (Johnson 131). It was the first movie that Murch edited for both sound and picture. As such, Coppola trusted Murch with the film's overall sound and technical design. Murch, as the Supervising Editor, is also credited with the titles of sound editor, sound montage, and sound re-recorder. Giving Murch control of the audio production enabled Coppola to focus on directing the visual production. As a result, Coppola is extremely forthcoming with his praise for Murch as a key collaborator on their films. He even attributes Murch with co-authorship. According to Coppola, "Walter was much more than your average editor—he was really a full collaborator on the project. Walter is an author of [*The Conversation*]" (Goodwin and Wise 158).

This chapter examines the following claims that Coppola and Murch make about Murch's contributions to *The Conversation*—that he helped make the main character more sympathetic, enhanced the suspense plotline, and clarified the narrative's incoherence through his editing and audio production skills. These claims are often reproduced in interviews and as part of the film's oral history (Schumacher 1999; Cowie 1989; Johnson 1974; Lewis 1977), but they are not critically investigated. Coppola's affirmation of Murch's claims seemingly undercuts the need to investigate them. Perhaps that is why, to date, they have gone unexamined. Why question the

assertion that Murch reconstructed *The Conversation* in the editing room if the director concurs? Coppola's confirmation, however, does not lessen the need to investigate Murch's claims about his role on the film. Therefore, this chapter uses archival evidence to provide a more in-depth analysis of *The Conversation*'s changes and creative revisions in post-production.

This chapter also highlights Richard Chew as a key collaborator on *The Conversation*. According to the film credits, Chew is the principal film editor on *The Conversation*—not Murch.¹ Chew, however, remains largely invisible within this history. In fact, beyond his list of screen credits, it is difficult to find any information on him at all.² Chew is officially credited as *The Conversation*'s principle editor, but Murch—as the Supervising Editor and Sound Editor—receives most of the credit for saving the film. Murch was responsible for all the sound editing and supervised the overall post-production process. Unfortunately, within the archival materials, it is impossible to identify Murch's contributions from Chew's. Therefore, this analysis—like most of the literature on Chew and *The Conversation*—does little to clarify Chew's specific contributions to the film during post-production or his place within the Hollywood industry. However, this chapter acknowledges that Murch and Chew collaborated during post-production and inserts Chew into this critical discussion.

Francis Ford Coppola

Coppola enrolled in the Master of Fine Arts program at University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) in 1960. There, he worked with Jean Renoir, Dorothy Arzner, and screenwriter

¹ According to guild rules, only one person may be listed as the film editor in the credits.

² In Spring 2009 *Cineaste* (an independent magazine about American film) included Chew in a critical symposium about film editing. In it, Chew describes his cinematic influences and approach to post-production ("The Art and

Arthur Ripley. While at UCLA, Coppola won the coveted Samuel Goldwyn Award for screenwriting. Coppola then applied for an assistant position to director Roger Corman and secured the job. During his time working with Corman, Coppola worked as a script doctor, production assistant, second-unit director, and sound recordist. Corman also financed Coppola's film *Dementia 13* (1963) which was shot in Ireland. During the filming, Coppola met his future wife, Eleanor Neil. They married in 1963. Later that year, he dropped out of UCLA and accepted a screenwriter position at Warner-Seven Arts in Los Angeles. He saved \$20,000 which he invested in the stock market (as a way to finance his own film) but lost every penny of it. Undeterred, Coppola continued working for Seven Arts and on his own projects. Coppola bought the rights to David Benedictus's novel *You're a Big Boy Now* (1966) and adapted it into a screenplay. He changed the setting from London to New York and based some of the main character's experiences on his own experiences after dropping out of the New York Military Academy. Warner-Seven Arts financed the \$800,000 budget, and, since he owned the rights to it, Coppola successfully negotiated his position as the film's screenwriter, director, and producer. It was his first critical success. The film was selected for competition at the Cannes Film Festival. Although the film met with mixed reviews in the United States, UCLA also accepted *You're a Big Boy Now* as Coppola's thesis film and awarded him a Master of Fine Arts degree. According to USC film student (and future colleague) Walter Murch, this made Coppola a legend in the Los Angeles (LA) student film community (Cowie 37).

After the success of *You're a Big Boy Now*, Coppola went back to his first love—screenwriting—and started work on *The Conversation*. But, it was short lived. Joe Landon offered him a chance to direct the large-scale Hollywood musical *Finian's Rainbow* with Fred

Craft of Filmmaking"). However, this article does not elaborate on Chew's biographical information, or reveal

Astaire and Petula Clark. Coppola took the job. During production, Coppola met and befriended University of Southern California (USC) film student George Lucas. “Francis let him make a documentary about the shooting and the result, *Filmmaker*, remains one of the most important analyses of Coppola’s craft and incipient philosophy” (Cowie 51). The meeting between them was fortuitous. Coppola and Lucas would go on to collaborate on several projects together including *The Rain People* (1969), *THX 1138* (1971), and *American Graffiti* (1973). In fact, their collaborative relationship would later include other LA area film students including Murch, Steven Spielberg, and John Milius. This group would later become known as the ‘movie brats.’ This group was the first generation of film school students turned industry insiders. They appeared on the landscape together at a transitional moment in the Hollywood industry. During this time, the industry sought out new directors with big ideas, innovative techniques, and a fresh perspective to connect with younger film audiences. In return, Hollywood promised them artistic freedom.

Before *Finian’s Rainbow’s* release, Coppola turned down the opportunity—and \$400,000—to direct another musical (*Mame*) because he wanted to produce his own film *The Rain People*. Using \$80,000 of his own money, Coppola bought film equipment and helped to support the cast and crew (Johnson). But the money was not enough. In the end, Warner Bros. helped him finance the film for \$750,000 (Cowie 43). For *Finian’s*, Coppola had assembled a small crew of actors who remained loyal to him throughout his career, including Robert Duvall and James Caan. On *The Rain People*, Coppola began a new working relationship with Murch. According to Murch, Coppola “didn’t know me... but we had one meeting lasting an hour, and three months later I came back with all of the sound mixed” (Cowie 52). In fact, according to

anything about his working relationship with Murch and Coppola on *The Conversation*.

Coppola, Murch “saved” them on that film (Onedaajte 53). It was accepted into Spain’s San Sebastian International film festival before it was completed. Murch worked day and night to finish the sound mix on schedule. At the time, Murch was not in the union so he was unable to receive credit as a sound editor on the film. Thus, they created a new title for him: sound designer. According to Coppola, “I always thought it was ironic that ‘Sound Designer’ became this Tiffany title, yet it was created for that reason. We did it to dodge the union constriction” (Onedaajte 53). Coppola privileged *The Rain People*’s small, collaborative working environment. He enjoyed working outside the Hollywood studio system and controlling all aspects of the production.

In fact, these working conditions were so desirable to him that in 1969 Coppola created his own independent production company, American Zoetrope. Coppola sunk all of his savings into a three-story loft building in San Francisco and the state-of-the-art visual and audio equipment (editing, mixing, sound recording) necessary to work outside of the major studios. Coppola, as the owner, named Lucas the Vice-President and Mona Skager Treasurer and Secretary (Cowie). Other key Zoetrope players included Murch, Carroll Ballard, Gloria Katz, John Kotry, and Matt Robbins. Ted Ashley, the head of Warner studios at the time, agreed to finance Zoetrope’s projects in exchange for the right of first refusal to distribute. The contract also included a provision that if Zoetrope failed to meet Warner’s expectations, Coppola would pay back their investment. According to Jon Lewis:

The deal with Warner Bros. was relatively simple. The studio fronted Coppola \$600,000 to develop movies for the youth market.... The studio’s gamble on American Zoetrope had little to do with admiration for Coppola or his work. Instead, the investment was the result of an industrywide [sic] panic to re-create the surprise hit of the previous year, *Easy Rider*, which successfully exploited the youth audience for the first time in a decade. The studio executives felt that Coppola and his entourage of young cineastes up in San Francisco (the very capital of youth

territory) might have a better shot at hitting the target audience than more established, and establishment, directors and producers in Hollywood. (13)

Coppola and American Zoetrope represent a significant role in the emergence of the Hollywood Renaissance. The shift in power from the studio heads to the director and the emergence of the youth audience reflect a major change in the Hollywood industry. As a result, Coppola leveraged his position during this time and used Warners to create an auteur-based, independent production company. Warners, in turn, invested in Zoetrope and used Coppola as a way to help them out of their financial slump.

Warners Studios had high expectations for its relationship with American Zoetrope but they were never fully realized. Instead of developing inexpensive youth audience films, Coppola focused his attention on three loftier projects: Coppola's scripts for *The Conversation* (1974) and *Apocalypse Now* (1979) and what would be Lucas's first film *THX 1138* (1971). According to Peter Cowie:

THX 1138 lived up to the aspirations of American Zoetrope. Its technical alertness far outdistanced the experimental efforts of underground movie-makers of the late 1960s—many of whom worked in the Bay Area. It carried the imprimatur of a famous studio—Warners—as distributor. And it dared to suggest that an American film could be every bit as perplexing and imaginative as its European counterpart. (58)

After one year, Coppola took the projects to Warners' executives, but they declined to exercise their option and demanded their money back. In return for dissolving the contract between Warners and American Zoetrope, Coppola maintained control of all three film projects. Unfortunately, he was unable to refund Warners' money when they requested it. He had spent most of it on high-end equipment and sunk the rest into producing *THX 1138*. To make matters worse, during their first year of production almost \$40,000 worth of equipment was stolen from

the facilities. Eventually Coppola admitted that his passion for American Zoetrope “far outpaced any kind of fiscal logic” (Cowie 56). By 1971, Zoetrope disintegrated and Coppola owed Warners several hundred thousand dollars. In order to pay back the debt he owed, Coppola leveraged Zoetrope’s cutting-edge technology. He produced television commercials and state-funded documentaries.

Coppola’s failure with American Zoetrope did not deter him from continuing to work inside—and outside—the Hollywood industry. In 1972, Paramount studios approached Coppola to adapt and direct Mario Puzo’s *The Godfather* for the big screen. He was reluctant at first because it was a mainstream genre film but, eventually, he agreed. It was a very “troubled” production, from casting through the shoot and into post-production.³ Despite these difficulties, however, it was a huge critical and commercial success. According to Michael Schumacher, “From the very beginning, it was clear to industry insiders that *The Godfather* had achieved event status . . . scalpers hawked tickets for twenty to thirty dollars each, and they had no trouble finding takers” (124). To date, the film continues to enjoy commercial longevity—it has secured a total domestic gross of \$133,698,921—and critical praise (Box Office Mojo). According to William S. Pechter:

The Godfather is a film which is not only Coppola's first big popular success as a director but seems further destined to be among the two or three most commercially successful movies of all time. And *The Godfather* is, furthermore, and by critical consensus, a stunning confirmation of . . . Coppola's talents: vividly seen, richly detailed, throbbing with incident and a profusion of strikingly drawn characters. (Pechter, N.P.)

It won five Golden Globe awards (best picture, director, actor, screenplay, and score) and two Academy awards (best film and best adapted screenplay—an award he shared with Puzo). The Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences also nominated Coppola for Best Director, but he

lost out to Bob Fosse for *Cabaret* (1972). In *Sight and Sound*, Corman states “Francis Ford Coppola's 'The Godfather ' is one of the enduring works of American cinema. It's a monumental combination of my cinematic favourites [sic] as a producer and a director: the American genre film and the European art film” (35). In addition, in 2008, the American Film Institute ranked it only behind *Citizen Kane* as the greatest Hollywood film in the last 100 years (American Film Institute).

The Godfather's success enabled Coppola to regain some creative autonomy over his films. Frank Yablans, the chief executive at Paramount, in fact, offered Coppola a production unit alongside William Friedkin and Peter Bogdanovich. Paramount invested \$31.5 million into the Directors Company as a way to provide a small group of auteur directors autonomy and, in return, (hopefully) profit from their unique vision. According to Lewis:

The director's contract with Paramount elaborated the following arrangement: each of the directors would make three movies during the following six years (a second version of the contract stipulated four films in twelve years) and act as executive producer on at least one film directed by one of the other company members. In consideration for Paramount's assurance of creative autonomy within its production and distribution superstructure, the guarantee of production funding (without the hassle of pitching ideas to the various studios), and a 50 percent profit participation on their films, the directors were obliged to work exclusively at and for Paramount for the duration of the contract As Yablans saw it, the Directors Company only *seemed* to perpetuate a growing acceptance of the *auteur* theory in Hollywood. What he and Paramount actually had in mind was a recontextualization of *auteurism* within the studio superstructure. Thus, for Yablans, the Directors Company conceded a modicum of autonomy and power over the product to three bankable directors, but it did so in exchange for what amounted to the directors' capitulation, their seeming unwillingness to make mainstream movies. . . . But Yablans' optimism was short lived. (16)

Once Paramount realized the directors had no intention of making mainstream, commercial films and every intention of making highly personal films, it pulled funding for any future projects. As

³ For more detailed information about *The Godfather* production, see Lebo.

a result, the Directors Company only produced three films through Paramount: Coppola's *The Conversation* and Bogdanavich's *Paper Moon* (1973) and *Daisy Miller* (1974).

By the time Paramount released *The Conversation* in 1974, Coppola had already secured his place in the industry. Two years earlier, *The Godfather* catapulted him into the auteur spotlight and, based on its initial success, easily kept him there for the next ten years. In hindsight, it is ironic that Coppola's initial reluctance to work on *The Godfather* because it was not one of his own films conceptualized and written by himself became his signature film. In return, it ultimately enabled him to work on his own projects for years to come. Over the last thirty-five years, Coppola has had a long (and somewhat mixed) Hollywood career directing some of the most provocative (*Apocalypse Now*, 1979), autonomous (*New York Stories*, 1989), trendy (Michael Jackson's *Captain EO*, 1986), baroque (*Bram's Stroker's Dracula*, 1992) and mainstream (*The Rainmaker*, 1997) productions. However, despite his prolific contributions to Hollywood cinema, Coppola himself acknowledges that *The Conversation* is "certainly, probably, the best" of all his films ("Writing and Directing *The Conversation*" 66). Although it was not a commercial success, it was a critical success and helped contribute to his growing auteur status. According to *Variety*, "This is Coppola's most complete, most assured, and most rewarding film to date, and the years it took him to bring to the screen should be considered well worth it" (in Cowie 83). *The Conversation* was nominated for three Academy Awards (picture, sound, and original screenplay) and five BAFTA awards (director, screenplay, actor - and won for editing and sound). It also won best film from the National Board of Review and took home the prestigious Golden Palm at the Cannes film festival.

The Conversation is an important case study because it represents an interesting intersection in Coppola's career and the Hollywood Renaissance. Coppola developed the idea for

The Conversation in 1967 before the success of *You're a Big Boy Now*, *The Rain People*, and *The Godfather*. Like many of his early films, Coppola wrote, directed, and produced *The Conversation*. In fact, because he worked on it—off and on—between films, it took him six years to develop the script. As a result, it was a highly personal project for him. Alongside *American Graffiti*, it was originally a Zoetrope project that he offered to Warners which passed on it. Then, Coppola, Friedkin, and Bogdanovich produced it within The Directors Company, but Paramount, a major studio, financed and distributed it. As a result, it represents the epitome of the tension between the Hollywood industry and Hollywood Renaissance's auteur filmmakers.

Walter Murch

Perhaps no Hollywood editor is as well known or recognized as Walter Murch. Over the last thirty years, some of Murch's films include *The Conversation*, *Julia* (1977), *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* (1988), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *Ghost* (1990), *The Godfather: Part III* (1990), *Romeo is Bleeding* (1993), *The English Patient* (1996), *The Talented Mr. Ripley* (1999), *Cold Mountain* (2003), *Jarhead* (2005), and *The Wolfman* (2010). He has received seven Oscar, seven BAFTA, and five *Cinema Editor* nominations.⁴ Of those, he won five awards. Another reason Murch is well recognized is because he is one of just a few Hollywood editors to write a book about editing.⁵ In 2001, Murch published *In the Blink of an Eye*—an outline of his editing philosophy and theory. In it, he examines editing as a craft, a creative art, and an intuitive process. He also explores the relationship between blinking, pacing, cutting, and storytelling.

⁴ American Cinema Editors (ACE) is an honorary society of film editors. *Cinema Editor* is their industry-standard magazine devoted to the art and craft of film editing. The editorial board is comprised of union-certified Hollywood film editors.

⁵ Ralph Rosenblum and Edward Dmytryk also wrote books about editing.

According to Murch, he avoids the golden rule of film editing: match-action cutting. Instead, when he edits he privileges emotion (of the scene, of the story, and of the audience) above everything else. Murch's ideal cut satisfies emotion, story, rhythm, eye-trace, the two-dimensional plane of screen, and the three-dimensional plane of action (17). *In the Blink of an Eye* describes this as the "rule of six." During the editing process, Murch attempts to position himself as an audience member and uses his own emotional response to drive his construction of the film. In addition to his own book, he is also the subject of two books: Charles Koppelman's *Behind the Seen: How Walter Murch Edited Cold Mountain Using Apple's Final Cut Pro and What This Means for Cinema* and Michael Ondaatje's *The Conversations: Walter Murch and the Art of Editing Film*. Also, in 2009 he was the subject of the documentary *Murch*. *Murch* was an "official selection" at the Telluride, Vancouver International, Palm Springs International, Rotterdam International, and San Francisco International film festivals.

Murch, like Coppola and Lucas, began his career as a film student in Los Angeles. At USC, he studied editing and sound design. Before attending USC as a graduate student, Murch studied art history overseas during the height of the French New Wave in the mid-1960s. Like the other "movie brats" of his generation, European films and filmmakers inspired his career. After graduating from USC, Murch accepted a series of odd and freelance jobs for the Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Films, Dove Films, and the U.S. Information Agency (Ondaatje). Then, in 1968, Lucas called him and asked him to do the sound on *The Rain People* for Coppola. Murch and Lucas had known each other since 1965. According to Murch:

I'd worked on a couple of his student films. We were the two finalists for a six-month Warner Bros. scholarship. As we were going in for our final interview, we realized, naturally, that one of us was going to get it—and the other one wasn't. So we made a pact that whoever did get it would turn around and help the other if something good came

along. Well, George got it. And when the chance came along, he called me. (Ondaatje 13-14)

Lucas and Coppola invited Murch to join them as part of American Zoetrope in San Francisco. Murch accepted their invitation and the rest is history.

Murch is a collaborative filmmaker. This stems as much from his experiences at USC and Zoetrope as it does from his belief in film as a collaborative art. In fact, he prefers to work with directors who create a collaborative working environment. According to Murch, “The film editor/director relationship oscillates back and forth during the course of the project” (Murch 26). For Murch, it is a give-and-take relationship. Ideally, the director gives the editor strong material to work with and a clear sense of his vision. Then, the editor synthesizes that through the footage. Murch believes that a talented director’s true function is to lay “out opportunities that can be seized by other people... And then to protect that communal vision by accepting or rejecting certain contributions” (Ondaatje 28). Therefore, it is crucial that Murch find directors who encourage this type of working environment.

Before he agrees to work on a new film, Murch always corresponds with a director. It is his way of gauging the project’s collaborative (or non-collaborative) atmosphere. First, he reads the script. Then, he typically types six to eight pages of notes on the script and gives them to the director. Director Anthony Minghella (with whom Murch has worked on several films) refers to Murch’s notes as “The Memo” (Koppelman 45). The notes include positive and negative feedback about the script. They also give the director a sense of Murch’s collaborative spirit, his approach to the content, and how intimately involved he plans to be on the project. As a result, some directors have decided against working with him. For Murch, however, that is not a problem. According to him, if the director “doesn’t agree with [his ideas], it’s good to learn that

early. Maybe something can be changed—or maybe I’m just not the right person to edit the film. Either way, the notes serve a purpose” (Ondaatje 43). The “memo” enables Murch to weed out projects and directors with which he would be philosophically and professionally incompatible.

Throughout his career, however, one director in particular has proven to be the quintessential collaborator: Coppola.⁶ According to Coppola, the feeling is mutual. During the last thirty-seven years, they have collaborated on *The Rain People* (1969), *The Conversation* (1977), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *The Godfather Trilogy*, *Youth Without Youth* (2007), and *Tetro* (2009). *The Conversation*, however, stands out among these films because of its production difficulties. In fact, without Murch, Coppola might not have finished the film. As a result, Coppola refers to Murch as “an essential collaborator” on *The Conversation* because of his commitment and contributions to the project (Murch ix).

The Conversation: Context, Collaboration, and Claims

The Conversation is about audio surveillance expert Harry Caul (Gene Hackman). Caul uses technology to spy on other people, but (and perhaps because of his profession) he is an intensely private and guarded person. In the film, a corporate executive anonymously hires Harry to record a young couple’s private conversation. He videotapes and audiotapes their conversation during their lunch-hour break in San Francisco’s Union Square. As a result of the number of sounds and people present, recording it and assembling the tapes is a complex process. Also, sound from the recorded conversation recurs throughout the film. In fact, the conversation is the recurring motif throughout *The Conversation*. Sound and video footage of the conversation occur

during the recording and assembly scenes, in flashback sequences, and in a dream sequence. Throughout the film, bits and pieces of the conversation come together for Harry (and for the audience) and eventually reveal a murder plot. During one key scene, Harry discovers the line “he’d kill us if he got the chance” buried within the conversation. The film is a psychological study of Harry, a thriller, and a murder mystery.

Although it fits within Hollywood’s classical “thriller” genre, *The Conversation* remains an auteurist film for several reasons. First, Coppola wrote and produced it using money from his own production company. Although Paramount initially financed the Director’s Company, Coppola had independent and creative control over the film itself. Second, this character study is incredibly slow-paced compared to more traditional Hollywood films. The narrative action unfolds unhurriedly and methodically throughout the film with little emphasis on dramatic or daring spectacle. Third, Harry is not a typical Hollywood protagonist. He is neither personable nor engaging, but instead quite bland and boring. He has no friends, loses his girlfriend, and has few social skills. This is especially evident during the last shot of the film in which Harry—having experienced a wild fit of paranoia—sits in his ransacked living room, playing the saxophone, all by himself. Harry bears no resemblance to a typical, virile leading man. He is, instead, metaphorically impotent because he cannot save his client from death. When he needed to perform the most (to save the client), he failed. These factors—and the film’s ambiguous, “open” ending—keep *The Conversation* outside of the classical Hollywood norm and classify it, instead, as an art film.

⁶ Murch and director Anthony Minghella also have a strong collaborative relationship. They worked on three films together: *The English Patient* (1996), *The Talented Mr. Ripley* (1999), and *Cold Mountain* (2003). Like Coppola, Minghella is vocal and supportive of Murch as a key collaborator on his films.

The Conversation's production history is well documented throughout literature on Coppola and Murch. According to the general consensus, Coppola began production on *The Conversation* in 1972 (Schumacher 1999; Cowie 1989; Johnson 1974; Lewis 1977). Beyond that, however, the literature is inconsistent—and so too are Murch and Coppola in their later descriptions of it. Both agree that Coppola never finished the shoot, but each gives a different reason as to why and what happened. According to Murch, Coppola ran out of time and money during the production. Coppola was already committed to work on a sequel to *The Godfather*. He was called away from *The Conversation* to begin pre-production on *The Godfather II* (Ondaatje 157). As a result, he failed to film ten days (fifteen pages)—and the conclusion—of the script. However, according to Coppola, it was only four—not ten—days. Also, according to Coppola, he did not run out of time and money on *The Conversation*. He ran out of energy and patience. He was trying to shoot the end of the film on location at a neighborhood park in San Francisco. It was a major scene between Harry and the mysterious woman from the conversation. To enhance the drama, the production crew used a fog machine. The neighbors, however, complained about the fog and called the cops. In addition to the police, local reporters showed up and caused a scene. Then, lead actor Gene Hackman became agitated. Finally, according to Coppola:

I remember I got so fed up with the people and the reporters—you know, making a mountain out of a molehill—that I just got upset and wrapped the film and didn't shoot anymore. And that's the reason why we were not able to use the film as written which used the sequence in the park as its conclusion. We didn't have all the pieces since I just wrapped four days early. (*The Conversation*. DVD. Audio Commentary.)

The discrepancy between Murch's and Coppola's account (and other discussions about the film) describing the production history reveals the fragility of a production team's memory and the

necessity for archival records.⁷ Both men differently remember the circumstances but similarly recall the main outcome. Coppola and Murch acknowledge the screenplay—and the conclusion—were not shot in its entirety. As a result, stopping left huge holes in the film’s exposition that Murch and Chew faced fixing during post-production.

Coppola wanted to stop work on *The Conversation* and return to it after he wrapped *The Godfather II*, but Murch convinced him that they could solve it (Koppleman 37). Eventually, Coppola’s advice to Murch was “let’s just cut what we have together and see if we can find a way to compensate for that missing footage” (Ondaatje 157). According to Murch, “Francis told us that if we thought of anything that wasn’t on the list we had, we should just go ahead and try it without bothering him; he would see it when he next came back to town” (Koppleman 34).

Murch and Chew proceeded without Coppola during much of the post-production process. The first cut was over five hours long, and they then worked on the film (both sound and picture editing) for almost a year. Throughout the year, they screened the film for Coppola and test-audiences. Much of what they had to fix in *The Conversation* was based on negative test audience screenings. Based on conversations with Murch, Koppelman claims test audiences:

admired the work-in-progress but were unclear about what had really happened at the end of the movie. More crucially, they found it hard to identify with the introspective, socially uncomfortable character of Harry, and felt the thriller parts of the story did not integrate with the character study. (36)

⁷ Cowie, Koppleman, and Ondaatje all support Murch’s claim that Coppola ran out of time and money because he was scheduled to work on *The Godfather*. Schumacher supports Coppola’s account of the on-location difficulties. Schumacher, however, does not mention that Coppola wrapped production because of it. It is interesting to note that Ralph Singleton, the former head of production at Zoetrope studios, contradicts this altogether. In his book *Film Scheduling*, Singleton outlines his work as production manager on *The Conversation*. According to Singleton, the last four days of production were interior shots of Harry’s warehouse, the surveillance convention, and exterior shots of a car chase—not the park scene. Also, according to Singleton, they were scheduled to shoot the park scene in one day (day twenty-eight of the forty-one day shoot)—not over four days.

As a consequence, Murch makes several claims about his contributions to the film. First, he claims he made Harry more sympathetic by recording and inserting new dialogue to help audiences better understand and sympathize with the main character. Second, he claims he enhanced the film's thriller aspect by cutting a scene with the corporate executive's assistant into two scenes to enhance the film's suspenseful plotline. Third, he claims he made the narrative more coherent by compensating for the missing footage and clarifying the film's conclusion. According to Murch, he turned part of the failed fog scene conclusion into a dream sequence not originally in the script. He also claims the line "he'd kill *us* if he could" was not in the original script. He states that he re-recorded the original conversation and used that alternative line reading to clarify the conclusion—the aural trompe l'oeil.

In order to investigate, and not merely reproduce, these claims, it is necessary to use the archival materials as evidence. Of course, the archive cannot prove or discredit whether Murch made these decisions all by himself, or if Chew was part of the overall discussion and decision-making process. Regardless, the archival evidence does reveal that changes exist between the script and the final film, and, as a result, indicates that Murch and Chew modified both the picture and the sound to create these changes during post-production.

Archival Evidence

The following information is based on *The Conversation* Final Script (November 22, 1972) available at the Margaret Herrick Library, part of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences film archive in Los Angeles, California, compared to the released film.⁸ The analysis

⁸ The final script is also reproduced in its entirety in *Scenario* 5:1. (1999). Any quotations from the final script are taken from this publication.

uses archival evidence to examine Murch's claims and provides a more in-depth analysis of *The Conversation*'s changes and creative revisions in post-production.⁹ First, he claims the post-production revisions made Harry more sympathetic. Second, he claims they enhanced the film's thriller aspect. Third, he claims they made the film more coherent.

Early test audiences did not like Harry Caul (Koppleman). One difference between the script and the film is the elimination of an entire subplot. The final script contains several scenes that focus on Harry's relationship with his neighbors. In the script, the neighbors treat Harry as an equal and a friend. They complain to him about the absent landlord and conspire with him about how to fix the constant plumbing problem. However, the script reveals that Harry owns the building and is the negligent landlord. He keeps this information from his neighbors and expresses contempt for them behind their backs. In contrast, the released film contains only one scene directly related to Harry's relationship with his neighbors. In the beginning of the film, Harry realizes that one of his neighbors has a key to his apartment building and reads his mail. It deeply disturbs him. As a surveillance expert, he is an intensely private person. He sees these actions as a complete invasion of his privacy which highlights Harry's proclivity toward paranoia. As a result, this scene sets up the film's conclusion.

Early test audiences not only did not like Harry but they also had difficulty relating to and understanding him. According to Murch, this is because Harry does not reveal why he is fearful his work might hurt other people until late in the script. Several years earlier, he worked on a surveillance job that resulted in the killing of three people. In the final script, this information is not revealed until halfway through the narrative which Murch thought was too late (*The Conversation*. DVD. Audio Commentary).

⁹ Ideally, I would also use preview versions of the film as evidence but none were available.

In order to remedy the problem, Murch re-recorded new audio with Hackman and inserted it into the church confession scene earlier in the narrative (*The Conversation*. DVD. Audio Commentary). During the reconstructed scene, Harry visits a church to confess his sins. In the script, he briefly confesses superficial offenses. He admits to taking the Lord's name in vain, stealing newspapers, and having impure thoughts—but says nothing about his inadvertent role in the past murders. Murch takes advantage of the confessional's dark, intimate interior. He uses the shot's slow, extreme close-up on the shaded priest to insert extra dialogue into the scene. Once the camera moves past Harry in the dark confessional and pushes into the shadowy, abstract close-up, Murch inserts the following re-recorded dialogue. According to Harry:

I've been involved in some work that I think will be used to hurt these two young people. This happened to me before. People were hurt because of my work and I'm afraid it could happen again. And I'm... I was in no way responsible. I'm not responsible . . . For these, and all of my past sins, I'm heartily sorry. (*The Conversation* DVD)

The editorial fix does not feel forced or artificial here because *The Conversation* is relentlessly told from Harry's point of view. The audience is always positioned alongside him and receives information with him. Harry becomes more sympathetic in this scene in particular because the confessional is such an intimate space. The audience can learn of Harry's remorse within these cramped, sacred quarters. Here, Murch and Chew smartly blend the available visual footage with new audio footage and retain the integrity of the film itself.

In the film, the confession scene occurs forty minutes into the narrative—one-third of the way through the movie. In contrast, in the final script, Harry's complicated past is not revealed until halfway through the narrative during the post-surveillance conference scene when several characters throw a make-shift party at Harry's warehouse. One of the characters (Moran, Harry's rival in the surveillance industry) mentions Harry's role in the murders. Later in the scene,

Meredith seduces Harry but he is distracted because this information, and his current surveillance job, weigh heavily on his mind. In the script, he says, “It was true. It was true. Those three men were murdered because of me.” During this scene, Harry and Meredith are listening to the young couple’s conversation in the background. Harry says, “They have no protection. I can find them wherever they go, and I can *hear* them” (*Scenario* 41). This scene also occurs in the film but the dialogue is slightly different and dubbed into the original footage. In the film Harry says, “he’d kill us if he had the chance. I have to destroy the tapes. I can’t let it happen again.” Once again, Murch uses his audio production skills to cheat the dialogue in this scene and make Harry seem more vulnerable and, therefore, more sympathetic.

Not only changing the timing of the disclosure of information, Murch and Chew reposition several scenes to enhance Harry’s character and contribute to *The Conversation*’s overall exposition. First, in the script, the church confessional scene starts on page ninety-eight of the 125-page script. It occurs after the surveillance convention/party and after Meredith seduces Harry. In the film, it starts forty minutes into the film and occurs immediately *before* both of these scenes. The result is two-fold. First, the expository information reveals information about Harry’s past and helps the audience connect with him. Second, repositioning the scene immediately before the party in Harry’s loft prepares for Moran’s re-telling of it. The audience hears it once from Harry and then again from Moran. It functions as a one-two punch. It hits home how dangerous Harry’s job is and helps the audience understand why this particular job is so potentially disturbing to him. Thus, a comparison of the script to the film indicates that changes are directed toward making Harry more comprehensible and likeable.

Murch’s second claim about his contributions to *The Conversation* is that they enhanced the film’s suspense plotline. According to Murch, the film is both a dramatic character study and

a mystery, crime thriller. However, the first cut of the film did not balance these two themes successfully. Preview audiences were impatient when the film skewed too heavily in one direction or the other. In order to blend seamlessly the character study with the mystery for the audience, Murch and Chew became creative. Not only did they make Harry more sympathetic but they also enhanced the suspense plotline. One way he accomplished this occurs immediately after Meredith's seduction scene. After Harry and Meredith make love, they fall asleep. When Harry wakes up in the middle of the night, Meredith is gone. According to the final script, Harry calls out for her but she is not there. He gets up and hears a constant hum throughout the warehouse. He walks over to his workbench and realizes that she went through some of his things. He also realizes that she used equipment from the surveillance conference to bug his telephone. In the script, he calls her a bitch when he makes this discovery. Murch and Chew, however, tweaked this scene during post-production. They do not include the telephone bugging but add an insert shot of empty tape reels instead. During post-production, they re-shot Harry pulling an empty tape reel from his workbench and opening empty tapes cases to insinuate that Meredith stole the tapes. After this insert shot, the scene resumes as written and Harry calls her a bitch. In the final script, the tapes are anonymously stolen later in the narrative in an entirely different scene. However, in order to shorten the first cut of the film and more effectively balance the thriller plotline throughout the film, Murch and Chew added this plot point here in post-production.

One of the film's critical moments occurs when Harry discovers the audiotaped line, "He'd kill us if he got the chance." This line reveals the film's crime plotline, changing the surveillance from a simple observation of a couple to something potentially much more sinister. In the final script, this information is revealed in a scene in which Harry and his assistant Stanley

meet at Harry's warehouse to assemble the tapes. The film (both audio and visual footage) cuts back and forth between the men in the warehouse and the couple in the park. We hear and see bits and pieces of the conversation throughout the scene. We also watch Harry (in wide shots and close-ups) use the technology to re-create clear audio of the conversation for his client. During the scene, Harry and Stanley argue. Stanley asks too many questions about the conversation, and it annoys Harry. So, Harry impatiently lashes out at him. Stanley then leaves for lunch, but Harry continues to work. He uses a filter to eliminate loud music that obscures part of the conversation. Once he eliminates the music, Harry hears the young man say, "He'd kill us." He quickly disconnects the filter, as if to un-do or un-hear what he just heard, and resumes assembling the tapes. A few scenes later, Harry attempts to deliver the tape to his client but his client is unavailable. Instead, the client's assistant Martin (played by Harrison Ford) greets Harry. Harry says he will only deliver the tapes to the Director himself—no one else. On his way out of the building, he sees Ann and Mark—the young couple from the conversation—but they do not recognize him. According to Murch, audiences did not respond well to this sequence. Murch says:

It turned out to be too much for an audience to swallow. They had to both learn the technical side of what Harry did, what it is he normally does, which is a mystery to most people, and then also find out what's different about this. So in the construction of the film, I had the idea of breaking those scenes into two different parts. (*The Conversation* DVD Audio Commentary)

Instead of editing the scene according to the script, Murch and Chew edited it so that Harry slowly discovers the critical information across three major scenes. This clarifies the information for the audience and enhances the film's suspense. First, Harry and his assistant assemble the tapes. Next, he attempts to deliver the tapes to his client but is greeted by the

assistant instead. Here, the editors caught a lucky break because Ford adlibbed much of his performance. In the scene, Martin and Harry physically struggle for possession of the tapes, but Harry wins control of them. Then, Martin says, “Now look. Don’t get involved in this Mr. Harry. These tapes are dangerous. Someone may get hurt.” Harry then walks out of his office and starts to leave the building. On his way out of the building, Harry sees Mark and Ann but they do not recognize him. He sees Mark in the hallway and rides alone in the elevator with Ann. Then, later that day, Harry returns to the warehouse and resumes working on the tapes. It is at this point that he and Stanley argue and Stanley’s questions irritate Harry who lashes out at him. Stanley leaves the warehouse and does not return. Then, Harry uses the filter to eliminate music from the conversation and hears the line “he’d kill us if he got the chance.” According to Murch, the technology scene is more suspenseful broken in two parts because:

Harrison seems a little too eager to get the tapes and Harry smells something fishy about this and demands to get the tapes back. Well, if you can imagine already hearing “He’d kill us if he had the chance” and Harry turning the tapes in, it would have a very different effect than the way it’s presently constructed which is Harry turned the tapes in without having heard that line. So that Harrison’s comments “these tapes are dangerous. You know what I mean.”—Harry has no idea what he means because it’s just a meaningless conversation or so it seems. So by splitting the tape assembly scene into two parts, we get the added intensity of Harry being trapped in the elevator with the girl whose voice he just recorded and then he goes back to the office and tries to find out what is so darned interesting about those tapes. What is it? (*The Conversation* DVD Audio Commentary.)

The decision to cut this scene in two also makes Harry a bit more sympathetic. In the script version, Harry yells at Stanley for no reason. In the film, Stanley constantly interrupts Harry while he is feverishly trying to discover why the tapes are so dangerous. The edit here helps motivate Harry’s impatience with Stanley.

Murch and Chew's first two editorial revisions to *The Conversation*—making the main character more sympathetic and enhancing the mystery plotline—support Murch's third claim that he made the film more coherent. Few films are coherent if the main character is impenetrable and the jumbled plot is inscrutable. Murch and Chew clarified both. However, his third claim also pertains to the fact that Coppola did not shoot several pages of the script. As a result, Murch claims, there was a major hole in the narrative. The hole refers to the foggy San Francisco park sequence and includes the Harry/Ann elevator scene mentioned earlier. This sequence initiates the narrative's conclusion.

In the script, the final sequence begins on page 106 of the 125-page script after Harry discovers evidence of the bloody murder in the hotel bathroom. At this point, he believes his client murdered Ann. He attempts to confront his client at work but the security guards escort him from the lobby. On his way out of the building, Ann enters the elevator with Harry, and he realizes she is still alive. After she exits the elevator, Harry follows her on to a bus. On the bus, he approaches her and says her name. He says he knows about her problem and recites lines to her from the conversation. He says he cares for her and wants to help her. This encounter spooks Ann, and she rushes off the bus into the foggy night. Harry follows her into a park where she begins to run away from him. At one point, she stops and Harry reveals snippets of personal information about himself. Ann slowly slinks away from him as he speaks. He continues talking to her but eventually realizes that she is gone. He is left alone in the fog.

Later that night he returns to his warehouse which was ransacked in his absence. Luckily, the tapes are still in his possession. He listens to them again and realizes his mistake. Harry hears the line "Do you think we can do it?" and according to the script "suddenly, these words have new meaning for him" (Scenario 55). The scene then flashes back to Harry's earlier point-of-

view in the bloody bathroom. He realizes that he wrongly assumed Ann was the victim. He quickly realizes he heard the conversation wrong and that, on the tape, she and her boyfriend are conspiring to murder Harry's client. The next day Harry visits his client's office building and discovers the client is dead. Later, in his apartment, Harry yells at his neighbors and shuts the door on them. He calls his client's office but cannot reach him. Then, his phone rings. It spooks him because his phone number is unlisted. He answers the phone and realizes it is Mark—the young man from the conversation. Mark says, "Leave it, Mr. Harry. Forget everything. It has nothing to do with you. All you can do is hurt yourself. Do you understand?" Harry agrees and Mark warns "I'll keep my eye on you" before he hangs up (*Scenario 58*). At this point, Harry begins to unravel. He thinks he is under surveillance and that his apartment is bugged. He tears apart everything in his apartment (the phone, light fixtures, furniture, the floorboards, a plastic Madonna sculpture). The film concludes with Harry on the floor, crying.

This sequence posed two major problems during post-production. First, Coppola did not shoot much of the foggy park scene. Second, test audiences did not understand the aural *trompe l'oeil*. Both problems affected the film's overall cohesion. In regards to the first problem, Coppola says when he wrapped production early: "I knew more or less we could end it, but it wasn't going to end the way the script was written" (*The Conversation DVD*. Special Features. N.P.). Here, Coppola acknowledges the discrepancy between the script and the finished film. He admits the film was incomplete and assumes it would be fixed in post-production. However, how Murch and Chew would fix it while Coppola was on location filming *The Godfather II*, Coppola did not know.

Murch and Chew salvaged some of the Harry/Ann park sequence and dispersed other parts of the existing footage throughout the film. In the script version, Harry encounters Ann in

the elevator *after* he discovers evidence of the murder in the bloody bathroom. Then, he follows her on to the bus and into the park. Their scenes together occur in a linear sequence. However, in the film, Harry encounters Ann twice. First, he encounters her in the elevator between Harry's tape assembly scenes as discussed above. This insertion establishes their early connection. Then, they meet in the park, later in the film. However, since Murch and Chew did not have footage from the entire park scene, the editing becomes creative with the existing, incomplete footage. This meeting between Harry and Ann is turned into a dream sequence. In the film, it occurs after the post-surveillance convention party. After Harry and Meredith make love, Harry falls asleep in his warehouse and dreams about Ann. In the dream, Harry follows her through the park and, very similar to the script, reveals personal information about himself. During the scene, Harry tells Ann:

I live here in the city . . . My mother was Roman Catholic. I was very sick when I was a boy. I was paralyzed in my left arm and my left leg, and couldn't walk for six months... When I was five years old I was introduced to a friend of my father's and for no reason at all, I hit him with all my strength in his stomach. He died a year later . . . He'll kill you if he gets a chance. I'm not afraid of death . . . but I am afraid of murder. (*Scenario 52*)

It is important to note that the park sequence is not crucial to the film because it does not contain critical plot information, just character development. In fact, without it, the murder plotline would still be complete. However, it does reflect Harry's growing obsession with Ann and, in that sense, enhances the overall narrative. Murch and Chew make it work here as a dream sequence because of intercutting between Harry tossing and turning in his sleep and the foggy park dream sequence. The image of Harry restlessly sleeping coupled with the dark landscape creates an air of mystery and enhances the film's thriller plotline.

In addition to redeploying the park sequence, Murch and Chew also restructured the film's overall conclusion.¹⁰ Unlike the script, Harry does not witness the hotel murder scene until *after* his encounter with Ann. In the film, he dreams about Ann and then discovers Meredith stole the tapes. The next day, he calls Martin. Martin tells Harry that he has the tapes and that Harry is under surveillance. This information implies Meredith works for Martin. Martin tells Harry to come to the office to receive payment for the job. Harry goes to the office and finally meets his client (Robert Duvall) face-to-face. The client and Martin are listening to the tapes. Harry sees a portrait of Ann in the office. He also sees a portrait of them together and learns that they are husband and wife. Harry asks the client "What will you do to her?" The client does not respond. Harry collects his money and Martin escorts him to the elevator. In the next scene, Harry checks into a hotel. According to the conversation, the couple planned to meet on Sunday at the Jack Tarr hotel, room 773. Harry checks into the room next door. He sets up his surveillance equipment in the bathroom so he can spy on the next room. During this scene, he hears muffled voices and screams. Deeply troubled, Harry turns on the TV and hides under the covers in his bed.

Later that night, he breaks in to room 773. Initially, he finds no evidence of a murder, but eventually the toilet overflows with blood. Harry flees the scene. The next day, Harry tries to confront his client but the security guards kick him out of the building. Outside, he sees Ann waiting in a car. They see each other but do not speak. Harry walks away and sees the newspaper headline announcing his client's death. Then, he goes back to the office building. Ann is inside surrounded by newspaper reporters. Mark and Martin are also present. Both men exchange knowing glances with Harry. Here, the scene is intercut with flashback footage from the murder

¹⁰ For a side-by-side comparison of the differences between the script and screenplay, see Appendix C.

scene.¹¹ Eventually, Harry watches Ann and Martin leave the office building. Then, the film cuts to images and audio from the conversation. Ann asks, “Do you think we can do this?” and Mark responds “Later in the week. The Jack Tarr Hotel. 3:00. Room 773. . . . He’d kill *us* if he got the chance.” Then, it cuts to the client, bloody in a plastic bag, lying on the hotel bed.

In the next scene, Harry sits in his apartment and plays the saxophone. The phone rings. Harry picks it up, but no one is on the other end. He goes back to playing his saxophone and the phone rings again. He seems upset but he answers it again. It is Martin. Martin says, “we know you know Mr. Harry. For your own safety, don’t get involved any further. We’ll be listening to you” and then hangs up. Then, like the script, Harry begins to unravel and destroys his entire apartment. The film concludes with an image of Harry playing the saxophone in the middle of all the chaos. There are no major story differences between the final script and the finished film. The story itself is essentially the same. The editors did not change the story but, in post-production, they alter how it unfolds.

The second problem they had to resolve in the conclusion was the aural *trompe l’oeil*. The aural *trompe l’oeil* is the critical piece of information necessary to understand *The Conversation*’s crime plotline. The film leads Harry and the audience to believe that Ann is the prey instead of the murderer. The subtle change in inflection from “he’d *kill* us if he got the chance” to “he’d kill *us* if he got the chance” is the key moment in *The Conversation*. Without this revelation, the narrative falls flat. Coppola and Murch contradict one another about this critical narrative device and both claim credit for it. According to Coppola:

¹¹ Throughout the film, the audience is always positioned alongside Harry and does not receive omniscient point-of-view shots. Therefore, it is unclear here whether this footage is the actual murder scene or if it reflects Harry’s imagination of the murder scene. For an explanation of objective and subjective point-of-view, see Bordwell et. al. pages 30-32.

The line “He’d kill us if he had the chance” many people ask me about it. It was, of course, totally the intention to have that line be repeated many times. ‘He’d kill us if he had the chance.’ ‘He’d kill *us* if he had the chance.’ And you were meant to hear it in different inflections or with different emphasis depending on what you knew about the story. (*The Conversation*. DVD. Audio Commentary Francis Ford Coppola.)

According to Murch, however, the alternative reading “he’d kill *us* if he got the chance” was his contribution to the film. As the sound editor, he was responsible for the film’s audio production. In order to improve the sound quality of the conversation throughout the film, Murch re-recorded the actor’s main conversation three times. On the last take, Murch noticed a change in the actor’s inflection during a key sentence. Instead of saying “He’d *kill* us if he could,” the actor read “He’d kill *us* if he could.” According to Murch, “it was purely fortuitous” but it helped clarify the crime plotline for the audience (Onedaajte 266). He explains:

We were trying out possible solutions, and inserting that particular line was just one of many. . . . It was a risky thing to do because it violated the basic premise of the film, which was to repeat the identical conversation over and over again. . . . It came very late in the process: when the idea occurred to me, I was mixing the film in San Francisco and Francis was already shooting *The Godfather II* in New York. When I finished, I took the mix to New York, and ran it for Francis. He liked the idea of the shift in inflection, so it stayed in the film. (Onedaajte 266).

Here, Murch claims Coppola intended to repeat the identical conversation throughout the film. This contrasts with Coppola’s assertion that he intended for the audience to hear slightly different versions of the conversation throughout the film. However, Murch also contradicts himself about this point. On *The Conversation*’s DVD audio commentary, Murch says that Coppola did, in fact, intend in his production planning for the conversation to be altered slightly throughout the film. Regardless of this confusion, however, the archival evidence supports an audio change. The line “He’d kill us” is in the final script but there is no indication that the inflection should change. More importantly, in the script, Harry only realizes his mistake after

hearing the line “Do you think we can do it?”—not “He’d kill us if he had the chance.” Ralph Singleton, the former head of production at Zoetrope studios, supports that Murch changed the inflection. In his book *Film Scheduling*, Singleton outlines his work as production manager on *The Conversation*. According to Singleton, on the day of shooting, “Harry listens to the tape again and discovers new meaning to Ann’s line, ‘do you think we can do it?’” (111). However, based on the first cut of the film, test audiences did not understand the big revelation. They did not comprehend the aural trompe l’oeil. In a different interview Coppola slightly modifies his strong claim about this particular moment in the film when he says:

Uh, perhaps we were too cautious about the point for a long time. The reading was more one reading but it took different inflections from the situation. Uh, we may have helped it along a little bit. Walter might have done something. (*The Conversation*. DVD. Audio Commentary Francis Ford Coppola)

As the director, Coppola ultimately had the final say over whether or not the line “He’d kill *us* if he got had the chance” would remain in the finished film. It was his script and it was his final cut. This moment, however, became *the* defining moment within *The Conversation*, and it is not described as such in the original script. It is also a good example of how academics tend to assume the director is the film’s author. In reference to the alternate-line reading in the conversation, David Bordwell and Janet Staiger state that “Coppola exploits an ingenious narrational device” (Bordwell 376). Yet it was not Coppola who exploited the narrational device. It was a collaboration among Coppola, Murch, and Chew.

Summary

In regards to *The Conversation*, Coppola conceived the story idea, wrote it over several years, produced the film, and directed it, but Murch and Chew contributed significantly to the final film. Therefore, the Coppola-Murch-Chew case is a strong example of collaborative authorship. It highlights the various ways editors' innovations can creatively revise a film during post-production. Murch and Chew were not able to construct the film according to the screenplay. They reconstructed the story based on the available footage, and Murch re-shot additional (visual and audio) footage himself. In this sense, they re-authored parts of the film. It is in this way that we need to consider the editor's role in the filmmaking process. It is important to disentangle the simplified editor/cutter association and re-imagine the complex methods editors use to influence and collaboratively author a film text.

As evidenced in *The Conversation*, an editor's job also includes adding relevant information into the narrative when necessary. For example, by re-recording and repositioning key information throughout the film, they clarified and enhanced the overall narrative into a Hollywood thriller with a sympathetic protagonist. Ironically, by doing this they aligned the film more closely with classical Hollywood cinema and distanced it from European art cinema, thus reducing Coppola's alliance with art cinema.¹² They do, however, maintain the film's overall art tone and style. Despite their effort to "Hollywood-ize" the film, *The Conversation's* non-

¹² This is not the first time Murch accomplished this for Coppola. He also assisted with Coppola on *Apocalypse Now*. According to Cowie, *Apocalypse Now* was an epic production that generated "1.5 million feet of film" (124). To put this in perspective, a typical film has a ratio of unfinished (uncut) to finished (edited) film of twenty to one. *Apocalypse Now*, however, had a ratio of ninety-five to one. Therefore, for every minute of finished film, Coppola shot ninety-five minutes of film that were not used in the movie. In order to manage the production, Murch claims that several editors were assigned to different sections of the film and had to sift through over 230 hours of footage in order to construct the coherent, two-hour film.

traditional protagonist, slow-paced narrative, and Coppola's independent control over the film, still cause it to be classified as an art-cinema film.

A large part of their success here is due to Coppola's trust in Murch and his own agency as a sound designer. Coppola's trust and Murch's audio production skills enabled Murch to play with the footage beyond what a typical editor might do. Murch was able to take the actors out into the field, direct them, and personally re-record their dialogue. This re-recorded audio enabled him to change certain scenes for the desired effect. As the Sound Editor, he dubbed in Harry's personal confessional in the church, scene earlier than it was originally intended. Later in the film, he also dubbed in the line, "I have to destroy the tapes. I can't let this happen again." Both of these changes make Harry more understandable and sympathetic to audiences. It also makes the film more coherent.

Murch's audio production skills might make him an atypical Hollywood editor, but it does not make his contributions atypical of Hollywood editors in general. Too often, film discourse focuses on editing as a visual—but not aural—practice. Murch, although atypical, highlights how important it is to consider editing as a holistic visual (image) and aural (sound) practice. Coppola knew Murch was a stellar sound designer and collaborated with him on the film to make it a success. To say that Coppola exploited Murch's innovation for his own gain is an overstatement. It is fair to say, however, that Murch's attention to detail, creativity, collaborative style, and critical contributions to his films enhanced Coppola's status as a talented director. According to Murch:

. . . if we had postponed *The Conversation* would have probably come out in late 1975, but with a cloud over it which would have been blamed on me—a re-recording mixer who had never edited a feature before. And the topicality of Watergate would have been lost. Both Francis and I had a lot invested in the film coming out on time. (Koppleman 38)

Had they delayed post-production on *The Conversation*, it would have lost some of its cultural and historical appeal because the Watergate scandal made sound recording a hot topic that year. In 1974 both *The Conversation* and *The Godfather II* received Academy Nominations for Best Picture. *The Conversation* was also nominated for Best Original Screenplay and Best Sound. The films' multiple nominations helped solidify Coppola as a force to be reckoned with within the Hollywood industry. Yet would Coppola have achieved this level of success and recognition without Murch and Chew?

With *The Conversation*, the editors had the daunting task of deftly blending Coppola's art-inspired character study with a traditional, crime thriller plotline appropriate for a mainstream Hollywood audience. Although *The Conversation* is quintessentially Coppola's signature film, it was a collaborative endeavor. As a result, Murch and Chew helped audiences associate Coppola with European-style directors which contributed to his auteur status.

Chapter 4: Annie Hall

Annie Hall represents a unique case within the American film canon. Each year, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences (AMPAS) nominates a select number of films to compete for the highest prize within the cinematic American arts: an Oscar at the Academy Awards. One of the best kept secrets about the Academy Awards is the interconnected relationship between the best picture and best editing categories—or more precisely, the major impact that film editing has on how the Academy evaluates a film in the best picture category. Since 1934 (the inaugural year of the best editing category) only seven movies have won best picture that were not also at least nominated for best editing—*It Happened One Night* (1934), *Hamlet* (1948), *Tom Jones* (1963), *Alfie* (1966), *The Godfather Part II* (1974), *Annie Hall* (1977), and *Ordinary People* (1983). Therefore, any film that is not nominated for best editing historically has only a ten percent chance of winning the best picture category. In 1977, *Annie Hall* defied these odds. It received Academy Awards nominations for best director (Allen), best original screenplay (Allen and Marshall Brickman), best actor (Woody Allen), best actress (Diane Keaton), and best picture (producer Charles Joffe). It won every category except best actor (perhaps because no one could tell when Allen was acting), but it was not nominated for best editing. This is significant because, according to one of the editors, he and Allen restructured—and significantly altered the original narrative—during the post-production process.

This chapter examines *Annie Hall*'s collaborative, post-production authorship. In his book *When the Shooting Stops... the Cutting Begins*, film editor Ralph Rosenblum claims the

final version of *Annie Hall* was not the film Allen intended to create. According to Rosenblum, he and Allen re-cut and, ultimately, re-structured the film from the surreal and non sequitur exploration of Alvy Singer's joyless life into a successful love story between Alvy and Annie Hall. This claim, corroborated by Allen himself, is often reproduced in interviews and as part of the film's oral history (Hirsch 1990; Bjorkman 1994; Bailey 2001; Fox 1996; Spignesi 1992; Meade 2000), but it is not critically investigated. Therefore, this chapter uses archival evidence to provide a more in-depth analysis of *Annie Hall*'s changes and creative revisions in post-production.

Rosenblum's rhetoric about his work on the film is reproduced so often throughout the literature that it is taken at face value and has become almost mythic. Allen's confirmation of Rosenblum's claims only adds to the myth. Perhaps that is why, to date, Rosenblum's account has gone unexamined.¹ Why question the assertion that he reconstructed *Annie Hall* in the editing room if Allen, the director, concurs? This also points to the larger issue in film scholarship and criticism because it confirms the director as authority. Were Allen to have objected to Rosenblum's claims about *Annie Hall*, it is unlikely that the myth of *Anhedonia/Annie Hall* would have spread as far and wide as it has today. Rosenblum's unexamined claims about *Annie Hall* suggest that within film scholarship, the director continues to function as a film's production history gatekeeper and its institutional memory. Any account of a film's production history is vetted through the director, and he (and less often, she) is acknowledged as the final authority. In this case, Allen willingly shares the spotlight with Rosenblum. However, this does not lessen the need to question and challenge Rosenblum's

¹ In the literature I reviewed, only Douglas Brode questioned "whether Rosenblum is correct . . . or whether Woody had considerably more input in shaping the final work than say Rosenblum chooses to remember" (156). However,

claims. Instead, it suggests the need for critical archival research about the film's production history in order to investigate and flesh out exactly how and where *Annie Hall* changed in post-production. Archival evidence that supports or refutes Rosenblum's claims is a critical factor in investigating his contributions to the film's post-production. It is also a crucial first step in better understanding *Annie Hall*'s collaborative authorship.

In the archive documents I examined, Rosenblum is listed as *Annie Hall*'s sole editor. Rosenblum is also listed—in large print—as the sole editor in the film's opening credits. However, Wendy Greene Bricmont is listed—in small print—in the scrolling end credits as the film editor, and both Rosenblum and Bricmont received the best editing award for *Annie Hall* at the British Academy of Film and Television Arts in 1977. She is listed on the Internet Movie Database alongside Rosenblum as a co-editor on the film, and in film scholarship she is both credited with co-editing (Nichols; Mitchell; Silet) and entirely excluded from it (Spignesi; Lee; Schickell 2003; Bailey; Fox). In fact, in *Woody Allen Interviews* she is listed in the filmography as co-editor even though Allen himself only attributes Rosenblum with it (Kapsis and Coblentz). Also, Rosenblum does not refer to Bricmont in his *Annie Hall* book chapter and thus does not share any collaborative authorship with her. He does, however, credit Susan E. Morse (the assistant editor) with inspiring and assisting him on the film's conclusion. Morse, herself, does not mention Bricmont in her own detailed account of the film. According to Morse

I was flattered by the degree to which Ralph and Woody asked my opinion and seemed to take what I said under serious consideration. . . . Ralph deserved a lot of credit for the success of that film, but what I witnessed in that cutting room was not one man's handiwork. It was the teamwork, the collaboration between Ralph and Woody, that made

Brode does not challenge Allen's co-writer Marshall Brickman about his collaboration with Allen on the film, only the editor.

the reworking of the film a success and that, tangentially, inspired me to stick with editing, at least for a while. (LoBrutto 209-210)²

Apart from Rosenblum's recognition as "editor" in—and Bricmont's exclusion from—the *Annie Hall* screenplays (in Allen's film archive at the Harry Ransom Center), the archival materials do not contain any information about her. Therefore, it is impossible to determine from the archive materials whether or not (or where) Bricmont was part of the editing process.

Allen's, Rosenblum's, and Moore's exclusion of Bricmont from the *Annie Hall* post-production discourse cannot be overstated. Were they to acknowledge her in any of the interviews I read (similar to how Murch acknowledged Chew in interviews about *The Conversation*), I would be sure to include her as part of this case study. But they did not. Thus, as a result of their deliberate exclusion of her from the *Annie Hall* discourse, and her exclusion from the archival documents and film's opening credits, I, too, am excluding her from my discussion here. I do not mean to dismiss anyone who may have been part of the editing team and she very well may have contributed to the post-production process, but the evidence does not support including her within a discussion of collaborative authorship.

Allen and Rosenblum: From *Anhedonia* to *Annie Hall*

Allen Stewart Konisberg was born on December 1, 1935, in Brooklyn, New York.³ Konisberg fell in love with film and comedy at an early age. Throughout his childhood and adolescence, he attended local movie theaters as often as he could. He was a poor student, and, for him, films functioned as a welcome relief to school. In 1951, Konisberg worked as a

² After *Annie Hall*, Morse and Allen continued their cinematic collaboration. Over the years, Morse has edited twenty-one Woody Allen films.

magician in the Catskills and toyed with the idea of pursuing a career in comedy. One year later, he took the name Woody Allen. In 1953 he entered New York University, but due to poor attendance and grades, he was later expelled. Between 1956 and 1959 Allen began to write comedy for television variety shows, married his first wife Harlene Rosen, began Freudian psychoanalysis, and performed stand-up comedy. In 1959, Allen signed with Jack Rollins and Charles Joffe, and his popularity as a comedian continued to increase during the next four years. Two years later, he and Rosen divorced. In 1964, Allen hosted the *Tonight Show* and began writing his first film *What's New Pussycat?* (1965). The film met with a negative critical response but earned a place within the top-five money-making films of the year. Between 1966 and 1969, Allen married and divorced his second wife Louise Lasser. Allen co-wrote and co-starred in the successful *Casino Royal* (1967). In 1969, Joffe secured a contract with United Artists on Allen's behalf that guaranteed him financial security and artistic freedom.

Take the Money and Run (1969) was Allen's directorial debut. However, he had difficulty during the post-production process. In 1969, the production manager called established film editor Rosenblum to help Allen salvage the film in the editing process (Björkman 33).

According to Marion Meade:

Several days later, a truck delivered two hundred boxes of film to Rosenblum's office . . . While Woody was away, Rosenblum performed deep surgery in the editing room. He carefully moved scenes around, restored others that had been cut, extended still others, and replaced music . . . When Rosenblum finished Woody had more than a movie. He had a hit. (Meade 83)

Rosenblum was already an accomplished Hollywood editor when he began working with Allen. By that time, he had edited documentary and television series (*The Search*, *Omnibus*, the *Guy*

³ For a more complete biography see King, Baxter, Guthrie, Meade.

Lombardo Show, and *The Patty Duke Show*) throughout the 1950s and 1960s. In addition, he edited upwards of twenty-four Hollywood films including *Long Day's Journey Into Night* (1962, Dir: Sidney Lumet); *The Producers* (1968, Dir: Mel Brooks); and *The Night They Raided Minsky's* (1968, Dir: William Friedkin). According to Rosenblum, "I was developing a reputation around this time as an editor who cut directors' first films, and already a surprising percentage of my credits were debut efforts for the directors who made them" (Rosenblum and Karen 233-4). He was also developing a reputation as someone with whom it was occasionally difficult to work. According to Meade, Rosenblum was "a bearded, burly six-footer with a leonine head... [He] had a reputation for being difficult and opinionated, a combative man whose temper had been known to erupt explosively in the cutting room" (82). He had specific ideas about how a scene and film should be edited and was not afraid to speak his mind. But this did not scare off Allen. *Take the Money and Run* opened to mixed reviews, but Allen approached Rosenblum to assist on his next five films: *Bananas* (1971), *Sleeper* (1973), *Love and Death* (1975), *Annie Hall* (1977), and *Interiors* (1978).⁴

Anhedonia was *Annie Hall*'s original title. Allen co-wrote the screenplay with Marshall Brickman. *Anhedonia* refers to a state of permanent displeasure. Allen chose the title because it represented his own interior state, his inability to experience pleasure. According to Allen, "I think everyone suffers from it just as everyone is a little paranoid. I don't develop big enthusiasms. I find filmmaking laborious and tedious" (Gutherie 159). Before the film's release, United Artists was unconvinced that it could profit off the movie with its cryptic *Anhedonia* title. According to Brickman, after hearing the original title, "Arthur Krim, who was head of United

⁴ In fact, Allen has a long history of working with the same people on many of his films. His multi-film collaborators include Kay Chapin (script "girl"), Santo Loquasto (production designer), Susan E. Morse (editor), Robert Greenhut (producer), and Jeffrey Kurland (costume designer).

Artists then, walked over to the window and threatened to jump” (Rosenblum and Karen 289). At the end of 1976—and sans title—United Artists advertised it simply as “the new Woody Allen film” (Guthrie 159). In 1977, United Artists released *Anhedonia* with the new title *Annie Hall*.

Annie Hall is semi-autobiographical. It explores the life and times of Alvy Singer (played by Allen) from his childhood in Brooklyn, New York, to his ascent as a successful comedian and writer to his failed romantic relationship with Annie Hall (Diane Keaton). Keaton, Allen’s one-time lover, plays his fictional lover in the film.⁵ The film invokes Allen’s real life biography to establish the fictional Alvy as a nervous and neurotic leading man. As Alvy, the film’s narrative agent, Allen definitely speaks in the first person in *Annie Hall*. He consistently breaks the fourth wall, directly facing toward the camera to speak, uses voice over to highlight the character’s interior thoughts, and plays with the classic Hollywood aesthetic. His psychology motivates a disjointed editing style in which Alvy jumps back and forth in time in his recollections. The film is a non-linear journey through Alvy’s memory and subconscious. The film explores love, commitment, and relationships through flashbacks, fantasy sequences, animation, surrealism, and dark comedy.

Annie Hall met with mixed critical response but great popular success. Richard Schickel in *Time Magazine* called *Annie Hall* “Woody Allen’s Breakthrough Movie.” Film critic Roger Ebert referred to it “as just about everyone’s favorite Woody Allen film” (Ebert). It marked the first time the Academy Awards recognized Allen, and, as a result, it is widely acknowledged as the film that established his stature as a Hollywood auteur (Spignesi 1992; Guthrie 1978; Fox

⁵ In fact, Keaton’s real last name is Hall. She changed it because a Diane Hall was already registered in the actor’s union.

1996). To date, the film has also stood the test of time. In 2007, the American Film Institute ranked *Annie Hall* thirty-five on its list of the top 100 Hollywood films. The list is based on critical recognition, popularity over time, historical significance, and cultural impact.

Rosenblum's Claims Versus Archival Evidence

When the Shooting Stops... is Rosenblum's professional memoir about his life as a Hollywood film editor and occasional director.⁶ In it, he dedicates several chapters to his experiences working with Allen. One chapter in particular, "*Annie Hall*: It Wasn't the Film He Set Out to Make," documents their collaborative effort to reconstruct *Annie Hall* during the post-production process. According to Rosenblum, the finished film was very different than the first cut. He claims that Alvy and Annie's love story was not the central narrative thread in the screenplay, but that he and Allen discovered Annie's importance during the post-production process. In order to "fix" the first cut, Rosenblum claims that Allen shot new scenes and they rearranged the plot in the editing process. Finally, although he never claims that he "saved" *Annie Hall* in the cutting room, he nevertheless makes a very strong argument for his own contributions.

The archival evidence reveals Rosenblum's increasing prominence in the film's overall production. This information is based on the Harry Ransom Center film archive in Austin, Texas, containing various drafts of the *Anhedonia / Annie Hall* screenplay. These screenplays are: 1) "Early draft, untitled, 4/15/76"; 2) "Revised draft with credits, production notes with alternate title *Anxiety*"; 3) "*Annie Hall* Final Draft, 1976"; and the 4) "Combined continuity with corrected dialogue, 5/3/77." Traditionally and contractually, the opening credits sequence is

created based on the hierarchical significance of the persons listed on-screen. In an early draft titled “Revised Draft w/Credits: Production Notes with Alternative Title ‘Anxiety,’” Rosenblum is listed eighth in the opening credits. Within the film, however, Rosenblum is listed second immediately after producers Rollins and Joffe. His six-place jump in the credits suggests the amount of work he did during the post-production process and the significance of his contributions to the finished film.

Rosenblum’s major claim is that the first cut was so incoherent that he and Allen re-cut—and ultimately, re-structured—the film into a love story between Alvy and Annie. Unfortunately, the first cut no longer exists. However, in his book, Rosenblum acknowledges that they cut the film according to how Allen and Brickman wrote the screenplay. For the following analysis, I focused primarily on the screenplay titled “*Annie Hall* Final Draft, 1976” (signed and dated August 2, 1976). This screenplay does not support all of Rosenblum’s claims. It does, however, reveal two major differences from the film that supports some of Rosenblum’s claims.⁷ First, he helped Allen alter the film’s central question during post-production. Second, he helped shift the narrative focus from Alvy to the romantic Alvy/Annie relationship.

The first major difference between the screenplay and the film relates to the narratives’ central questions. According to Linda Seger in *Making a Good Script Great*, “Every story, in a sense, is a mystery. It asks a question in the set-up that will be answered in the climax. Usually a problem is introduced, or a situation that needs to be resolved is introduced” (13). In the film version, Allen as Alvy Singer appears against a burnt orange back drop for the opening scene. In

⁶ Rosenblum co-wrote the book with Robert Karen.

⁷ In order to investigate this claim and illustrate better the key differences between the final screenplay and the film itself, it is necessary to provide an in-depth, side-by-side comparison of them as evidence. Therefore, for my purposes here, my primary examples are focused on the first third of the 120-page screenplay. This deliberate constraint centers my analysis on the screenplay’s original foundation and highlights its original narrative focus.

direct address to the audience, he admits the “key joke in his adult life” is a Groucho Marx joke about not wanting to belong to any club that would have him as a member. He then acknowledges he has just turned forty, explains that he and Annie are no longer a couple, and laments their breakup. According to Alvy:

Annie and I broke up and I-I still can't get my mind around that. You know, I-I keep sifting the pieces of the relationship through my mind and-and examining my life and tryin' to figure out where did the screw-up come, you know, and a year ago we were... in love. You know, and-and-and ... And it's funny, I'm not-I'm not a morose type. I'm not a depressive character. I-I-I, uh, (Laughing) -- you know, I was a reasonably happy kid, I guess.

The footage then cuts to a new scene of childhood with Alvy and his mother in a doctor's office. In the film, Alvy asks the central question, “Where did the screw up come?,” within the first three minutes. The question refers to the film's central tension: his romantic relationship with Annie. Throughout the movie, he attempts to answer that question and resolve this central tension for himself and the film audience. The film narrative moves forward and looks back at their relationship through Alvy's point-of-view.

In contrast with the final film, the screenplay begins similarly but quickly becomes more complicated.⁸ It starts with Alvy's direct address but shortly changes into cross-cutting between Alvy, Annie, and her new boyfriend Tony Lacey (Paul Simon). Also, the screenplay has a completely different central question than the film. In the screenplay, Alvy never wonders where did the screw up come? Instead, he asks “What am I missing? . . . What are my values? I'm forty, I should have values. What are they? How did I get them? Are they worth anything? I got a lot of hostility but I don't know how many values” (Allen and Marshall. *Annie Hall Final*

⁸ For a side-by-side comparison between the film and the screenplay, see Appendix E.

Screenplay. N.P.). The central tension in the film is between Annie and Alvy. In the screenplay, the central tension is Alvy's uncertainty about himself: who he is, what he believes in, and how he developed into his current self. These questions dictate the screenplay and, subsequently, confirm Rosenblum's claims about the first cut of *Annie Hall*. The screenplay explores Alvy's search for meaning in his life, and Annie is just one woman (of many) with whom Alvy encounters on his quest. In contrast, the film focuses on Alvy and Annie's romance as the primary motivating factor in Alvy's life.

The screenplay focuses on Alvy's personal, interior psychology much more than the film. For example, a flashback scene at Alvy's childhood school occurs at 3:04 minutes into the film and on page four in the screenplay. In the film, the scene is condensed.⁹ In it, an adult Alvy goes back to his elementary school classroom and watches the teacher scold his childhood self. Adult Alvy uses psychoanalysis to defend childhood Alvy and then wonders where his elementary school classmates are now. Several of the school children stand up and reveal their current hobbies and occupations which include "selling tallises," owning a "plumbing company," doing "heroin," and one young girl admitting to a future leather fetish. In contrast, this scene is extended in the screenplay to include three additional fantasy sequences: two with Alvy's former classmates and an exchange with a television game show host.¹⁰ The difference between these two scenes supports Rosenblum's claim that within the first cut of *Annie Hall* the "stream of consciousness continuity, rambling commentary, and bizarre gags completely obscured the skeletal [romance] plot" (275).

⁹ See Appendix F for the film version of this scene.

¹⁰ See Appendix G for the extended screenplay version of this scene.

This elementary school flashback/fantasy scene occurs in both the screenplay and the film before Alvy and Annie's relationship develops within the narrative. In the film, the scene lasts 1:40 minutes and establishes two plot features: Alvy's problem with women at an early age that sets him apart from his childhood classmates. In the screenplay, however, the scene is extended over eight pages. It not only establishes his relationship with women and sets him apart from his classmates. It also provides a stinging critique of television culture and introduces an additional love interest. These additions detract from the film's basic love story and might have derailed the film's narrative momentum. For example, Alvy's exchange with the television game show host is a fantasy sequence within the Donald fantasy sequence within the schoolroom flashback/fantasy sequence. As a result, the scene digs itself into an embedded box structure and stalls the romance narrative. This example illustrates Rosenblum's and Allen's challenge and success in the cutting room. Cutting away an exploration of Alvy's values moves the romance forward and focuses on its comedic momentum.

The film version of *Annie Hall*, similar to the original screenplay's extended classroom scene, does contain a series of cultural critiques. In the film, Alvy resists everything from television to new age philosophy, Los Angeles, and community college. In fact, the final screenplay contains several anti-intellectual vignettes that are not present in the film. Rosenblum and Allen deleted this material in order to streamline *Annie Hall's* narrative. For example, twenty-one minutes into the film Alvy and his first wife Robin attend a high-brow cocktail party. It is clear that Robin wants Alvy to be on his best behavior because "these are friends, okay?" Yet the academic crowd irritates Alvy, and he is annoyed that he is missing the Knicks game. In the film, we hear a brief snippet of the cocktail party conversation. Then, Alvy retreats to the bedroom to watch the Knicks game. Robin comes in to the bedroom to coerce him to come back

to the party but he refuses. Instead, he attempts to coerce her into the bed to have sex, but she accuses him of using “sex to express hostility” and storms out. The film then cuts to a scene of the two of them at home, unsuccessfully trying to have sex. The cocktail party scene lasts less than two minutes.

In contrast to the film, the screenplay extends the cocktail party scene over four and a half pages. Instead of a brief snippet of conversation, the screenplay includes an extended montage of the participants.¹¹ This extended scene (like an earlier scene on page twenty, deleted from the film, in which Alvy burns one of his college deans in effigy) interjects Allen’s antipathy toward intellectuals and academia. In the screenplay, the cocktail party scene is expanded even further after Robin storms out of the bedroom. Alvy returns to watching the Knicks game and mutters to himself, “Intellectuals – where does it get you?” Then, the television announcer says “Knicks ball – out of bounds – Jackson to Bradley – shot! – No good! Rebound – Kierkegaard” (Allen and Brickman. *Annie Hall Final Screenplay* 34). Then, it cuts to this fantasy basketball game as the announcer continues: “Passes to Nietzsche – fast break to Kafka! Top of the key – it’s Kafka and Alvy – all alone – they’re gripped with anxiety - -and guilt and neither can shoot! Now Earl Monroe steals it! And the Knicks have four on two” (35).¹² As this expanded scene illustrates, the screenplay distances the narrative from Alvy and Annie’s romance to consider Alvy’s general dissatisfaction with much of the world around him. Instead, this scene combines Alvy’s distaste for academics with his love of sports alongside his general state of anhedonia. As a result, it was cut from the film. According to Rosenblum:

Time and again, if we could view this first cut, we would be surprised to find the film dwelling on issues that were just touched in passing in the version we know. From

¹¹ See Appendix H for the extended screenplay version of the cocktail party scene.

¹² It is interesting to note that *Anxiety* was an alternative title to the film, after *Anhedonia* and before *Annie Hall*.

anxiety about proving himself and being tested to a distaste for intellectuals and an envy of athletes, Woody seemed to be intent on covering every issue of his adult life. (278)

Instead of keeping this surreal fantasy, Rosenblum and Allen edited the scene to highlight Alvy's cultural critique but cut away the excess materials that contribute toward eventually understanding the failed Alvy/Annie romance.

In total, the archival evidence reveals that twenty-four scenes were cut entirely from the screenplay because they did not move the love story forward.¹³ In addition to the scenes previously discussed, other deleted scenes include: his mother describing blacks moving into the neighborhood as “the Element”; childhood Alvy with his Cousin Dolores; a fantasy scene with Nazi officers; an *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* fantasy sequence with Rob in Los Angeles; childhood bullies on Coney Island; a Garden of Eden fantasy with Pam; Alvy, Rob, Annie, the Devil, and Richard Nixon stuck together in an elevator; Alvy almost beaten up in Los Angeles; a scene with “The Masses”; and Alvy flirting with two women in Los Angeles. These scenes do not focus on the romantic relationship between Alvy and Annie but unravel, instead, like an extreme version of Alvy's stream of consciousness. The screenplay flashes sideways so often that it is difficult to tell when the narrative moves forward. As a result, the screenplay appears non sequitur. In the film, the love story grounds the whimsical and episodic plot. The love story anchors the film and acts as the causal glue in between the film's recurring surrealist asides and fantasy fissures. Without the central love story to hold it together, *Annie Hall* would be a very different film.

¹³ Additional scenes were also deleted but I did not include them within this total because they did not specifically derail the romance. They were simply unnecessary to the whole narrative. See Appendix E for a list of deleted screenplay scenes.

The deletion of twenty-four scenes resulted in several re-shoots. For example, both the screenplay and the film contain the scene in which Alvy and Rob take Annie to Brooklyn and visit their old neighborhood. However, the screenplay (and probably the first cut of the film) contains additional narrative material. In the screenplay, Alvy, Annie, and Rob visit a Burger' N' Bun restaurant in Los Angeles. In this scene, a big man is bullying an older gentleman at the table behind them. Reluctantly, Alvy steps in to help the old man and is almost beaten up. The bully, however, then recognizes Alvy from television and asks for his autograph. Immediately following this scene, Annie and Alvy are at Alvy's apartment. She says she had a wonderful day. They have a brief discussion about what he would have done if the bully had not recognized him. Then he mentions it is Annie's birthday and gives her presents: gaudy underwear and a beautiful silver star. In contrast, the film version (which also occurs after their visit to Brooklyn) deletes the restaurant scene but includes the apartment/birthday scene. In order to include the information about Annie's birthday, they re-shot a scene between Annie and Alvy walking down a street in New York. In the film, as they walk she says she had a wonderful day, and he immediately mentions her birthday. Then the scene cuts to her opening presents upstairs in his apartment: gaudy underwear and, instead of a silver star, a watch.

A second scene deleted from the screenplay also resulted in a re-shoot. The original scene occurred in split screen between Annie and Alvy. The two prior scenes were ones in which Tony Lacey (Tony Roberts) approaches Annie in the nightclub after seeing her sing for the first time. Then, during a scene which was also cut, Alvy and Annie donate blood and he eventually passes out. Immediately following this scene, Annie and Alvy converse in split screen. He says they have to go to California to attend an award show, and Annie says she is looking forward to it.

Alvy, however, is dreading it because he hates Los Angeles.¹⁴ According to Rosenblum, “Without these lines we had no way of explaining the cut to California” (284). So Woody shot a new scene, not in the original screenplay, to explain their trip to California. The new scene is the party scene in which Alvy sneezes into two-thousand-dollars worth of cocaine. According to Rosenblum, at test screenings for the film, this moment achieved the single largest laugh. As a result, “The laughter was so great at each of our test screenings that I kept having to add more and more feet of dead film to keep the laughter from pushing the next scene right off the screen” (284). It is valuable to note that Rosenblum’s editing (or perhaps Rosenblum’s and Allen’s) actually resulted in a re-shoot that generated one of the most memorable comic moments of the film.

The archival evidence also confirms Rosenblum’s claims that the first cut and final cut had somewhat different endings. According to the archival evidence, Allen restructured and re-shot the last two and a half pages of the screenplay. In the film, Alvy produces a play based on his relationship with Annie. In the play, Annie and Alvy are about to break up, but Annie changes her mind and they quickly reconcile.¹⁵ This scene is entirely absent from the screenplay and was created to resolve the film’s central love story theme.

¹⁴ The scene immediately following this deleted scene was also deleted. It is a straight cut to a shot of “the Masses” in which they proclaim, in uniform “We’re the masses and we respond only to junk. We voted twice for Nixon and we get a big kick out of seeing people give and receive meaningless awards. Thank you for giving us this time.” The script also contains a derogatory joke about the Oscars. It is possible to speculate that were these scenes included in the final film, the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences may not have been so generous with Oscar nominations for *Annie Hall*.

¹⁵ Allen claims he is often asked about doing a sequel to *Annie Hall* but always declines the request. However, in 2006, Diane Keaton starred in Nancy Meyer’s *Something’s Gotta Give*. Keaton starred as a successful dramatist who writes a play about a bad breakup. In it, the couple does not reconcile. Instead, the male character has a heart attack and dies. Meyers (who wrote and directed the film) claims she wrote it specifically for Keaton. Although Meyers has never publicly acknowledged *Annie Hall*’s influence on the film, *Something’s Gotta Give* offers a glimpse of what might have happened to Annie, post-*Annie Hall*.

Moreover, in the screenplay, Annie and Alvy run into each other in a flower shop six months after Alvy returns to New York from Los Angeles without Annie. Annie's new boyfriend Paul is with her, and they exchange awkward "hellos" before Annie and Alvy agree to meet for lunch sometime as "friends." Then, according to the screenplay, the scene cuts to "selected footage earlier in their relationship that was totally passionate and they each vowed they'd always love one another. Perhaps the beachhouse [sic] with the lobsters and other spots" (Allen and Brickman. *Annie Hall Final Screenplay* 120). The script scene ends when Annie leaves the flower shop and Alvy says to the camera: "Charlie, can you give me a big laugh on this?" This refers to an earlier scene in which a horrified Alvy is watching Max add canned laughter to a television show in Los Angeles.

In contrast, the film ends after Annie and Alvy run into each other and their significant others outside a theater screening *The Sorrow and the Pity*. Then it cuts to a shot of Annie and Alvy eating together in a restaurant. In voice-over (not in the screenplay), Alvy tells the audience that they met up for lunch at a later date and talked about the old times. The film cuts to a montage of their previous footage, in happier times. Rosenblum added Annie's song "Seems Like Old Times" (from an earlier scene) to accompany the visual montage. Although it was not originally listed in the screenplay, pairing this song with the montage is especially poignant for the film's resolution. The last shot of the film shows Annie and Alvy parting ways on a crowded New York street. Again, in voice over not in the screenplay, Alvy explains his view about relationships. He says "You know, they're totally irrational and crazy and absurd and, but, uh, I guess we keep goin' through it because uh, most of us need the eggs."

Although the archival evidence confirms the majority of Rosenblum's claims about his contributions to *Annie Hall*, it does not support every claim. In fact, it refutes one claim he makes about Annie and Alvy's post-breakup transition. According to Rosenblum:

I urged [Allen] to forget all these dramatic transitions and have Alvy say "I miss Annie—I made a terrible mistake" on a flat cut from the scene in which Annie and Alvy are sorting out their things in his apartment—which is finally how the last segment gets underway. (286)

However, according to the screenplay, that is exactly how Allen and Brickman intended the scene and dialogue to occur. In the screenplay, immediately following their breakup in the apartment, is a straight cut to Alvy saying, "I miss Annie. I made a mistake." In this instance, it seems that Rosenblum reconstructed his memory of this event much like he reconstructed the film itself.

Despite the volume of material available, some of Rosenblum's claims can be neither confirmed nor rejected by the archival evidence. First, Rosenblum claims he suggested Allen should read the "eggs" joke against the script in order to best time the conclusion. It is impossible to determine whether or not Rosenblum made this suggestion. Second, he also claims the first cut of the film extended the scene in which Alvy is jailed after smashing his car in Los Angeles and tearing up his ticket in front of the policeman. According to Rosenblum, the deleted scene is "A jailhouse scene in which Woody, arrested for his reckless parking-lot driving spree in Los Angeles, is thrown in with a bunch of tough cons and wins them over by entering their joke-telling session with a tour-de-force performance" (280). This scene, however, is not in the final screenplay. Third, Allen himself claims that *Annie Hall* was originally written as a murder mystery (Björkman 79). Yet neither the final screenplay nor the "Early Draft, Untitled, 4/15/76" confirms any murder mystery plot. These claims cannot be verified against the archival

information but are important to consider when trying to determine *Annie Hall*'s collaborative authorship.

Summary

The final draft of the screenplay confirms the majority of Rosenblum's claims about his contributions to *Annie Hall*. According to Rosenblum, rather than a love story, the first cut of the film reflected "the surrealistic and abstract adventures of a neurotic Jewish comedian who was reliving his highly flawed life and in the process satirizing much of our culture" (275). His central claim is that the love story between the lead characters Alvy Singer and Annie Hall was not "the intended focus of the film" (274). The *Annie Hall* screenplay "Final Draft, August 2, 1976" supports this claim. Their relationship is present within the screenplay and is a central theme within the text, but unlike the film, it is secondary to Alvy's own psychologically motivated narrative episodes. Also, the screenplay includes additional footage of Alvy with his other lovers. As a result, Annie appears in the screenplay alongside these other women as one of Alvy's many relationships. Yet in the film, she is the central female figure in the story. As a result, it is clear that Rosenblum and Allen restructured—and collaboratively authored—the narrative during post-production.

This is not meant to detract from Allen's artistry. Allen and Brickman wrote much of the film's innovative structure (the childhood flashback sequences, the Annie/Alvy split-screen scenes, the split screen between Annie's and Alvy's families at Easter, and the animated Snow White scene) into the original screenplay. This case study is an attempt to broaden existing film scholarship through an inclusive, rather than exclusive, approach to the auteur theory. It is

designed to draw attention to the long-standing relationship between Allen and Rosenblum as a way to highlight the beneficial and complicated role of collaborative authorship.

Rosenblum's lack of an Academy Award nomination for *Annie Hall* reflects the difficulty of a Hollywood editor to showcase his or her artistic ability within a film text. An editor's labor should enhance the director's status as the sole author of the text. As a result, his or her own artistic style should not outshine the director's vision. Ironically, their artistic effort to re-work the first cut of *Annie Hall* and reconstruct the narrative is interpreted as Allen's authorial genius. Rosenblum and Allen finessed Allen's vision and made it *more recognizable* as a Woody Allen film. Part of Allen's public authorship reflects their private artistry. But Rosenblum did not share the success at the Academy Awards. This, of course, raises the question: if Allen were listed as co-editor with Rosenblum (as he was with co-script writer Brickman) on *Annie Hall*, would they have been nominated for best editing?

Allen himself is the organizing principle behind "Woody Allen" films. Film critics, scholars, and audiences use Allen's supposed personal life as the primary driving force to understand the central and recurring themes throughout his work. In part, this is justified because he often co-writes and stars as well as directs in his own films. He is also a visible presence throughout the marketing campaigns. When United Artists advertised *Annie Hall* as "the new Woody Allen film," this advertising technique assumed Allen's fingerprints were on the film (Guthrie 159). It stamped Allen onto the marketing campaign as the author and used him as the major selling point. As a result, it assumed that he is a creative presence off and on-screen and his authorship is apparent. As a result, Allen's strong authorial presence may have cost him an Oscar for best actor. Throughout *Annie Hall*, the real Allen and the fictional Alvy are so intertwined it is difficult to tell them apart, and discerning the two becomes one of the key jokes

in Allen's films contributing to his auteur status in making his "personality" readable within the films he directs.

Allen's strong presence within the film may be a crucial reason why Rosenblum was not nominated for their efforts on *Annie Hall*. Allen's presence within the marketing campaign clearly marks him as the star, and his multiple roles (actor, writer, director, narrator) clearly mark him as the author. In addition, the film's episodic construction highlights the editing but ultimately masks the editor because Alvy's psychology motivates the interrupted sequences. Rosenblum's lack of a best editing Oscar nomination is not a comment that the film was badly edited. Instead, it reflects the Academy members' assumption that they did not contribute much to—nor co-author—the highly personal narrative in the post-production process. According to Rosenblum:

. . . editors are part of an oppressed class in filmmaking... they are the lowest paid and least recognized of the top members of the movie team... Directors never give special mention to their editors when they lope up there to receive their Oscar— lest an overeager critic surmise that the film had been in trouble and was salvaged by heavy editorial doctoring. (297, 8)

Despite Rosenblum's efforts, Allen cast too huge a shadow on the production for the spotlight to reach the editors for the Academy Awards. Allen's presence is so strong and seamless that it is difficult to see anyone else's fingerprints on the negative—or in the cutting room. However, despite being one of only seven films ever to win best picture without also being nominated for best editing, *Annie Hall* highlights the interconnected relationship between the best picture and best editing categories—a relationship, and collaborative art, that deserves visibility, recognition, and respect.

Chapter 5 - *Raging Bull*

This chapter outlines Martin Scorsese's and Thelma Schoonmaker's collaborative relationship. It examines their early days together at New York University and, in particular, pays special attention to their collaboration on *Raging Bull* (1980). Literature and discourse about the film often highlights Scorsese's storyboards as *Raging Bull's* central guiding force during the production and post-production process. These claims are often reproduced in interviews and as part of the film's oral history (Kelly, Keyser, Gross, *Raging Bull* "Inside the Ring," *People Weekly*), but they are not critically investigated. Therefore, this chapter uses archival evidence to provide a more in-depth analysis of *Raging Bull's* changes and creative revisions in post-production. This chapter confirms that the *Raging Bull* Master Script storyboards do correspond to many identical shots and sequences in the film. However, the editing deviates from the storyboards throughout the film—especially during the fight scenes. Therefore, in contrast to the original storyboards, Scorsese and Schoonmaker rearrange key moments, use non-continuity editing, and insert jump cuts into the scene where none were originally planned.

Scorsese and Schoonmaker: Biography and History

Few relationships in Hollywood are better known than the collaborative partnership between director Martin Scorsese and his long-term editor Thelma Schoonmaker. In fact, to date, she is Scorsese's longest-serving collaborator.¹ Although neither one of them planned on

¹ Schoonmaker is not credited on Scorsese's earliest films because she had trouble entering the union (Keyser 31).

becoming a filmmaker, they have two of the most critically acclaimed and well-respected careers in the industry. Both Scorsese and Schoonmaker came to Hollywood via New York. Scorsese was born on November 17, 1942, in Queens, New York. His parents (Charles and Catherine) both worked in the garment industry. In 1949, they could no longer afford to live in Queens and moved to Little Italy, New York. Scorsese lived there until 1966 attending Old Saint Patrick's School. Although the Scorseses were Catholics, the Irish Catholic influence of Old Saint Patrick's School—its apocalyptic vision of hellfire and brimstone—left a lasting impression on the anxious, young boy.²

When he was growing up, Little Italy was tight knit and dangerous. It was a tough neighborhood populated by mobsters. Living there was difficult for Scorsese because he was a sickly child plagued by respiratory problems. As a result, he did not play sports, and the local neighborhood boys did not perceive him as macho. To prove he was tough, he learned to take a punch. According to Scorsese, “the only way I was able to defend myself was to be able to take punishment. Then I got a lot of respect. They said ‘Oh, he’s okay, he can take it. Don’t hit him.’ The guys were pretty big and I had asthma” (Ansen in Keyser 4). To protect him from the local gangs, Scorsese’s dad started taking him to the movies at an early age. There, he fell in love with film. He would often come home and draw storyboards for his own productions or act out scenes for his friends. During this time, he also became an altar boy and befriended a young priest who was also a cinephile. This friendship taught Scorsese that loving movies and the church were not mutually exclusive activities, and he decided to become a priest. The ritual and iconography the church offered intrigued him because it was lacking in his own home life. According to Scorsese,

² Later, Scorsese would convince Francis Ford Coppola to use Old Saint Patrick's School for the baptism massacre scene in *The Godfather* (Keyser).

he was “lonely. . . as a kid. My parents worked and I came home from school at three and sat at my kitchen table making up stories on my drawing board, or watching television, or escaping to the movies” (Attanasio in Keyser 5). The church provided Scorsese with a sense of stability and a safe community in comparison to his turbulent childhood in Little Italy. It also provided him with the very appealing idea of eternal salvation—an idea that he craved but could not necessarily comprehend.

In 1956 (despite his parent’s protestations), Scorsese entered Cathedral College, the seminary of the Archdiocese of New York on Manhattan’s Upper West Side. Then, according to his biographies, he simultaneously found God, sex, and rock and roll. According to the church, however, these activities (celibacy and masturbation/sex) were mutually exclusive, and his time in Cathedral College was short lived. He was expelled. Soon after, Scorsese transferred to Cardinal Hays High School in the Bronx and chased after girls instead of the priesthood. For college, he wanted to attend the prestigious Fordham University but because of his poor grades, he attended New York University (NYU). There, he met his lifelong mentor, film professor Haig Manoogian. Manoogian’s energy and passion inspired Scorsese to make his own films.

According to Scorsese, with Haig and at NYU, he was

able to try new things with film, new things with editing. We were excited by Godard, Truffaut, and Antoniono, who didn’t seem to use any cuts at all in *L’Aventura*. We were open to so many different ways of making movies that we broke all the rules. That doesn’t mean we did films without learning the rules first. . . but I was able to draw on many new films and create a vocabulary for myself with camera movement and cutting. (Kelly 38)

Scorsese completed his undergraduate and graduates degrees at NYU. There, he produced several critically acclaimed student films such as *What’s a Nice Girl like You Doing in a Place like This* (1963), *It’s Just Not You*, *Murray* (1964) (which was shown at the New York Film

Festival and also had a brief commercial release), and *I Call First* (1967, later changed to *Who's That Knocking at My Door*) screened at the Chicago International Film Festival.³

Who's That Knocking at My Door was Scorsese and Schoonmaker's first collaboration. Like Scorsese, Schoonmaker did not plan on becoming a filmmaker. Schoonmaker attended Cornell University and studied political science. She planned to graduate and work as a diplomat.⁴ When she went to take her final exams, however, her professors told her that she was too idealistic and would be unhappy in her chosen profession. She returned to Cornell to complete graduate work in primitive art instead. Then, she saw an advertisement in the *New York Times* for an Assistant Film Editor. She had no experience but they hired and trained her.

According to Schoonmaker:

I got the job and worked for a terrible old hack who was butchering the great foreign films for late night television. Fellini, Antonioni, Truffaut, Godard—he was just taking their films and shortening them, so they would fit exactly between 2:00 A.M. and 4:00 A.M. This was before anyone considered these people 'great artists.' . . . I learned to cut negatives, and I learned enough to realize that maybe it was something I wanted to do. (Kelly 50)

Despite the unfavorable task at hand, she enjoyed the work and enrolled in a summer course at NYU. There she met Manoogian who asked her to help Scorsese cut *Who's That Knocking*. Scorsese had already shot part of the film, and she volunteered to crew and edit the picture with him. According to Manoogian:

³ That year, future film critic Roger Ebert attended the festival and Scorsese's film had a major impact on him. According to Ebert, "I had seen great films, I had in truth seen *greater* films, but never one that so touched me. Perhaps it was because of that experience that I *became* a film critic, instead of simply working as one" (Ebert 2).

⁴ It is interesting to note that film editors are often diplomatic. They must often negotiate conflicts in the editing room between themselves, the directors, and producers. Also, in the book *Selected Takes* LoBrutto interviews thirty editors. Throughout the book, his subjects reveal personality traits common to editors such as patience, good listening skills, cooperation, and flexibility. It could be suggested that these traits are also common to diplomats and that perhaps Schoonmaker applied her training at Cornell to her work in the editing room.

she was great. She and Marty had a marvelous rapport. Marty and I used to come down once every week or two to take a look at it, and she'd show us exactly what we wanted to see. So we would ask "All right, T, what do you think?" and we'd get her opinion, and boy, she had an opinion. Through that system, we developed the picture. (Kelly 53)

Over the last twenty-two years, they worked on twenty-four films together.⁵

Schoonmaker's deference toward Scorsese is one of her most striking attributes. In a 2006 *Cinema Editor* article, she uses the words "luck" and "lucky" on three separate occasions when describing her relationship with Scorsese. She also refers to meeting him as "a miracle" (Burcksen 6). Despite their long-standing and intertwined careers, Schoonmaker often credits Scorsese with her accomplishments but refuses to take any credit for his success. For example, despite the fact that she won an Academy Award for her work on *Raging Bull*, she does not take credit for it. She gives all the credit to Scorsese. According to Schoonmaker:

I cannot tell you what *despair* I felt when standing backstage next to Robert De Niro, who had also won for the film, and heard that Marty hadn't won Best Director. I was just devastated and I never felt the same about that particular Oscar ever since—because I just wanted to just rush out and hand it to him and say, 'It's yours, not mine.' In fact, in her acceptance speech at this year's ceremony, Schoonmaker again attributed her success to Scorsese. "This is the third time you've given the editing Oscar to a film that was made by Martin Scorsese," she told the audience at the Kodak Theatre. "And believe me, I know I wouldn't be standing here if it wasn't for him." [emphasis mine] (Almo N.P.)

Part of Schoonmaker's reluctance to take credit for their films is because she regards Scorsese as an auteur. In Mary Pat Kelly's *Martin Scorsese: A Journey*, Schoonmaker refers to Scorsese as an "auteur." She says "every frame of *Raging Bull* has his stamp on it" (147). Again, when asked about winning the Oscar for *Raging Bull*, she states:

When I won the Academy Award, I felt it was Marty's. He should have won as director. I felt that *my* award was *his* because I know I won it for the fight sequences, and the fight sequences are as brilliant as they are because of the way Marty thought them out. I helped

⁵ According to imdb.com they have two other films in development: *The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt* (2010) and *Sinatra* (2011).

him put it together, but it was not my editing skill that made the film look so good. In a way it was a tribute to him that they Academy voted for me even though I was just then getting into the union. Certainly De Niro deserves his award, but Marty should have won one as well. *Raging Bull* was seamless. It was perfect. We participated to a certain extent, but it felt like we were being guided through it by this omniscient hand. (Kelly 150)⁶

To Schoonmaker, *Raging Bull* was not her film. It was Scorsese's vision. It reflected his ideas, his personality, and his artistic genius. According to Schoonmaker, she merely helped him achieve that vision. True, there are recurring motifs throughout Scorsese's films (religion, male jealousy and sexual insecurity, the Italian American ghetto, mobsters, Catholic guilt, and violence), but it is impossible to determine if *Raging Bull* would have been as successful without Schoonmaker.

***Raging Bull*: History and Production Context**

In the early 1970s Robert De Niro suggested that he and Scorsese should adapt Jake LaMotta's autobiography for the screen. Scorsese declined. He was not a boxing fan and did not care for sports, in general. In short, he had no interest in the making film. For years DeNiro persisted and Scorsese resisted. Yet Scorsese was not idle during this time. He directed *Mean Streets* (1973), *Alice Doesn't Live here Anymore* (1974), *Italianamerica* (1974), *Taxi Driver* (1976), and *New York, New York* (1977). While he supervised editing on *New York, New York*, he also worked on two documentaries (*American Boy*, 1977 and *The Last Waltz*, 1978) and began pre-production for Liza Minnelli's eventual Broadway show *The Act* (1977).

⁶ She worked on many of Scorsese's earlier film but did not receive proper credit because she was based in New York and not in the union. Before officially joining the union, they required that she work eight years as an apprentice but she declined. According to Schoonmaker, "on *Raging Bull*, Marty, through Irwin Winkler, used lawyers and standby editors and I got into the union" (Kelly 1991, 146).

Professionally, he was pushing himself beyond his limits and it eventually took its toll on his personal life. In the mid-1970s, his second wife (Julia Cameron) divorced him. The media speculated it was due to his alleged cocaine use and an affair with Minnelli. In 1978, Scorsese's hard days and long nights caught up with him. He was sick and exhausted and wound up in the hospital. DeNiro used the opportunity to pitch *Raging Bull* again and this time it worked.

Scorsese was frail and vulnerable. His career had stalled (neither *New York, New York* nor *The Act* were well received), and he felt—both personally and professionally—he was up against the ropes. As a result, he could finally relate to and understand the LaMotta character. According to Scorsese:

the motive became to achieve an understanding of a self-destructive lifestyle—of a person who is destructive to the people around him and to himself—who finally eased up on himself and on those other people, and somehow made peace with life. I used *Raging Bull* as a kind of rehabilitation. (Kelly 122)

Once Scorsese decided this, he agreed to work with DeNiro on the project.

Scorsese hired Mardik Martin to write the screenplay. Scorsese still had little love for boxing and trusted Martin with the adaptation because they had previously collaborated on *It's Just Not You*, *Murray*, *Mean Street*, *Italianamerica*, *New York, New York*, and *American Boy*. Martin did research, conducted interviews, and worked on the screenplay for two years. When he finished, he presented Scorsese with a chronological version of LaMotta's story based on the book itself. Yet, Scorsese and DeNiro wanted to take the film in a different direction so Scorsese hired Paul Schrader (with whom he had previously worked on *Taxi Driver*) to re-work the screenplay. Both Martin and Schrader received full screenwriting credit for their work yet each emphasized different aspects of the narrative. According to Keyser, “where Martin emphasized the punches scored on others, Schrader saw the cruel blows to the self” (108). Schrader's version

was more in line with the story Scorsese and DeNiro wanted to tell but neither of them were satisfied with the final screenplay. To fix it, they took matters into their own hands. Together, they traveled to St. Martin and spent several weeks re-working the script. According to DeNiro, “Marty and I liked parts of Schrader’s script but not others. We still had to make it our own. So we revised the script, and went over each scene, sometimes adding dialogue” (Kelly 126). Scorsese adds, “Paul had said, ‘You guys do your dialogue.’ he also said, ‘If you want to compress it, you can combine characters, too.’ And this is what we wound up doing down in St. Martin. Schrader had done a great job but we had to make it our own” (Kelly 126).⁷ According to Scorsese, *Raging Bull* is not necessarily an adaptation of LaMotta’s book but an artistic interpretation of his life instead.

One reason Scorsese was determined to make *Raging Bull* according to his own vision was because he did not want to duplicate the feel or look of any other recent boxing movie such as *Rocky* (1976), *Rocky II* (1979), or *The Main Event* (1979). One of the ways he accomplishes this is by using black-and-white instead of color film. According to Keyser:

Eschewing color for black-and-white photography, substituting montage for continuity, offering a loathsome protagonist instead of a hero, emphasizing the sordid instead of the respectable, highlighting defeats instead of victories and exultation, *Raging Bull* seemed an anti-*Rocky*, a tale of the fall down the museum steps and not the run-up. In *Raging Bull* Scorsese masterfully reworks his favorite themes, retribution and personal salvation, again demonstrating that real men don’t make up for sins in church but instead find atonement in the streets. (110)

Raging Bull is a brutal film. Once Scorsese grabs the audience, he does not let go.

According to film critic Roger Ebert, “*Raging Bull* is not a film about boxing but about a man with paralyzing jealousy and sexual insecurity, for whom being punished in the ring serves as

⁷ They took Schrader’s advice and combined two characters into one: Jake’s brother Joey and his friend/co-author Pete Savage (Keyser 109).

confession, penance, and absolution” (277). Scorsese not only punishes LaMotta in the ring but he places the audience alongside him for the beatings. Unlike *Rocky* or *The Main Event*, Scorsese filmed all the fight scenes inside the ring with one camera—not outside of it with multiple cameras. This technique distinguishes *Raging Bull* from other boxing films and contributes to the film’s overall intensity. It creates a claustrophobic feeling because the audience is placed subjectively with LaMotta as a participant in each fight instead of objectively and safely outside as an observer or impartial witness to it. Scorsese also sped up and slowed down the film camera during production to enhance the scenes’ disturbing and disorienting atmosphere.

In 2007, the American Film Institute ranked *Raging Bull* fourth on their list of the top 100 movies in 100 years (AFI’s 100 Years). It is Scorsese’s highest ranked film on the list. However, when it premiered in 1980, it received mixed reviews. According to Andrew Sarris:

Martin Scorsese’s *Raging Bull* is an achievement at once prodigious and puzzling. . . Scene for scene, Scorsese may be the most talented contemporary American filmmaker, but wholeness has never been his strong point. Scorsese, like so many auteurs of his generation, cannot tell a story to save his life. (33)

David Denby states “I admire *Raging Bull* immensely for its beautiful period detail and its brutal humor, but I find it a monomaniacal, crabbed, limited work” (44). Gary Arnold claims, “Martin Scorsese’s obsession with a dubious mystique of masculinity turns *Raging Bull* into a ponderous work of metaphysical cinematic bull” (54). In contrast, both Michael H. Seitz and Jack Kroll proclaimed *Raging Bull* “the best American movie” in 1980 (Kroll p. 37; Seitz p. 139). Judith Crist declares *Raging Bull* “a triumphant exercise of style: tough, street-wise, and brutal” (85). Also, according to Vern Stefanic, “*Raging Bull* is a superlative film, at least in technical terms, and it is probably the best movie about boxing ever made” (145). Throughout the many film reviews, critics praised Scorsese, his cinematographer (Michael Chapman), and the screenwriters

(Martin and Schrader) for their work on the film. Yet surprisingly—or not—only two critics mention Schoonmaker. The *Variety* review credits Schoonmaker alongside Scorsese with their “highly effective use of slow motion in the fights and elsewhere to take the film out of objective reality into the subjectivity of La Motta’s mind” (32). However, Stanley Kauffmann, in his review for *The New Republic*, singles out Schoonmaker for her contributions to the film. He called *Raging Bull* a “huge leap” in Scorsese’s filmmaking and states:

I’ve a hunch, too, that the result owes a great deal to its editor, Thelma Schoonmaker, that she found ways to fuse the fiery particles into a flow and to make a viable organism out of what may have been digressions and lingerings in the shooting. (50)

Here, Kauffmann uses the word “hunch” to describe what he thinks *might have happened* during post-production. This, of course, is part of the problem for film critics and scholars. Without a first-hand account, it is impossible to know exactly what occurred during the post-production process. Instead of hunches and guesswork, however, I argue for archival research as a way to critically investigate and better understand *Raging Bull*’s script-to-screen evolution.

Claims and Archival Evidence

The following information is based on the *Raging Bull* “Master Script ‘as Shot Pre-Hiatus 8/17/79’ Shooting Script with RDN Notes” (Martin and Schrader).⁸ This script is part of the Robert De Niro archive collection at the Harry Ransom Center in Austin, Texas. The collection contains various versions of the script (“First Draft Undated,” “Untitled Undated,” etc.), but this is the only version entitled both the “Master” and “Shooting” script. It has notes,

⁸ Scorsese shot the fight scenes with De Niro (and the scenes that depict a young Jake LaMotta) months before he shot the “old” (fat) Jake LaMotta scenes. The “pre-hiatus” in the shooting script title refers to the four-month-long production hiatus that was required so that De Niro could gain weight to play older, “fallen” version of LaMotta’s

De Niro's handwritten revisions, and most importantly Scorsese's storyboards in it. The shooting script is key to my analysis here because this is the script members of the production and post-production team used. This is the blueprint for shooting the film. Therefore, any variations between the shooting script and the film text either occurred on-set during production or during post-production in the editing room.

Scorsese and Schoonmaker closely collaborate during post-production. Half the time, she works with Scorsese in the editing room, but the other half of the time she works by herself (Feeney). She does not, however, collaborate with him during planning or pre-production.

According to Schoonmaker,

What I do with the script is usually read it whenever Marty tells me to. . . then put it away and I don't look at it again because my job really is to be a cold, objective eye for him. We look at dailies together, every night, of what he shot the day before. Then he talks to me constantly during that process. He's telling me what he thinks, constantly. 'I don't like that. I do like this. This is a better reading of that line.' Then I take those notes - I write like the wind, fortunately - and I take my own feelings and start creating selects. So I carve out all that raw footage. I carve out what's the best. . . When he comes in after he's through shooting I have carved out the film for the first time, in a rough cut, and then we start working scene by scene, from the beginning, editing together. Then he'll go away and leave me alone for a while and then I'll work again and present another cut to him. We just keep going. (Feeney N.P.)

Although Schoonmaker is not involved during pre-production, Scorsese is during post-production. They work together over several months fine tuning the film until they are both satisfied with the final cut. Scorsese, of course, has final approval over the cut, but he seeks Schoonmaker's council throughout the process. She, in turn, uses her skill to articulate Scorsese's personal vision during post-production. According to Schoonmaker,

former self. From this point forth, the ""Master Script 'as Shot Pre-Hiatus 8/17/79' Shooting Script with RDN Notes"" will be referred to as the *Raging Bull* Master Script or just Master Script.

You would have to sit here for two months with me and see how a scene has been transformed from the way it was originally cut and then how it looks at the end. What happens is that there are thousands of decisions I make every day. ... It's incredibly creative, because you're dealing not only with image but with sound, with acting, with lighting, with the camera moves, the director's intention. (Feeny, N.P.)

Both the *Raging Bull* Master Script and the film have nine major fight scenes. According to Scorsese, each fight was expertly choreographed and designed in explicit storyboards. In fact, Scorsese claims he basically pre-edited the fight scenes during preproduction based on his detailed storyboards. According to Ebert, "Schoonmaker told me, when we went through this film a shot at a time. . . she felt as much work, preparation, shooting, and postproduction, [sic] went into the fight scenes in *Raging Bull* as any footage of any film ever shot" (185). Scorsese originally planned five weeks to shoot the fight scenes but ultimately went over schedule. Although the fight scenes only constitute about twelve minutes of screen time, he spent ten weeks shooting them.

The entire film is worth analysis. However, *Raging Bull* is a boxing film and these scenes are an integral part of its success. Therefore, this chapter focuses on three main fights: the Cerdan, Dauthuille, and Robinson scenes. The Robinson scene is particularly important to my analysis for two reasons. First, it is the film's climax. It is also the most stunning and memorable fight sequence in the film. Second, it is one of only a few scenes about which Schoonmaker makes any major claims. In general, Schoonmaker is incredibly deferential toward Scorsese and reluctant to take any credit for her contributions to *Raging Bull*. However, according to Schoonmaker, they deviated from Scorsese's Robinson storyboards and greatly reworked the scene during postproduction. In order to investigate Schoonmaker's deference to Scorsese (and his supposedly pre-edited fight scenes), it is necessary to pay special attention to the fight scenes.

Scorsese makes a major claim about the Dauthuille fight. He claims that “in the fight between Jake and Dauthuille, we followed the storyboards exactly. It was almost like it was pre-cut” (Kelly 135). However, he complicates the claim by confusing the Dauthuille fight with the Cerdan fight. In an interview with Kelly, he claims the Dauthuille fight is the fight with the long tracking shot at the beginning of the scene, but the Cerdan fight is actually the scene with the initial, long tracking shot.⁹ So it is unclear whether or not he meant he replicated the Dauthuille storyboards or the Cerdan storyboards in the editing room. In order to investigate this claim, it is necessary to examine *both* fights and their accompanying storyboards.

It is easy to understand how Scorsese might confuse the Cerdan and Dauthuille fights. In the film, there were nine major fights. Cerdan and Dauthuille are fights seven and eight. The Cerdan fight contains forty-five seconds of boxing footage and the Dauthuille fight contains fifty-five seconds of boxing footage. The Cerdan fight had thirty storyboards across thirteen pages of the master script whereas the Dauthuille fight had thirty-nine storyboards across sixteen pages of the seconds of boxing footage. Finally, on the most superficial level, they both contain brutal boxing footage and La Motta wins both fights. That, however is where the similarities end.

The Cerdan Fight

The Cerdan fight is the championship fight. It is the fight La Motta has been waiting for throughout the whole film. It is his chance at the title. A gorgeous, long tracking shot begins the fight sequence. It follows Jake and Joey from inside the dressing room, down the hall, into the

⁹ In this interview, Scorsese talks about the “lazy Susan” effect and the shot when the mouthpiece flies out of Dauthuille’s mouth. That *does* occur during the Dauthuille fight. Still, it is unclear whether or not he is referring to the Dauthuille or the Cerdan fight in terms of the storyboards.

stadium, through the two thousand-person crowd, and into the boxing ring.¹⁰ Classical music is the soundtrack in this scene. It is the only fight scene in the film with a classical music soundtrack. After the announcer gives the boxers' initial introductions, the scene (unlike the majority of the other fights in the film) has no announcer commentary. Also, unlike the other fight scenes, the Cerdan fight contains hand-held camerawork that creates tension and energy in the ring. Then, when the boxers are in their corners, the film changes to a slow motion effect as they catch their breath in between rounds.

No doubt Scorsese planned *Raging Bull's* fight sequences in great detail. The Cerdan fight had thirty storyboards across thirteen pages. Also, throughout the Cerdan storyboards (and all of the fight sequence storyboards), Scorsese illustrated various camera set-ups and motion, as well. Scorsese's storyboards are a master blueprint for the edited scenes. However, the edited Cerdan fight deviates from this master plan. According to the storyboards (and the accompanying notes), once the initial tracking shot ends and La Motta is in the ring, he looks over at Vickie in the audience. This point-of-view shot, however, does not occur in the film. We do see Vickie in the audience (in a medium, long slow motion, push-in shot), but it is not Jake's point-of-view. In the previous shot, his back is turned to her in the ring and once he eventually turns around in the next shot, there is no eye line match between them. Clearly, Scorsese storyboarded—and shot—Vickie from Jake's point-of-view. Throughout the film, Scorsese shoots Vickie in slow motion from Jake's point-of-view when trying to capture his subjective (and often jealous) state of mind. Yet here, it is not his point of view. The shot of Vickie is in the sequence but used differently than Scorsese originally intended in the storyboards. By not using

¹⁰ Scorsese used a similar, long tracking shot in *Goodfellas* (1990) when he followed the main character from the street, into a building, through the kitchen, down the hallway, and into an exclusive club.

an eyeline, match cut between Jake and Vickie, the choice diminishes their emotional connection. Each character is looking at the other one, but they are not seeing each other. This minor detail reveals major information about their relationship and foreshadows their eventual breakup.

The storyboards also contain a wide shot of the entire arena that was supposed to be used for the beginning and the end of the fight. Yet this image does not occur in the scene. The only time we see a wide shot of the arena is at the very end of the tracking shot. The tracking shot follows Jake from the dressing room into the ring and then pulls back into a very brief, high and wide angle of the arena. Beyond that, unlike the storyboard's instructions, we do not see another wide angle of the arena for the rest of the scene. Once the camera (and Jake) enter the ring, it stays inside of it. As a result, Schoonmaker and Scorsese contain both Jake and the film audience within the ring. It makes the scene more claustrophobic and intense due to Jake's and our enclosure within the confined space. This, coupled with the lack of an eyeline-match cut between him and Vickie further isolates Jake and contributes to his metaphoric portrayal as a trapped animal—a raging bull.

According to the Master Script, the Cerdan scene was supposed to show rounds one, three, five, seven, and nine but round five is not in the final film.¹¹ Rounds one, three, five, and seven are storyboarded in the master script, but round nine is explained in a shot-by-shot description instead. According to the Cerdan storyboards, nineteen shots were supposed to be in round one but in the film only five shots are. Scorsese and Schoonmaker deviated from the storyboards and cut out the majority of the footage in round one. Although it only contains five

¹¹ A note in the master script says to “omit” round five. However, I included it here because the original master script does provide the storyboard for it with instructions for camera placement and coverage.

shots, round one remains the longest and most detailed round in the scene. Were it any longer, it would feel out of place in this extremely quick and fast-paced scene. Both rounds three and seven only contain two shots each.

The boxing footage in round nine is even simpler than in rounds three and seven. According to the storyboards, the shot immediately following the image of the ninth-round title card should be a “med full pan and dolly shot – Jake and Cerdan punching down side #4 to Cerdan’s corner, truck with Jake returning to his corner” (Master Script, N.P.).¹² Yet the film only contains the last half of these instructions. Absent the pan and dolly, it does not show very much of the fight between Jake and Cerdan. In the ninth round, Jake only punches Cerdan twice up against the ropes in Cerdan’s corner before the round is over. Then, the camera follows Jake back to his own corner. The next fifty seconds of the film proceeds similar to the screenplay. Their handlers attend to Cerdan and Jake in their respective corners as someone walks around the ring holding up a “Round 10” card. However, before round ten can commence, Cerdan concedes the fight. It is over. He is finished. Then, the referee walks to Jake’s corner and gives him the good news. Jake stands up and raises his arms in triumph as Joey and others congratulate him in the ring.

At this point the film deviates from the master script. The film simultaneously omits footage from the script and adds additional images to it. According to the master script, the film is supposed to cut to Vickie in the crowd as she walks up to the ring and calls out Jake’s name. Then, later in the scene, Jake is supposed to fight his way through the ring to kiss her before Joey pulls him back into the center stage to soak up his long-awaited moment in the sun. This footage

¹² In general, the Master Script does not contain page numbers so it is impossible to cite them throughout my research. Certain sections do contain page numbers and I will cite them when available.

of Vickie, however, is not in the film. In contrast, Schoonmaker and Scorsese edited in extra footage that does not occur anywhere in the Cerdan fight storyboards or description. Interspersed during the last twenty-five seconds of the scene (when Jake celebrates in the ring) are five, quick close-up shots of the ringside photographers and their flashbulbs. The effect is three-fold. First, the quick cuts enhance the scene's overall excitement. Second, they add significance to Jake's victory. The physical presence of the newspaper photographers (in addition to the steady stream of their ever-present flashbulbs) implies the event itself is newsworthy and important. It underscores the magnitude of Jake's win and the pinnacle of his success. Third, they serve as a stunning juxtaposition to highlight the depths of his fall in the very next scene in which Jake is fat, out of shape, and miserable. It is three years after the Cerdan fight, and Jake accuses Joey of sleeping with Vickie. In short, it is the beginning of the end for Jake—both personally and professionally. Although the shots of the photographers were not in the storyboards, the addition here is to great effect.

The Dauthuille Fight

The Dauthuille fight is the next and eighth fight in *Raging Bull*. In the beginning of this fight, LaMotta keeps his arms down and takes a beating. It seems certain that he will lose the fight, but it was a ruse. According to the announcer, Jake was only “playing possum” with his opponent. Toward the end of the fight, Jake pummels Dauthuille and wins the fight. According to Scorsese, this is the fight he “pre-cut” with the storyboards. According to the Dauthuille fight storyboards, the first shot should be “an extreme close-up [sic] Jake being hit from behind ropes” (Master Script, N.P.). It should also be a tracking shot. In the storyboard image, Jake is framed in the center of the screen and faces screen left. The camera is placed outside of the ring and the top

rope obscures part of his face. The second shot should be the wide shot of the first shot but taken from a low angle. The image contains the two boxers, screen left, in the left corner of the ring. Then the third shot should be a tighter shot of shot two and the fourth shot should be a tighter shot of shot three. Shot four should also be an extreme close-up (low angle) of Jake against the ropes (screen left facing screen right) with his face obscured by the ropes. In shots one through four, the camera remains outside the ring. Also, according to the storyboards, shots two through four should “be covered as separate cuts needed when Jake bounces off one side of the ropes to other” (Master Script N.P.).

The next page of the storyboards contains images of the radio announcer coverage. This page has five separate storyboards and suggests these images should be shots five through nine in the edited fight sequence.¹³ Shot five is shot wide from behind the main radio announcer. We see the back of his head as he watches the fight in front of him. Only the boxers’ legs are visible in the right corner of the ring. The rest of the action is cropped out of the shot. Shot five is supposed to track from left *and* right.¹⁴ Shot six is similar to shot five except here it is a medium shot not a wide shot. Shot seven is the inverse image of shot six. Here, the camera is in the ring and focused on the ring announcer’s face as it is framed through the ropes. Again, the camera instructions for this shot are to track left and right. Shot eight is similar to shot seven. The only

¹³ In the master script, however, they are not labeled as shots five through nine. The corresponding number next to the first storyboard is unreadable. The second storyboard on this page has the number twelve next to it. The third storyboard on this page has the number thirteen (or possibly fifteen) next to it. The next two storyboards have the numbers four and five next to them. Therefore, it is unclear whether the last two storyboards were supposed to follow in consecutive order as shots fourteen and fifteen. It is possible this photocopy of the master script did not accurately copy the 1 in front of storyboards four and five on this page. It is also possible that they are numbered correctly and Scorsese had a specific place in mind for these shots to be inserted. However, because Scorsese claims they followed the storyboards “exactly” during the Dauthuille fight, I followed the master script according to these claims. Therefore, my analysis here is informed on the basis that the storyboards are laid out in the master script according to the order in which Scorsese wanted them edited into the scene.

difference is that shot eight is a close-up instead of a medium shot of the announcer. Shot nine is a “fast dolly in to flashes.” This image contains a close-up of an old-fashioned camera (center screen) and flashbulb presumably taking photographs of the fight itself.

In the film, the first part of this scene deviates from the master script. In contrast to the master script, the first shot is not an extreme close-up as the master script implies. It is a medium shot. The camera is outside the ring and it tracks forward but never into an extreme (or even a basic) close-up. However, similar to the shot one storyboard, Jake is hit in the face and the rope briefly obstructs the image. Shot two in the film is similar to shot two in the storyboard. It is a wide, low angle shot of the two boxers up against the ropes. In this shot, Jake leans forward against Dauthuille but Dauthuille pushes him off back into the ropes. Unlike the storyboards, however, the film action occurs in the right corner of the boxing ring (and screen), not the left. Shot three in the storyboards is a tighter image of shot two but the film deviates from the implied storyboard instructions. Shot three in the film is footage of the radio announcer. It is a slow, tracking shot (left *to* right not left *and* right) from behind the radio announcer’s head in the audience. Its placement in the master script suggests it should be shot five in the scene but it is actually the third shot in the edited film scene. Like the storyboard suggests, we see the boxers’ legs in the ring but the rest of the action is cropped out of this shot. (The scene also includes an inverse shot of the radio announcer later in the scene even though the master script does not call for it. Although the storyboards included four shots of the radio announcer, Schoonmaker and Scorsese only used two in this scene.) Shot four in the film is a medium shot of Jake. He continues to take a beating in the right corner up against the ropes. His arms hang down by his

¹⁴ It is interesting to note that the instructions for shots five through eight say track left *and* right not track left to right. In fact, Scorsese draws both left and right arrows in shots six and seven to indicate he wants the camera to move in both directions, not just one.

sides. This shot is similar to shot one in the film. The camera is outside the ring and the ropes partially obstruct the shot. Shot five is a wide shot from a different angle outside the ring. Jake is in the corner with his arms down. He leans against Dauthuille but Dauthuille pushes him into the ropes and then punches him in the face.

Shots six through eight in the film represent a major change in the Dauthuille fight. Shot six is a medium shot. This is an over-the shoulder (OTS) shot taken from over Dauthuille's shoulder. Dauthuille punches Jake in the face several times but it is not a match-action cut from the last shot. This shot backs up from *before* the last punch in shot five and now we see it again from this angle. Jake eventually dodges one of the punches, and Dauthuille punches the ropes instead. Now, when he is off balance, Jake begins his attack. Jake quickly punches three right hooks in the face. Then, shot seven is an extremely quick over-the-shoulder close-up of Dauthuille from over Jake's shoulder that lasts less than one second. In it, we see Jake throw a right hook. Shot eight is a very impressive and masterfully executed wide shot. The camera starts outside the ring but moves in between the ropes and into the ring during this shot. The camera moves from screen right (outside the ring) to the center of the ring and into a high angle shot of Jake beating Dauthuille in the corner against the ropes—both face and body shots. According to the master script, the next few images should be a two shot of the boxers followed by a close-up of Jake and then a close-up of Dauthuille. Instead, the film omits the two shot and cuts directly to a close-up shot of Dauthuille's point-of-view. It is an extreme close-up of Jake (on axis) as he looks directly into the camera and throws a left hook. This edit is especially effective. It conveys the fight's intensity and the speed at which Jake ambushes his opponent. As soon as the camera enters the ring (in shot eight), Dauthuille is under attack and so is the audience. This cut to Dauthuille's point-of-view (instead of the less subjective two-shot) immediately puts the

audience in Dauthuille's shoes and forces them to feel the intensity of Jake's assault. Then we see Jake's corresponding point-of-view shot of Dauthuille. In this shot, Dauthuille's head snaps to one side and blood spurts out of a cut above his right eye. To achieve this image in production (like a later image in which his mouthpiece flies out of his mouth after he is hit in the jaw) requires planning and special effects. Yet nowhere in the master script is this image or these special effects storyboarded. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not Scorsese storyboarded the image, and it did not make it into DeNiro's copy of the master script, or whether or not they decided to add this special effect during the fight scene or perhaps in post-production. Based on the evidence here, however, it is not part of Scorsese's "pre-cut" master plan.

After Jake cuts Dauthuille above the eye, the film scene proceeds through a series of close-ups between each character and then cuts to a two shot. In this two shot, Jake appears to throw a right hook or uppercut. His arms and hands are out-of-frame below the camera, but his body movement suggests either of these punches. Toward the end of this shot and throughout the next shot, the sound (the ambient crowd noise and the announcer's voice) begins to fade out. Then, it cuts to a quick, close-up insert shot of a right hook (on axis, coming at the camera) that lasts for less than half a second. Despite Scorsese's claim that they followed these storyboards "exactly," this image is not part of the Dauthuille storyboards in the master script. The next image is an extreme close-up of Dauthuille as Jake's right hook connects with his jaw. As Dauthuille's head snaps to one side, his mouthpiece and a stream of saliva fly out of his mouth and toward screen left. In this shot the ambient sound is silenced and replaced with a wet, squirting noise. The effect is both grotesque and stunning.¹⁵

¹⁵ No collaborative authorship analysis of *Raging Bull* would be complete without acknowledging sound effects supervising editor Frank Warner. In a word, his work on this film is brilliant.

At this point in the scene, the master script and the edited film converge. Jake hits Dauthuille one last time and sends him backwards into the ropes. It is interesting to note that this is not a match-action cut. Like shot twenty, this cut backs up and shows the action—the left hook—before the end of the last shot. As a result, the audience sees the same left hook twice in back-to-back shots. The second shot is an extremely quick cut that lasts on screen for less than half a second. Then, Dauthuille lands on the mat with his head propped up on the bottom rope and Jake wins the fight on a technical knockout. When the referee calls the fight, Jake kisses his gloves and slams the mat with his gloves. He kisses them again and jumps up to celebrate. He walks over to his corner and briefly hugs one of his handlers. In the scene's last shot, he walks around the ring and the referee holds up Jake's arm in victory.

The evidence here suggests Schoonmaker and Scorsese deviated from the original storyboards. Arguably, the changes are minor but not insignificant. They break the classical Hollywood tradition of continuity editing in two places during this scene: shots six and twenty. They are both jump cuts that go back in time to before the end of the shot that preceded them. Here, Schoonmaker and Scorsese borrow from the art-cinema tradition and play with time in the scene. They could have edited the images together as match-action shots but they did not. Instead, the shots (and consequently the scene) violate the classical Hollywood tradition, and as a result they align the film with the auteur film tradition.

The changes between the Master Script storyboards and the film are significant because they shed light on the complex relationship (and misunderstanding) between storyboards and editing. Scorsese's assertion that he pre-cut the Dauthuille scene with his storyboards implies that editing is equivalent to basic shot selection, but that is wrong. It implies that editing is simply cutting the storyboarded shots (one, two, three, etc.) in a rigid, sequential order. Yet good

editing is more nuanced than that. A good editor (and, arguably, an editor with some degree of freedom and agency in the editing room) works with the available material to shape the best possible scene. Often, this requires flexibility and innovation within the editing room in order to add, re-arrange, and eliminate shots from the original storyboards. Schoonmaker and Scorsese did that in this scene.

Scorsese's assertion also implies that a storyboard is equivalent to a shot but, again, that is wrong. A storyboard is equivalent to *one frame* in one shot but not the entire shot itself. Schoonmaker did use the storyboards to edit *Raging Bull*, but she used them as a simple guideline. The storyboards provided her with basic information about what shots were supposed to go where in each scene. Yet, as the editor she had to decide when to start and end each shot. Again, this may seem insignificant, but when every second of film is made of up twenty-four frames, the decision is significant indeed. Good editing requires more than basic shot selection. It requires a fine tuned eye and exquisite sense of tone and pacing. It requires the knowledge to choose when to follow the storyboards and the courage to deviate from them when necessary. In this scene, the changes were minor (it cuts to the announcer quicker than in the storyboards and returns to him later in the scene, omits two shots of him from the scene, entirely eliminates the flashbulb shot,¹⁶ immediately cuts to Jake for shot nine, on-axis instead of a two-shot, and employs two jump cuts during the scene), but they made a major impact.

¹⁶ One reason for this might be due to the fact the film relied so heavily on it in the previous Cerdan fight scene.

The Robinson Fight

For only three scenes in *Raging Bull* does Schoonmaker indirectly attempt to take *some* credit. First, she claims that the scene when Jake and his first wife Irma argue in the kitchen was not initially supposed to be intercut with footage of Joey (Jake's brother) and Salvy (a local mobster) talking on the street. This is the third scene in the film. In the scene, Joey (Joe Pesci) and Salvy (Frank Vincent) walk down a city street and discuss Jake's career. Salvy tells Joey that Jake needs the help of the mob boss Tommy if he wants a shot at the title championship. Then, the scene cuts to an interior shot of Jake and Irma in the kitchen. Jake accuses Irma of overcooking his steak and they begin a heated, almost violent, argument. Jake flips over the kitchen table. The film then cuts back to the two men on the street as they continue their conversation. They stop at Jake's home and end the conversation, and Joey goes inside. Joey walks into the middle of the argument between the volatile couple and tries to calm the situation. Irma goes into the bedroom, but Jake and Joey stay in the kitchen and talk about his future career. According to Schoonmaker, she intercut these sequences "to improve the flow of the picture" (*Raging Bull*. DVD. Special Features . Commentary). Yet the *Raging Bull* Master Script does not support her claim. Both the Master Script outline (featured at the very beginning of the script) and the script itself indicate these scenes should be intercut. So while Schoonmaker is often remiss to take credit for her work, here her claim is unwarranted.

The second scene Schoonmaker indirectly takes credit for—which could also be considered an extension of the last scene—is when Jake and Joey talk in the kitchen after Jake's wife goes into the bedroom. Here, Schoonmaker indicates that most of the scene was a spontaneous improvisation between the two actors filmed with a one camera set-up in the small

kitchen. Scorsese's penchant for improvisation is another way in which he is a collaborative filmmaker. He structures the overall scene but trusts and allows his actors (and Schoonmaker) to help shape the scene with him. Also, with regards to this particular scene, Schoonmaker is quick to acknowledge and share credit with De Niro and Pesci as gifted improvisational actors (Burcksen 56). In this scene, they took turns improvising lines and, as a result, she did not have the necessary cut-away footage or reaction shots to edit the scene according to the master script. According to Schoonmaker, she used intercutting throughout the scene as a way to remedy the problem. Intercutting is basic technique editors use to edit improvised scenes. It requires skillfully blending the available footage (improvised action, appropriate reaction shots, etc.) with the best performances (or best takes) from the improvisation. According to Schoonmaker, in this scene it "meant if De Niro goes off on a fantastic improvisation and I don't have Joe Pesci's answers, then we have to try and get that in another take. . . And I had to make it seem like it was all scripted" (Debruge N.P.). In this instance, the Master Script supports Schoonmaker's claim. The overall dialogue in the both the script and the film are similar but not identical with each other. The actors used the script as a general outline from which to work but improvised and embellished the drama as necessary during filming. Then, the editing pulled the individual shots together to create the scene.

The third and final scene for which Schoonmaker takes some credit is the film's climax—the final boxing match between Jake and Sugar Ray Robinson. It is, perhaps, the scene she is most proud of as *Raging Bull*'s editor. In numerous interviews and discussions, it is consistently the *one* scene in which she claims she and Scorsese violated the explicit storyboards. For example, on *Raging Bull*'s DVD commentary Schoonmaker states:

The main sequence in which we used the storyboards a lot was the final beating that Jake takes from Sugar Ray Robinson... Marty had done elaborate storyboards for all the many, many shots he took for that sequence. As we were editing it, we discovered that the kinetic flow of the images actually dictated sometimes different structure. So we spent a long time on that sequence juggling the shots around. So the storyboards were very, very important. But in that particular sequence, we did violate them. (*Raging Bull* "Inside the Ring.")¹⁷

Notice, she gives Scorsese credit first (for his storyboards) before taking any credit for herself in the scene. However, both Schoonmaker and Scorsese use the term "we" in reference to how the film was edited. According to Scorsese:

During the editing, we put it together the normal way, shots one, two, three, four, and so on—it was a total of thirty-six setups. We realized after we put it together that we had our structure, but we then discovered other values of movement, lighting, special effects, and started juggling the shots. (Keyser 115)

Although Schoonmaker is listed by herself as *Raging Bull*'s film editor, they verbally share credit with one another as "co" (or collaborative) editors.

In both the Master Script and the film, the Robinson fight scene has four major parts: the introduction, round eleven, round thirteen, and the conclusion.¹⁸ According to the Master Script and Scorsese's storyboards, the Robinson fight introduction is supposed to start with both fighters in the boxing ring. According to the Master Script, the scene begins with the "TV angle - Jake jabbing several revolutions in the ring. Bell sounds. They go to corners. Camera pans to corner - Jake."¹⁹ Then, the film is supposed to cut to a pail of water. One of the trainers dips a

¹⁷ Her use of the term "violate" here is insightful because it implies an aggressive aberration from storyboards. Normally, she is usually very diplomatic in her deference to Scorsese and his vision. Here, however, her tone is somewhat different.

¹⁸ In the Master Script, the brief round of boxing preceding round thirteen is identified as round eleven. However, round eleven is not specified in the film. Therefore, the audience is led to believe the brief round of boxing before round thirteen is actually round twelve not round eleven.

¹⁹ It is unclear whether the "TV angle" phrase mentioned here refers to a camera angle that might mimic a shot for broadcast television or if it refers to the broadcast footage of the match as shown on television. For example, in the

sponge into the pail and squeezes it down Jake's back. As the liquid releases from the sponge, the audience realizes it is a pail full of bloody water. The dark colored water pours down Jake's back, and we realize this fight, more than other fight in the film, is especially difficult for him. According to the Master Script, the shot after the bloody pail of water shot should be an over the shoulder shot—from Mario (Jake's trainer) to Jake. Then, shot four should be a reverse shot from Jake to Mario. Shots five through seven should show parallel action between the two boxers sitting in their corners. For example, shots five and six should be footage of Sugar Ray and his trainer in their corner. Then, shot seven should be a shot of Jake (the "same size as Ray's face in shot #5") in his corner. The shots in this sequence (and their accompanying dialogue) should vary between normal speed and slow motion. Shots eight and nine conclude the introduction to this scene. In shots eight and nine, both boxers rise and walk out of the frame as they approach each other in the center of the ring.

In contrast to the Master Script and the storyboards, Schoonmaker and Scorsese omit the first shot (the TV angle) of the introduction. We do not see Jake and Sugar Ray boxing in the ring. Instead, the first shot of the sequence is the pail of dark water and then the liquid running down Jake's back. This edit is slightly different but significant for three reasons. First, had they shown the audience the fight and then moved to the pail of bloody water, it would not have been as striking an introduction to this scene. The bloody water image (beautifully conceived by Scorsese and executed by his cinematographer Michael Chapman) is stunning. Placing it at the very beginning of the scene ensures that its visual impact is not lost or diminished between two lesser shots. Here, the editors did not save the best image for second place within the shot selection; they used it as the first image. Second, the decision to start the scene with the bloody

film, the last shot of the introduction to this scene is a television screen as it broadcasts the "live" image of Jake in

water immediately sets this fight apart from every other fight in the film. It also signifies that Jake's rise to the top is now over. For example, the Cerdan fight began with the long, beautiful tracking shot through the cheering crowd and into the ring. That first shot illustrates the protagonist's journey and his climb toward reaching his championship goal. The Dauthille fight is Jake's next battle. In that first shot, the camera tracks from outside to inside the ring during a fight action sequence. For the Robinson fight, however, Schoonmaker and Scorsese took a different approach. Instead of starting the scene with the fight between the two boxers, it starts with the pail of bloody water and Jake alone. This signifies that Jake is not only fighting Robinson in this fight but he is also fighting himself, and from the looks of it, he is losing. From this fight onward—from the film's climax forward—all of Jake's battles are with himself. For Jake, his demise starts here but it does not end here.

The third reason this edit is so significant is because it violates the basic premise of a classic boxing (or any sport, for that matter) scene. Most sport narratives (scenes or entire stories) do not indicate the conclusion at the onset of the activity. The crux of a sport narrative is the central question: who will win? Here, in this scene the filmmakers give away the ending of the fight with the very first image. Jake's blood is spilled and it foreshadows the fight's eventual and inevitable conclusion. Sugar Ray, not Jake, wins the fight. Also, Jake's trainers so carefully administer to him; this opening sequence almost mimics a ritualistic last rites ceremony. Whereas Jake is not literally killed in the scene, his boxing career dies here. As a result, the sequence mimics the film's overall narrative structure because the very first image of the film itself (an older, obese, and battered Jake practicing his monologue in the comedy club) also gives away the film's end. The first shot of the film (like the first of this scene) tells the audience just

the corner with his trainers. My assumption, therefore, is that Scorsese's "TV angle" refers to this type of shot.

how far Jake will eventually fall before we ever see his initial ascent. Both edits subvert an introduction-climax-conclusion narrative (and the protagonist's ascent-climax-descent journey), but in this particular scene, it works especially well.²⁰

The rest of the Robinson fight's opening sequence is also different from the Master Script. The Master Script goes back and forth twice between Jake and Sugar Ray in their respective corners but, in the film, the crosscutting only occurs once. Here, the film focuses less on the parallels between each fighter and focuses solely on Jake's exhaustion. To enhance further Jake's overall lethargy, most of the imagery and sound occurs in slow motion. The sluggish sound (which includes a bizarre mix of completely ambiguous noises intercut with a sharp horse whimper) creates the scene's ominous tone. The only normal sound and dialogue in this introduction sequence occurs during the conclusion. The scene concludes with an image of a television screen as it broadcasts the "live" image of Jake in the corner with his trainers. During this shot, the announcer advertises Pabst Blue Ribbon in normal speed as the beer logo is superimposed over Jake's image on TV. Then the film immediately cuts to a normal-speed, close-up (accompanied by loud punching sounds) as Jake pummels Sugar Ray in the next round—round eleven.

In round eleven, Schoonmaker and Scorsese deviate from the original Master Script. In the Master Script, the slow motion introduction ends as each boxer stands up, walks toward the center of the ring, presumably toward each other, and out of the frame. This proposed cut is a perfectly acceptable way to edit this action because it prepares the audience to see the next boxing round. However, that is precisely why violating it is a smart decision. The jump cut

²⁰ It also probably does not destroy any major suspense since LaMotta was a real person. It is quite possible that the film's advertising already revealed the key information regarding this scene and the film's overall conclusion.

between the Pabst Blue Ribbon shot and the boxing close-up is startling because the audience is unprepared for it. The cut itself is so surprising, watching it is almost like being hit in the face. As a result, the edit (the juxtaposition between the slow and sluggish introduction and the quick, close-up punches) is visually and viscerally stunning. With one “simple” cut the scene changes from slow and ominous to fast and brutal. Upon its initial release—and even today—the fight scenes are an enormous part of *Raging Bull*’s success. According to Richard Corliss’s review in *Time Magazine*, “the ring is where Scorsese’s art is most alive” (40). Phillip Wuntuch states “the fight scenes, photographed from remarkably versatile angles, are savage, primitive ballets, but the impact of their stylized violence is staggering” (143). Also, in their respective reviews of the film, Andrew Sarris refers to Scorsese as an “auteur” in his review of *Raging Bull* while Robert Hatch compares him to Jean Luc Godard. Yet it was Scorsese *and* Schoonmaker who crafted some of the most striking (and memorable) edits in the fight scenes.

According to both Schoonmaker and Scorsese, round thirteen significantly varies from Scorsese’s storyboards. The *Raging Bull* Master Script also includes a section entitled “Cutting Sequence – Round 13.” This cutting sequence was a blueprint for Schoonmaker to follow in the editing room. It includes the storyboard numbers, slate numbers, and a brief shot description of each proposed sequential shot. This archival information is a goldmine for a scholar interested in film editing and collaborative authorship. Unfortunately, the document itself is incomplete. The Cutting Sequence includes pages one, two, and four, but it is missing page three. In order to remedy the situation, I cross-referenced the Cutting Sequence with the actual storyboards themselves. Pages one and two of the Cutting Sequence document accurately reflect storyboards one through twenty-eight. Page four accurately reflects storyboards forty-one through forty-four. I am assuming, thus, that page three (although missing and impossible to verify within the

Master Script itself) would include storyboards twenty-nine through forty. Therefore, the following comparative analysis between the film text and the Master Script uses both the Cutting Sequence and the storyboards.

The round thirteen film version and the Master Script version vary from the very first shot.²¹ According to the Cutting Sequence, the Master Script scene begins with a man walking around the ring holding a “Round 13” card and immediately cuts to a shot of Jake against the ropes. In contrast, Schoonmaker and Scorsese keep the audience outside of the ring—even outside of the stadium—with the first shot. The first shot of the sequence returns to a TV screen image that shows Jake seated in his corner with the Pabst Blue Ribbon logo superimposed over his televised image. “Round 13” is written across the television screen.²² In contrast to the Master Script descriptions, film shots two and three are in slow motion. They are close-ups of each boxer as each stands up and moves out of the frame toward the center of the ring. According to the Master Script, these images were originally intended to conclude the introduction to this scene. However, the editors use them here instead. In round eleven, the images jumped straight into the action, but in round thirteen the editors slowed it down. As a result, the shot choices give the audience time to catch its breath before Jake’s brutal beating. The slow start works well next to the incredibly fast-paced cuts that occur later on in round thirteen.

Pacing a film is an extremely important part of a film editor’s job, and Schoonmaker and Scorsese execute it remarkably well in this scene. Film shot four in round thirteen is a wide shot and returns to normal speed. The camera moves with the boxers in the ring as Sugar Ray begins

²¹ To see a side-by-side comparison of this scene, see Appendix K.

his assault on Jake. Shot four lasts seven seconds and feels uncomfortably long in comparison to the first few shots in this scene. It shows Jake withstand ten punches but not defend himself in return. His arms hang low and his head bobbles around on his shoulders as Sugar Ray throws punch after punch after brutal punch. This action occurs across several shots in a shot-reverse shot pattern. Despite its immediate brutality, this is only the introduction to round thirteen. The introduction ends once Sugar Ray realizes that Jake will not or can not fight back. In both the cutting and Master Script, Sugar Ray takes a step back from his opponent to assess the situation. As Jake wearily leans against the ropes, he goads Sugar Ray to hit him. Once this occurs, the film editing and the Master Script “Cutting Sequence – Round 13” document are synchronized. In both, this occurs as a shot-reverse shot sequence between Jake and Sugar Ray before Jake’s climatic beating. As the storyboards instruct, the film cuts back and forth between Sugar Ray and Jake before Sugar Ray begins his assault.

Round thirteen is both the climax to this scene and to the film itself. Yet Scorsese only begins numbering the storyboards for round thirteen after its introduction. The round thirteen storyboards begin with 1A, B, and C. The description for storyboard 1A is “Robinson comes in for the kill.” This sequence is an iconic moment in *Raging Bull*. Here, the entire scene slows down and comes to an ominous halt. The film speed dramatically slows down and all the diegetic background noise (the crowd, the announcer) diminishes. Low animal noises (a tiger’s roar and ambiguous grunting) and ominous tones become the soundtrack as white smoke rises up behind each boxer. In storyboard 1A, Sugar Ray is in close-up and on axis. He stares directly into the camera and presumably at Jake. The description for storyboard 1B is “Zoom out – track in

²² The first shot of round thirteen is preceded by a shot of Joey (Jake’s brother) watching the fight at home on the television in his living room. Joey does not occur anywhere in Scorsese’s round thirteen storyboards but is edited into this scene on three separate occasions.

simultaneously. Decides to finish off Jake. Comes into 1 C.” The description for storyboard 1C is “Start – zoom out and tracking then, when he decides, he comes toward the camera to XCU. His face is now backlit. He is in silhouette.” Storyboard 2A is a medium shot of Jake. The storyboard description is “Jake head down. Hangs on ropes – he looks up – to see Sugar Ray coming in. Dolly into 2B.” (Storyboard 2B is a close up of this same image.) The directions for storyboard 2A also state that this image is “to be intercut with 1A, B, C.” This series of film shots—the two men staring down each other in uncomfortably quiet close-up shots—lasts approximately twenty-three seconds. Then, storyboard 3 is a medium shot (over Sugar Ray’s shoulder) as Jake is hit, and storyboard 4 is a close-up of Sugar Ray’s left glove hitting Jake in the face. Storyboard 5 is an extreme close-up of Jake’s face (with a primary emphasis on his eyes) as he is hit. Storyboard 6 is a close-up shot of Sugar Ray’s right glove coming up to punch Jake. Storyboard 7 is an extreme close-up of Jake’s mouth as he is hit. In this storyboard, his mouthpiece flies out of his mouth. Storyboards 8, 9 and 10 show Sugar Ray hit Jake (low angle, slanted frame), Jake get hit (medium shot), and Sugar Ray throw another punch (from an extreme low angle, in silhouette). Then, storyboard 11 cuts to a high angle—or what Scorsese refers to as the “shock effect angle”—as we see the boxers in a two-shot as Sugar Ray lands a left hook. Storyboard 12 uses special effects to amp up the drama in this sequence. It is an extreme close-up of Jake’s face (on axis) as he is hit and blood squirts from his mouth. Storyboard thirteen pulls back into a high angle shot of Jake being punched on the ropes. Storyboard 13 is similar to storyboard 12, but, this time, Jake’s face is angled toward screen left and the blood squirts out from his nose. Storyboards 15 through 23 include a medium shot and a close-up shot of Sugar Ray (on axis) throwing punches. Extreme close-ups of Jake’s various body parts (part of his face, his right

glove hanging onto the rope, another face angle as blood squirts from his left temple, his knees buckling, and his wobbly feet) are intercut throughout the Sugar Ray storyboard images.

Schoonmaker and Scorsese cut the first few round-thirteen, post-introduction images almost exactly as Scorsese outlines in his storyboards. The film cuts back and forth (in a shot-reverse-shot pattern) between Sugar Ray and Jake's smoky, slow-motion footage. Then, the first two film shots of Jake's barrage are identical to the storyboards. Sugar Ray pulls back and throws a punch, and in the next shot it lands on Jake's face. However, in contrast to the Master Script, the film then cuts to an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray, not Jake. In the Master Script, it cuts to an extreme close-up of Jake's eyes but the film cuts to the lower half of Sugar Ray's face. This shot only lasts a few frames. (It is one of several blink-and-you-miss-it moments in this scene.) In the shot, Sugar Ray's face is tense as if he is baring his teeth at his opponent. Yet we do not see his teeth. Instead, we see his stark white mouthpiece stand out against his dark black skin. In this shot, he throws a right-handed jab just past the camera (obscuring his face in the process) as a photographer's flashbulb lights up the ring. The next image cuts back to Jake in close-up. It is the same image as storyboard 4, but here, the editors violate the classical Hollywood tradition of match-action cutting because Jake is hit with a left hook, not a right hook as the previous shot implies. The photographer's flashbulb also goes off in this shot. The film then cuts back to the previous image of Sugar Ray, punching past the camera (screen right) and slightly pulling back his arm (which un-obscures Sugar Ray's face). Then, there is a jump cut. Shot eight is also of Sugar Ray. In this shot, he is on axis throwing multiple, straight punches directly above the camera. Shot nine is an extreme close-up of Jake's arm slipping off the rope. In contrast to the Master Script, the film cuts to the extreme close-up of Jake's arm slipping off the rope much quicker than it does in the Master Script. Film shot ten returns to the previous

image of Sugar Ray on axis throwing punches above the camera. Then, shot eleven contains the first film image with special effects. This shot is an extreme close-up of Jake's face. In it, he is hit above his left eye and blood squirts out from the cut. Also, in contrast to the master script, the film does not show the bloody special effects *before* Jake's arm slip off the ropes. It occurs after.

The storyboards and the film text differ so greatly from shot five onwards, it is difficult to do a streamlined shot-by-shot analysis of them.²³ It is, however, useful to compare key differences between the two as a way to highlight where the editors deviated from the storyboards. Both the storyboards and the film contain various images of the boxers throughout the fight. Schoonmaker and Scorsese, however, change the images' arrangement in key locations throughout the film. For example, storyboards 33 through 41 are a good example of this alteration. In both the Master Script and the film, a key sequence starts when Sugar Ray lifts his arm above his head and ends when the referee ends the fight. This sequence ends round thirteen and precedes the scene's conclusion. This storyboard sequence is also completely different than the film. True, almost every individual storyboard does occur as an individual shot in the film. However, they do not occur *at the same particular point or in the same sequential order* in the film.

According to the Master Script, storyboard 33A is similar to storyboard 1C. Like 1C it is a close-up of Sugar Ray in silhouette. Unlike 1C his left arm is lifted above his head and out of the top of the frame. Storyboard 33B is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray's lifted glove, and it moves downward toward the bottom of the screen. Storyboard 34 is an extreme close-up as the glove smashes into Jake's right ear. In this image, blood squirts out from Jake's ear. Storyboard 35 is a close-up from Jake's point-of-view. He looks down at his own body and sees his knees

buckle underneath him. Storyboard 36 is an extreme close-up as Jake is hit in the face. Sugar Ray's glove enters screen right and an arrow indicates that it pushes Jake's face toward screen left. Storyboard 37 returns to an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray's glove. The storyboard text indicates Sugar Ray will throw a left hook. Storyboard 38 is the reverse angle of thirty-six. In this shot, Jake is in an extreme close-up, but Sugar Ray's glove enters screen left.²⁴ This time, an arrow indicates the punch will push Jake toward screen right. Storyboard 39 is a wide shot of the photographers in the audience. In this image, they are splattered with Jake's blood. Storyboard 40 returns to an image almost identical to storyboard 36—which is the inverted, parallel image of storyboard 38. In it, Jake is again in an extreme close-up. Sugar Ray's glove enters from the right and pushes Jake's face toward the left. Storyboard 41 is a close-up of Jake's wobbly feet covered in his own blood.²⁵ Storyboard 42 returns to the same image as storyboard 33—Sugar Ray on axis, in silhouette. This time he throws several punches toward the camera, presumably at Jake. Storyboard 43 is an extreme close-up of Jake in profile as his right temple splits open and blood pours from it. The next storyboard is a high angle of Sugar Ray. According to the storyboard text, in this shot, Sugar Ray repeatedly punches Jake and the referee stops the fight.

In the film, this sequence occurs quite differently. The major differences between the storyboard sequence and the film are their placement in the scene, the shot arrangements, Vickie's inclusion in the film, the frequency of Sugar Ray's (close-up) glove in each text, and

²³ To see a side-by-side comparison of the script and the film text, refer to Appendix H.

²⁴ The image in storyboard thirty-eight violates the classical Hollywood continuity aesthetic. If Sugar Ray threw a left hook in storyboard thirty-seven, it would land on the right side of Jake's face. It would enter the frame screen right. Yet the storyboard thirty-eight image shows the punch landing on the left side of his face. However, it is unclear here whether or not Scorsese *intended* to violate the classical aesthetic because the text "left hook right hand" is handwritten onto this storyboard.

²⁵ A close-up shot of Jake's feet occurs three times in the Master Script—in storyboards twenty-three, thirty "A," and forty-one. Yet this image is not in the film. It is unclear whether Scorsese shot this footage and it was omitted, or whether this footage was ever filmed at all. What is clear, however, is that this imagery does not occur in this scene as the storyboards instruct.

Jake's extreme facial close-ups in the storyboards but absence in the film. In the film, this sequence occurs later in the scene than it occurs in the storyboards. The image of Sugar Ray with his glove above his head and out of the frame is storyboard 33 but film shot thirty-nine.²⁶ In shot thirty-nine (similar to the *content* of the Master Script but not its *location* within the scene), Sugar Ray is backlit and in silhouette. Here, Scorsese and Schoonmaker start the final boxing sequence in round thirteen just like they started the scene's conclusion. They return to the striking backlit image of Sugar Ray in silhouette.²⁷ In this image, Sugar Ray begins to raise his right (not his left) arm above his head. Initially, it is a medium shot, but as he raises his arm, the camera begins to push in and angle up toward his glove. Shot forty is a close-up of Jake leaning against and hanging on to the ropes with his left arm. Shot forty-one returns to the image in shot thirty-nine. Sugar Ray continues to raise his arm until it is over his head. As he does so, the camera pushes into a close-up on his glove. Shot forty-two is a wide shot of Jake's wife Vickie in the crowd. In shot forty-two, her head is down but she looks up to see what happens. Shot forty-three returns to shot forty-one—which is an extension of shot thirty-nine. (Sugar Ray's gloved is raised and poised in the air, ready to smash Jake.) This image occurs three times in the film, but it is only reproduced twice in the storyboards. Shot forty-four is similar to storyboard 34. However, in the storyboard Jake is turned toward to the camera whereas Jake is turned away from the camera in the film. Film shot forty-four shows the back half of Jake's head as Sugar Ray's glove smashes into Jake's left ear. The next image is a jump cut that also crosses the 180-

²⁶ The numbers are somewhat confusing here because Scorsese does not start numbering his storyboards until after the scene's introduction. Film shot thirty-nine refers to the shot's placement in the scene *excluding the introduction and the round eleven sequences*. Shot thirty-nine is actually shot sixty-four in the overall scene but for the purpose of comparison here, I synchronized my shot numbers to Scorsese's storyboards to streamline the analysis.

²⁷ Once again, the importance of Frank Warner's sound in this sequence (and in this film) cannot be overstated. Here, Scorsese and Schoonmaker return to the slow motion visual image of Sugar Ray in silhouette and Warner uses

degree line. Shot forty-five is a close-up as Jake (turned toward the camera) is punched on the *right* side of his jaw (not the left side as the previous shot would indicate), and blood gushes out of his mouth. In this shot—and similar to the Dauthuille fight—Schoonmaker and Scorsese violate the classical Hollywood continuity style of editing.²⁸ Film shot forty-six is identical to storyboard 39. In it, blood splatters across the ringside photographers. In shot forty-seven, Vickie hangs her head in the hands. Vickie is noticeably absent from the round thirteen storyboards but the editors use her image twice in the scene. Shot forty-eight is similar to storyboard 35 but with one major difference. Both images are high-angle shots looking down onto Jake’s blood splattered legs. However, storyboard 35 is from Jake’s point-of-view looking down his own body but the film shot is Sugar Ray’s point-of-view. Once again (like storyboard 34 and film shot forty-four), the image is inverted.²⁹ Finally, film shot forty-nine is similar to storyboard 33. Like the storyboard, the film is shot from a high angle and the referee stops the fight. However, unlike the storyboards Jake is screen left (in background) facing the camera whereas Sugar Ray is screen right (foreground) facing away from it.

The storyboards and the film are filled with inconsistencies. Yet Vickie’s inclusion in round thirteen is perhaps the most notable differences between the Master Script and the film. In fact, according to Schoonmaker, she and Scorsese edited round thirteen around Vickie’s footage.

slow motion ominous sounds, animal noises, and strategic silence during this sequence. Warner’s sound design is a brilliant accompaniment to the visual imagery.

²⁸ Berliner claims this violation in *Raging Bull* is still consistent with the classical Hollywood continuity aesthetic because “it does not take the spectator out of the immediate space of the boxing ring” (49). It is true that the action itself remains within the boxing ring but Schoonmaker does not match the action of the cut within the scene. As a result, she violates the traditional continuity aesthetic.

²⁹ It is unclear here whether or not Scorsese shot both versions of the two images during production and he and Schoonmaker chose these particular shots from the available footage. Or, whether Scorsese disregarded his own storyboards during production and decided to shoot the footage from a different perspective.

At a special screening of *Raging Bull* at the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences in Los Angeles, California, she states:

On the big final beating he takes from Sugar Ray, Marty had done an elaborate storyboard but as we were working, of course, the footage was kinetically telling us different things to do. For example, where Vicki raises her head or puts her head down became sort of a lynchpin on which we cut that montage. (Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences Film Series)

In the Master Script, Scorsese includes three photocopied images of Vickie (from *Life* magazine). In the first and second images, she smiles as she watches the fight. In the third image, her hands are up to her face, her head is thrown back, and she looks worried. Scorsese included these images in his description of round eleven. In the film, however, these images occur in round thirteen—shots thirty-nine, fifty-three, and sixty-seven. Schoonmaker and Scorsese also use an additional image of Vickie in round thirteen—shot seventy-two. In this shot, her head is slumped forward in her hands, and she covers her eyes. They could have used Vickie in round eleven but it would have been premature. Vickie's strong emotional response works better later in the scene because more is at stake in round thirteen. It is Jake's last chance to win the fight but he fails miserably, and it is horrifying to watch. Therefore, this editing decision works exceptionally well here because Vickie stands in for the film audience. In this scene, the natural impulse is to avert our eyes from its unrelenting brutality. However, even if the audience cannot look away from the gruesome spectacle in front of us, Vickie does it for us.

Schoonmaker and Scorsese also use three insert shots of Joey in this scene—shots fourteen, fifty-one, and fifty-nine. Joey is not included anywhere in the storyboards for this scene or the Round thirteen Cutting Sequence but they include him in this sequence. In the film, Joey is watching the fight on television in his living room. Vickie and Joey are the two people who love

Jake and whom Jake loves more than anyone else in the world. Editing them into round thirteen and showing their sadness for Jake enhances this scene's emotional impact.

Clearly, the major differences between the storyboards and the film suggest the film underwent a significant creative revision during post-production. However, upon deeper inspection, it is clear that although the content varied within the film, Schoonmaker and Scorsese copied the overall storyboard form. They kept the basic structure within round thirteen but cut up the order and the sequential images within it. The special effects in this sequence are the best example of this because the *frequency* and *content* in each shot differs between the storyboards and the film—but their *strategic placement* is similar in both texts. The storyboards contain seven special effects, the film contains six special effects, and the order of which special effects occur at what time during the scene varies between the storyboards and the film. However, *the special effects' location within the film scene is almost identical to the storyboards*. For example, the special effects occur for the first time in the storyboard and the film at approximately the same time (storyboard twelve and film shot eleven) within the fight sequence. Yet the specific special effect in each shot is different. Blood shoots out of Jake's mouth in storyboard 12, but it shoots out from a cut above his eye in film shot eleven. Although the images' content are different (blood from Jake's mouth versus blood from his eye), their *placement* within the scene (shots twelve and eleven) and the *type* of image (a special effect image) are almost identical to each other. Yet perhaps most importantly, *the special effects images occur at nearly identical intervals throughout the scene*. Special effects occur in the Master Script at storyboards 12 (blood from Jake's mouth), 14 (blood from his nose), 20 (blood from his left temple), 28 (blood from his left eye), 32 (blood from his right temple), 34 (blood from his right ear), and 43 (blood from his right temple). In the film, the special effects occur at shots eleven (blood from his left

eye), twenty-one (blood from his left eye), twenty-seven (blood from his right temple), thirty one (blood from his right eye), thirty-four (blood from his left temple), and forty-five (blood from his jaw/mouth). The special effects' occurrence at the same time (and at nearly identical intervals) throughout the scene suggests the type of shot (the special effect) is as important—*if not more important*—than the content (the image) itself within the editing process.

This phenomenon is repeated throughout round thirteen. First, both the storyboards and the film cut to the first extreme close-up at the same exact time. Both storyboard 5 and shot five are extreme close-ups. However, the close-ups are different images. Storyboard 5 is an extreme close-up of Jake's eyes whereas film shot five is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray's face and mouth. One again, the content in each text is different, but the type of image (the extreme close-up) is the same. Second, the storyboards contain two instances in which Jake's glove slips off the rope during the fight—storyboards 18 and 25. The film, however, contains four instances of this footage—shots nine, fifteen, seventeen, and thirty-eight. The first instance of this image in the film is shot nine, but it occurs much later as the eighteenth storyboard. *However, this same image reoccurs again in both the film and the storyboard at approximately the same time.* It returns seven shots later in the film and six shots later in the storyboards. Third, both the film and the storyboards repeat the image of Jake's knees buckling during the fight. This image repeats on three occasions (in different locations) in both the storyboard and the film text. This image occurs in the Master Script in storyboards 21, 30B, and 34. It occurs in the film as shots eighteen, twenty-three, and forty-nine. However, once again, the duration between each image is similar in both texts. Scorsese repeats this image on storyboards 30 and 35 whereas the image repeats on film in shots eighteen and twenty-three. Five shots exist between the reoccurring images in both texts. Fourth, there are thirteen storyboards for the final boxing sequence in round thirteen.

Similarly, there are twelve shots in the film sequence. Although this is a slight variation on my point here, it bears examination. Schoonmaker and Scorsese rearranged the individual shots within this sequence but maintained the original storyboard structure and the number of shots in the sequence.

The similarity between the type of images and their location within each text highlights the strong relationship between shot selection and pacing a scene. As these examples imply, the content itself (the image itself) is less important than the *type* of image placed within the scene for maximum effect. It stands to reason then that, during post-production, both Scorsese and Schoonmaker agreed an extreme close-up was necessary for shot five to enhance the scene's intensity just as the first special effect was necessary for shot eleven. Despite the many differences in the script and film text, the parallels here reinforce the importance of shot selection and pacing as one of editing's key contributions to a film. It also highlights Scorsese's innate sense of pacing because he chose these types of images (extreme close-up, special effects, etc.) and their placement within the scene *before* production ever began on the film. Finally, it reflects Scorsese and Schoonmaker's collaborative effort to create the best possible scene based on the available footage. Although they chose content different from Scorsese's storyboards, they often maintained the integrity of the types of images he constructed and their placement within the scene.

Round thirteen is brutal to watch. It is an assault on the protagonist and on the audience. The storyboards contain mostly close-up and extreme close-up images, but, as Schoonmaker claims, she and Scorsese violated the order in which the shots occur in the film. The hits are so quick and the cutting is so fast it is difficult to keep one's bearings in this scene. Like Vickie, the

natural impulse for anyone watching the fight is to look away. As a result, it creates an intense and almost claustrophobic atmosphere for the audience.

Scorsese's storyboards were constructed according to the classical Hollywood tradition. They contained instructions and images for match-action editing. However, the editors violated the classical tradition of match-action-cutting throughout this scene. There are several jump and non-match action cuts (shots thirty-one, thirty-three, thirty-eight, and fifty-eight) throughout the scene. The decision to ignore Scorsese's storyboards and the classical Hollywood tradition works well here. The non-match-action cutting exaggerates the scene's intensity. It also aligns the audience with Jake because it mimics the chaos and confusion he experiences in round thirteen. Therefore, the editing creates a visceral experience for the audience. It leaves the audience both disoriented and slightly dazed as if we were in the ring with Sugar Ray. If they had cut the scene according to Scorsese's explicit storyboard instructions, the scene would have been fine. His storyboards still include incredible close-up and extreme close-up shots. Also, the filmed footage contained all the necessary elements for a good fight scene. However, they took it one step further, one notch higher, and made it that much better.

Summary

Martin Scorsese is one of the great American, auteur filmmakers. The combination of his keen cinematic technique and key reoccurring motifs (religion, male jealousy and sexual insecurity, the Italian American ghetto, mobsters, Catholic guilt, extreme violence) reinforce his auteur style. However, it is important to acknowledge the key reoccurring *people* who work beside him—in addition to the reoccurring motifs that occurred within his early films—as he developed his auteur status.

When it premiered in 1980, *Raging Bull* received mixed reviews. Part of its mixed reception is because audiences and critics alike did not know what to do with it and where (or how) to place it within the traditional boxing film canon. It was in black and white, not color. The protagonist was an unsympathetic brute, and the film did not sugar coat anything. Instead, it presented a severe portrait of LaMotta (both the man and the boxer) as a raging bull. At the time (and even now), the film was so different and outside of the classical Hollywood “feel good” formula it aligned Scorsese with the art-cinema filmmakers and artists. Critics praised it for its stark aesthetic and its stylized fight scenes and they commended Scorsese for his unflinching artistry. By the time *Raging Bull* was released, Scorsese already had some commercial success within the Hollywood industry with *Mean Streets* and *Taxi Driver*. This, however, was the first time the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences recognized a Scorsese film. As a result, it helped reinforce Scorsese’s reputation as a filmic force with whom to be reckoned within the industry. Yet it is important to recognize that he did not accomplish this on his own. True, he had a particular vision for *Raging Bull* but several individuals helped him write and co-author it along the way.

De Niro is Scorsese’s most visible and well-known collaborator. Before *Raging Bull*, they worked together on *Mean Streets*, *Taxi Driver*, and *New York, New York*. They grew up together in the industry and it is hard to imagine one’s success without the other. Several years before they made the film, DeNiro brought *Raging Bull* to Scorsese but he declined. However, DeNiro persisted and eventually won him over. DeNiro worked tirelessly with Scorsese on the screenplay. Their relationships were a constant negotiation between establishing the film’s character, plot, setting, and tone. Screenwriters Martin and Schrader also contributed to the screenplay. (Martin is also one of Scorsese’s earliest reoccurring collaborators.) Scorsese and

Schrader previously worked together on *Taxi Driver*. It is safe to say that Scorsese would not have made the film (nor succeeded with it) without DeNiro, Martin, and Schrader's collaborative efforts.

Raging Bull is memorable (and striking) not only because of the well-crafted subject matter but because of its visual and aural construction. First and foremost, the use of black and white sets this film apart from the cohort of other post-1950s boxing films just as it sets Scorsese (as an author) apart from the other directors who directed those fight scenes. According to Scorsese, "The most important thing about the look was the use of black and white" (*Raging Bull* DVD. Special Features . Commentary). However, the decision to use black and white instead of color film stock was not Scorsese's alone. It came out of conversations among Scorsese, Michael Powell, *Raging Bull* cinematographer Michael Chapman, and Gene Kirkwood (Thompson and Christie). Each one of these men contributed to *Raging Bull*'s iconic look.

Also, the importance of sound—and its absence—in *Raging Bull* cannot be overstated. Frank Warner, the audio sound effects supervising editor, deserves a large portion of the credit for his work on the film. The audio sound effects in *Raging Bull* are incredible and truly enhance the overall story. He uses animal noises and ambiguous sounds during the fight scenes to create an ominous atmosphere and heighten the tension. Also, during key moments in the film (again, usually during the fight scenes), he diminishes the diegetic background noise altogether and relies on silence as the scene's primary sound. It is incredibly effective because it is counter-intuitive. Instead of raising the volume during a heightened emotional moment, he takes the sound away. As a result, the moment becomes more emotional, more intense, and more stunning because it hits the viewers with unexpected silence and leaves them listening to their own anxious breath, instead.

Finally, as this chapter illustrates, without Thelma Schoonmaker *Raging Bull* would not be the film it is today. Scorsese and Schoonmaker worked side-by-side during post-production and contributed their time, effort, and creative energy. As such, Schoonmaker deserves credit alongside Scorsese as a collaborative author. This is not an attempt to strip Scorsese of his well-earned auteur status. It is, simply, an attempt to shed light on film editing and collaborative authorship as a complex and complicated artistic process.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation is an attempt to analyze the value of film editors and collaborative authorship during the Hollywood Renaissance. The Renaissance was a special moment in film history because it embraced a new style and welcomed collaborative innovation. Hollywood's major box office decline and the increasing popularity of prestigious European art cinema converged in the late 1960s and early 1970s and rattled the industry. As a result, Hollywood considered aesthetic experimentation a tactic to connect to the youth market and boost poor ticket sales, and the studios chose a new, younger, flashier generation of filmmakers to accomplish it.

It would be an overstatement to claim that the period between 1967 and 1980 represents a complete break, instead of a transition, within the Hollywood industry. The Renaissance was not a revolution, but an *evolution* in Hollywood narrative and industrial practices. It maintained the hierarchical division of labor among the individuals (director, screenwriter, editor¹) and between the groups involved ("above the line" versus "below the line" talent) in all facets of the production process, but artistic collaboration between these individuals and groups occasionally blurred the lines. Renaissance films moved narrative structure away from the causal, linear, illusionist aesthetic with an individual hero protagonist to a more ambiguous, unmotivated, non-linear, and reflexive art-cinema aesthetic. Of course, not every film made during this time period conformed to these artistic parameters, but the Renaissance films I examine here (*Bonnie and*

¹ According to Bordwell and Staiger, "technology and unions still keep the labor crafts specialized... Union contract agreements prearrange wage scales and working conditions. Thus... the unions, while protecting their members, have also contributed to the continuation of detailed division of labor" (369).

Clyde, *The Conversation*, *Annie Hall*, and *Raging Bull*) helped define the era as one of the most creative, collaborative, and artistic periods within the Hollywood industry.

The Renaissance transitioned some Hollywood films away from the classical and continuity aesthetic toward a more reflexive and modernist one. Instead of hiding their own construction, some Hollywood films began to reveal—and revel—in it instead. And the American auteur director emerged alongside these films as the creator and artistic “brand name” hook on which to lure audiences back into the theaters. The Hollywood Renaissance’s self-conscious aesthetic highlights the man or woman behind the screen. Both the aesthetic and the marketing campaign that highlight a film’s auteur director point toward, and refer to, the creative individual behind the images. What I have attempted to do here is to pull back farther to reveal the editor, alongside the director, as a critical part of the production process.

Writing about, and trying to understand post-production is difficult. Unless we are present in the editing room, it is impossible to know exactly who did what and in what order. Most film scholarship relies on filmmakers’ interviews as a way to gather information about the post-production process, but this evidence is imperfect at best. Archival materials are another way to access behind-the-scenes documentation of the post-production process. This way, scholars can better interpret filmmakers’ or crew members’ varying accounts of what happened during production. Or—and as equally important—scholars can better analyze similar claims about a film’s production that are often reproduced but rarely investigated.

Arguably, film scholars and critics do not challenge Ralph Rosenblum’s and Walter Murch’s claims about their specific contributions to the films because the directors do not contradict them. Therefore, it is important not only to investigate their claims as I accomplish here but also to ask why the unexamined claims are so often reproduced uncritically throughout

film scholarship. While it is encouraging that Woody Allen and Francis Ford Coppola are willing to share credit for a film's success with their editors, scholarship that reproduces this unexamined discourse merely perpetuates the problem because it reinforces the director's authorial role over the production. Why question the story if the director agrees with the editor? These unexamined claims suggest that within film scholarship, the director continues to function as a film's production history gatekeeper and its institutional memory. Instead, as I have tried to do here, it is necessary to determine exactly where and how an editor collaboratively contributes to a film as a way to open up the film's production history and enhance our critical understanding of collaborative authorship.

However, the question remains: does this apply to films made after the Hollywood Renaissance? Does collaborative authorship exist in Hollywood today? If so, how? Where? It is incorrect to assume that the collaborative authorship I describe here exists within mainstream, major studio, blockbuster films. In the contemporary model, the editor serves the corporation and the blockbuster formula more than the director and their artistic, collaborative process. Instead, in most accounts a return to a more Classical Hollywood mode of production in which the editor is a contract laborer – not a collaborative partner has occurred. True, an editor and director may work together to tell the story (to create the blockbuster) in the best possible way, but their primary goal is not “art” per se but profit.

Today, more likely, collaborative authorship opportunities apply to “independent” filmmakers operating outside of the mainstream, blockbuster format.² According to Janet Staiger,

² This also applies to documentary filmmakers, as well. Editing, in particular, is a crucial component to the documentary film practice because in documentary film—even more than within a Hollywood narrative—the story is often discovered and shaped during postproduction. Documentary filmmakers can anticipate what information they might find and what story they could tell with their film in advance, but much of the storytelling process occurs in the editing room. As a result, the editor is a crucial part of the documentary film production process. Although the

traditionally an independent production firm refers to “a small company with no corporate relationship to a distribution firm” (“The Labor Force” 317). She also makes a distinction between those filmmakers working *outside* of the control of major Hollywood studios and those working within it. Recently, major studios owned semi-independent subsidiaries within their companies as a way to finance and distribute riskier, non-mainstream, non-blockbuster content such as Warner Bros.’s New Line Cinema and HBO Pictures, The Walt Disney Company’s Miramax Films, and Twentieth Century Fox’s Fox Searchlight Pictures. Arguably, the directors and editors working within these smaller, “indie,” subsidiary companies had more artistic control over their films than their colleagues working on larger, studio films. However, they were still responsible to the major studios and their hierarchical, corporate bureaucracy. While the directors and editors working on these films may have more freedom to collaborate with each other on the production, they must also negotiate the final product with the studio that funds them.

Independent filmmakers working outside of large, corporate, studio-controlled subsidiaries may have more freedom to collaborate and artistically express their own point-of-view, but they also have less access to funding and distribution sources.³ So, while they may not work under the same corporate constraints, if they want to fund and distribute their films, they are nevertheless subject to some degree of corporate control and intervention. Increasingly, independent filmmakers are turning to the internet as a way to market and distribute their own films. Indeed, it would be useful to explore collaborative authorship for filmmakers working

documentary mode of production is outside the scope of my analysis here, it is a good place to look for collaborative authorship analysis.

³ Robert Rodriguez is one notable exception. Not only does he write, direct, score, and edit most of his films, but he also owns Troublemaker Films, his own film production company.

entirely outside of the industry such as non-profit groups, feminist and queer film alliances, and guerilla filmmakers. However, this is beyond the scope of my script-to-screen research here.

In each film, the master scripts do deviate from key moments in the final film suggesting that while films are often written and directed in a particular way, they can be re-written differently during the editing process. This, of course, does not only pertain to these particular films but to major Hollywood films in general. Post-production is part of the production process. Therefore, just as scripts, shots, lighting schemes, and the actors' costumes are re-worked and revised during pre-production and production, so, too, are scenes and sequences re-worked and revised during post-production. It is all a normal part of the filmmaking process. However, archival scholarship that pinpoints exactly how and where these creative revisions occur enhance our understanding of the relationship between collaborative authorship and post-production. Ideally, this model of "script-to-screen" archival research will inspire other academics to investigate how and where a film's creative revision occurs during post-production—and to what effect.

Despite the advances this dissertation offers, however, it is not without its limitations. For example, it does little to describe the rest of the editorial team involved in these productions. An editor, like a director, does not work in isolation but with a group of people. Editors typically work with—and delegate editing responsibilities to—their assistants. Yet with such limited information and archival materials about editors in general, it is difficult to assess exactly who did what in the editing room. The primary editor? Or his or her assistant? I focused the scope of my research on the primary editor because he or she is the editorial team figurehead and, as such, is held accountable for decisions made in the editing room. However, like film scholarship that focuses on the director as a film's overall figurehead, focusing solely on the primary editor

obscures the rest of the production team's critical contributions to the text. Yet this research offers an exciting place from which to start the conversation and from which to contribute future research.

As an outsider, it is nearly impossible to know exactly who did what in the editing room of a major Hollywood film; was it the editor, the director, an assistant, or was it some combination of all three? One way to solve this problem in the future would be to sit in on the post-production process from start to finish. This would enable a researcher to see how, when, where, and how often the editor (and/or the director/assistant) cuts the film differently than the screenplay, restructures a scene, or innovates anywhere within the narrative. This type of behind-the-scenes research would contribute greatly to our understanding of Hollywood film editing and collaborative authorship. And—this cannot be overstated—it would enable a researcher to know what was cut *out* of a film versus what was left in it.

In lay terms, editing is eliminating the bad parts of a film. This, of course, is an oversimplification but it holds a kernel of truth. Knowing what an editor (and/or director) chose to leave on the cutting room floor is almost as important as what he or she chose to include. A major Hollywood film can be edited in numerous ways. Knowing what footage was available to, and discarded by, an editor would nuance greatly our understanding of textual production and enhance the possibilities of textual analysis. Along these lines, another possibility for future research would be to give multiple editors identical film footage and then analyze how they tell the story.⁴ Would their versions be similar or different? How? And to what degree? This might highlight the multitude of choices an editor has at his or her disposal and make more visible their

⁴ Personally, I think this would also make for an incredibly interesting film! Several films already exist that tell one story from multiple characters' perspectives (*Roshamon*, *Vantage Point*). But the multiple perspectives are filmed

often invisible role in the storytelling process. Unfortunately access—or more importantly the lack of access to this ideal behind-the-scenes-approach—is a major obstacle to this future research.

Another possible extension of this research would be to analyze the collaborative authorship of the same editor and director across several of their films together to determine if they, together, have a signature style. That analysis could then be used to compare their work to other films they did with other editors or directors to see if and how their collaborative signature style differed with different filmmakers. Or this “script-to-screen” model could be used to do a historical comparison of films made within the Classical Hollywood cinema, the Hollywood Renaissance, and the New Hollywood to determine if and how collaborative authorship changed over time. Finally, it would also be useful to conduct a comparative analysis of how collaborative authorship occurs (and what it looks like) within different modes of production such as independent and documentary films. Arguably, the process of artistic negotiation and collaboration would be similar, but the differences would provide insight into how collaborative authorship works within different modes of film production.

This study also opens up another possible area of future research—the relationship between film editing and gender. Within the four case studies, the male editors readily take credit for their success and contributions to the films, whereas the female editors do not. Both Rosenblum and Murch wrote books about their cinematic contributions. In fact, Murch is one of the most public and visible Hollywood editors around today. He has two books written about him, is often interviewed about editing, and in 2009 was the subject of a documentary aptly titled

according to the pre-existing screenplay and edited by the same editor. In contrast, I propose filming the same story but letting multiple editors tell it (edit it) in its entirety from their own perspective.

Murch.⁵ I suggest that both Rosenblum and Murch publicly take credit for their work as a strategy to resist editing's privately conducted and marginalized role within the production hierarchy. In contrast, Dede Allen and Thelma Schoonmaker accept it. Neither female editor resists their subordinate role within the hierarchical division of labor. In fact, it is something with which Allen is comfortable. According to Allen, "there's a big difference between men and women who enter the editing field. Women of my generation are used to serving someone else creatively, and not feeling misaligned by it as much" (LoBrutto 85). Schoonmaker does not point to her sex as either an asset or detriment to her work as an editor in the industry. However, she often points to Scorsese as the key to her own success. She is reluctant to take credit for her contributions and keeps the spotlight artistically centered on Scorsese instead. However, keeping a low profile may also be strategic.

As I stated earlier, although the Renaissance was a vibrant time for filmmakers, it provided little economic security. After the studio system collapsed, editors (as freelance workers) were in a tenuous position. Without long-term contracts, they were at the mercy of the directors who employed them. If they spoke up and took credit for any aspect of a director's stylistic innovation, it may have been career suicide. Therefore, it is probable that many editors are less likely to struggle openly against their institutional invisibility. Perhaps Allen and Schoonmaker were careful not to aggrandize their labor and usurp the director's acclaim for fear they might not work again in the male-dominated Hollywood industry. It is also probable that they used their institutional invisibility as a strategy. If they remain unseen, behind the scenes, they are less likely to steal the spotlight from a director and, as a result, more likely to remain

⁵ *Murch* was an "official selection" at the Telluride, Vancouver International, Palm Springs International, Rotterdam International, and San Francisco International film festivals.

employed in an extremely competitive industry. In order to examine this hypothesis further, however, it is necessary to expand the overall research project. For example, are these results generalizable? Would these findings be repeated with other male and female editors? Are these results generalizable with the same editors across different films with the same director or across different films with different directors? What other ways do editors negotiate or subvert their role within the production hierarchy? Unfortunately, these questions are beyond the scope of my project here, but they are still worthy of critical analysis.

My hope is that this dissertation moves editors from the margins of auteur and production studies and gives them a more visible space within film scholarship. And, in doing so, it is meant to expand—not contract—our understanding of film editing and collaborative authorship. In no way am I trying to take credit away from the auteur directors. I am, instead, trying to shed light on film editing and collaborative authorship as a complex and complicated artistic process. Too often film editors are overlooked within the production process, partly due to the Classical, invisible aesthetic. But that aesthetic is an illusion since it still takes work and skill to achieve it. My hope is that this project inspires other scholars to pull back and peer behind the production curtain to reveal Hollywood editors as the collaborative illusionists and cinematic wizards they truly are.

APPENDIX A

Bonnie and Clyde Opening Scene – Shot-by-Shot Analysis (02:15 - 03:55)

1. Ex. close-up. This shot cross fades from Clyde's title card into an extreme close-up of Bonnie licking her lips. The camera pulls back and pans right into a close-up to reveal Bonnie admiring herself in the mirror. The camera pauses for four seconds and then starts to pull back again as Bonnie turns away from the mirror.
2. Jump cut. Bonnie stands up and turns away from the mirror. The camera tilts up and pans to follow her movement. She aimlessly meanders around her room and then she starts to sit down.
3. Jump cut. Bonnie lies down (collapses/throws herself down) on her bed. The camera is placed in front of her bed frame and she is tightly framed between two horizontal metal bars as she lies face up on the bed. She begins to hit the bars with her fists. She seems angry, frustrated, and trapped (like an animal) within the *mise-en-scène*. Then she momentarily pauses before she pulls herself up between the bars and rests her forehead on them. She pauses again and then sits up on the bed. As she sits up, the camera quickly moves into an extreme close-up on her eyes. The camera lingers there for a five seconds, and she moves to get up off the bed.
4. Match-action cut. Bonnie stands up. She walks toward the back wall of her bedroom. She is shot from behind, from the waist up, and her bare back is exposed. She grabs a piece of clothing and turns around to face the camera, modestly placed behind a changing screen. She sighs. She seems bored and upset.
5. Wide shot. This is a high angle shot from Bonnie's bedroom window. Clyde is standing by Bonnie's mother's car.
6. Medium shot. Bonnie still stands behind the screen. She walks out from behind the screen and the camera pans with her. She stands at the window.
7. Medium shot. The camera is placed outside the house at a low angle looking up at Bonnie in the window. (However, this shot is not from Clyde's point-of-view perspective.) Bonnie initially stares straight ahead and does not notice Clyde, but eventually looks down and sees him below her window.
8. This shot is similar to shot five but now it is Bonnie's point-of-view.
9. This shot is similar to shot seven. She seems intrigued and amused by Clyde and she calls out to him. ("Hey boy!")
10. Wide shot of both characters. Clyde and the car are in the left foreground of the shot (on ground level) and Bonnie (still naked but not revealed) is in the middle, background (up in the second story window) of the shot. She looks down at him from the window.

11. Medium shot. Clyde turns from the car and tries to figure out who is talking to him.
12. This shot is similar to shot ten.
13. This shot is similar to shot eleven, but it is now a close-up shot. Clyde looks up and sees Bonnie for the first time, suggestively framed in her second-story bedroom window.
14. This shot is similar to shot seven but now it is a wider shot.
15. This shot is similar to shot eleven. Clyde looks up at Bonnie and smiles.
16. This shot is similar to shot seven. Bonnie smiles and tells Clyde to “Wait there!” She turns away from the window and disappears into her bedroom.
17. This shot is similar to shot thirteen, but now Clyde looks perplexed and amused.
17. Wide shot. Int. Bonnie’s bedroom and closet. She runs into the frame (from stage right) and rushes to put on her clothes.
18. Wide shot. Extreme low angle. Bonnie rapidly descends downstairs in a dark silhouette.
19. Medium shot. Bonnie runs outside of her house and looks at Clyde standing on the sidewalk.

APPENDIX B

Bonnie and Clyde Climax Scene – Shot by Shot Analysis (1:46:50 - 1:50:00)

1 Ext Day. Wide Shot. Malcolm disassembles one of his car tires in the rural countryside. Then, he looks and stands up to see if anyone is coming down the road. The camera rises with him as he stands up.

2. Wide shot. Malcom's point-of-view. The long, dusty road is empty.

3. Malcolm looks down the road, and then he continues "fixing" his car.

4. Int Car. Medium, close-up, two-shot of Bonnie and Clyde taken from Clyde's driver-side window. Clyde is driving. Bonnie turns to get something in the backseat. (This shot lasts ten seconds.)

5. Match action cut. Medium shot. Shot head-on. The camera placed on the hood of the car. Bonnie grabs a pear from the back seat. She turns and sits in the front seat and begins to eat it. (This shot lasts five seconds.)

6. Match action cut. This shot is similar to shot four. Bonnie eats the pear and offers some to Clyde. He takes a bite of it and juice runs down his chin. Bonnie laughs. (This shot lasts eight seconds.)

7. This shot is similar to shot one. Malcolm looks up again.

8. This shot is similar to shot two. Malcolm's point-of-view. This time he sees their car coming around the bend in the road.

9. This shot is similar to shot one. He continues to work on the car.

10. Reverse of shot four. INT. CAR. Medium, close-up, two-shot of Bonnie and Clyde, taken from Bonnie's passenger-side window.

11. Bonnie and Clyde's point-of-view as they drive down the road and see someone.

12. This shot is similar to shot five. Medium shot. Shot head-on. The camera is placed on the hood of the car. Bonnie and Clyde squint to see if it is Malcolm.

13. Wide shot. Malcolm stands alongside his car and then walks into the road with his hands up, signaling distress.

14. Medium shot of Malcolm standing the road with his hands up in the air.

15. Two shot of Bonnie and Clyde smiling at Malcolm. Clyde starts to pull over.
16. Bonnie and Clyde's point-of-view of Malcolm in the road. Malcolm gestures for them to park next to his car.
17. Wide shot of Bonnie and Clyde parking.
18. Wide shot. Malcolm smiles and walks to their car.
19. Wide shot. Clyde gets out of the car. He is still eating the pear.
20. Medium shot. Interior of their car. The driver's side car door is open. It is filmed from behind Bonnie's head as she watches Clyde and Malcolm.
21. Medium shot. Malcolm shows Clyde his car. (one second)
22. Close-up. Bonnie looks at Clyde. (one second)
23. Close-up. Clyde looks around. (one second)
24. Close-up. Malcolm hears something and quickly turns around to see what it is.
25. Wide shot. This shot is Malcolm's point-of-view of a truck coming down the street in the opposite direction.
26. Close-up. Malcolm looks back at Clyde. (one second)
27. Close-up. Clyde looks up. (one second)
28. Full shot. Birds suddenly fly out of a tree.
29. Close-up. Clyde. (one second)
30. Close-up. Malcolm. (one second)
31. Same as 28. The camera pans and follows the birds in flight.
32. Bonnie looks out the open car door at the birds and smiles.
33. This shot is similar to shot thirty-one.
34. Close-up. Malcolm looks nervous.
35. Malcolm's point-of-view of a big bush shaking as if something were hiding inside of it.

36. This shot is similar to shot thirty-four.
37. This shot is similar to shot twenty-five.
38. Malcolm suddenly dives under his truck.
39. Close-up. Clyde still looks up at the birds. (one second)
40. Close-up. Bonnie still looks up at the birds. (one second)
41. Malcolm hides under his truck.
42. Close-up. Clyde smiles. He starts to say something to Malcolm. He does not understand what is happening.
43. Medium shot. Bonnie quickly turns her head. She looks worried and confused.
44. This shot is similar to shot thirty-five. (Now, the bush shakes.)
45. Close-up, Bonnie. (half-second shot)
46. Clyde turns quickly and ducks. (half-second shot)
47. Close-up. Bonnie looks at Clyde. (half-second shot)
48. Close-up. Clyde ducks and stares at Bonnie. (half-second shot)
49. Close-up. Bonnie stares lovingly at Clyde. They share a moment together.
50. Close-up. Clyde quickly runs out of the frame (frame right) toward Bonnie in the car.
51. This shot is similar to shot thirty-five but now machine gun fire explores the bush.
52. Medium shot. Clyde is hit from gunfire and falls backwards. (half-second shot)
53. Close-up. Bonnie is hit from gunfire. Her body lurches back from the impact, and she screams. (half-second shot)
54. Hammer (a Texas sheriff Bonnie and Clyde humiliated in an earlier scene) emerges from the bush. He fires a machine gun at them.
55. Wide shot. Clyde falls backwards. (half-second shot)
56. Medium shot. Slow motion. Bonnie screams as she is riddled with bullets. (half-second, slow motion shot)

57. Medium shot. Clyde is still falling to the ground, toward screen right. The pear explodes in his hand. (half-second, slow motion shot)
58. This shot is similar to shot fifty-seven but now it is a close-up shot. (Slow motion)
59. This shot is similar to shot fifty-eight but now Clyde falls closer to the ground. (Slow motion.)
60. Medium shot. Bonnie (similar to shot fifty-three but it is taken from a different, lower angle) is riddled with bullets. Her body is covered in bloody gunshot wounds. (Slow motion.)
61. Clyde on the ground. His body lurches from the gunfire.
62. Close-up. Bonnie writhes in agony as she is shot.
63. Clyde rolls face up on the ground. He is covered in bloody bullet holes, and part of his head is blown off.
64. Bonnie. This shot is similar to shot sixty-two.
65. Wide shot. High angle. Clyde is on the ground, laying one foot from the car. Bonnie is still in the driver's seat. The rapid gunfire continues against them. Bullet holes riddle their bodies and the car.
66. This shot is similar to shot fifty-four. Hammer shoots at them from the bush. (half-second shot)
67. This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Clyde is on the ground.
68. Bonnie (same as shot fifty-five)
69. Clyde (same as shot sixty-one)
70. Bonnie (similar to shot fifty-five). Slow motion. Bonnie starts to fall outside the driver's side door.
71. This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Slow motion. Clyde on the ground.
72. This shot is similar to shot sixty-five. Slow motion. Wide shot of Bonnie, Clyde, and the car.
73. Bonnie. Her back is covered in blood as she continues to fall out of the car.
74. This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Slow motion. Clyde on the ground.

75. Bonnie. The camera tracks down to the ground as her body falls out the door. Her legs stay in the car but the top half of her body falls out of the car.
76. This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Slow motion. Clyde rolls on to his back and then on to his stomach. He lies face down and eventually his body stops. (This shot lasts five seconds.)
77. Close-up. Bonnie, still half-hanging out of the car. Her arms drops and dangles toward the ground. (This shot lasts four seconds.)
78. This shot is similar to shot sixty-five. Now, their bodies stop moving as the gunfire stops. (This shot lasts six seconds.)
79. This shot is similar to shot thirty-five. The bush shakes.
80. Wide shot. Two farmers stop in the truck on the road, and they look at the scene in front of them.
81. Medium Shot. Hammer and the police emerge from the bush.
82. Close-up. Malcolm still hides under his truck.
83. Wide shot. Malcolm's point-of-view. He looks at the farmers and the truck up the road.
84. Wide shot. The farmers get out of their truck and start to run down the road.
85. This shot is similar to shot eighty-one. Hammer and the police start to crawl out of the bush and survey the carnage. (This shot lasts ten seconds.)
86. Wide shot. The farmers run down the road toward the scene (and the camera) as Hammer emerges from under his truck. Then Hammer and the police come into the frame. They all stand around the car. The camera pans around the car past a close-up of the bullet holes. The men are framed on the opposite side of the car through the car window with a bullet hole in it. (This shot lasts twenty-five seconds.) Then, it cuts to five seconds of black.
87. "The End" title card fades up in white lettering on the black background and the credits roll.

APPENDIX C - *The Conversation* Case Study -- Final Script vs. Film Scenes

(* indicates scenes omitted from the script)

Final Script

Scene 1 – (pgs 1 – 11)

EXT. LOCATION SHOT. DAY.

Union Square, San Francisco. Harry and his team conduct surveillance on the young couple and record “the conversation.”

*Scene 2 (pgs 11 - 12)

EXT/INT CONVENIENCE STORE/DRY CLEANERS

* Harry takes bus but it breaks down. He walks to a convenience store and buys ingredients for dinner. Then, he picks up his dry cleaning and does a magic trick for little boy.

Scene 3 (pgs 12 – 18)

INT HARRY’S APARTMENT BUILDING, APARTMENT

Harry comes into his apartment, and argues with his neighbor. After they leave, he plays the saxophone.

* (Pg 13 – 18) Harry cooks dinner in his kitchen. His neighbors are loud next door. He hears them complain about the landlord. Then they knock at his door. They are upset because they do not have any water. The tenants want to go on a rent strike but do not know the landlord’s identity. The scene is hectic. Harry is annoyed and just wants to be left alone. Someone wishes Harry a happy birthday and someone else

Film

Scene 1 – (0:00 – 9:40)

EXT. LOCATION SHOT. DAY.

Union Square, San Francisco. Harry and his team conduct surveillance on the young couple and record “the conversation.”

Scene 2 (9:40 – 14:00)

INT HARRY’S APARTMENT BUILDING/ HARRY’S APARTMENT

Harry comes into his apartment, and argues with his neighbor. After they leave, he plays the saxophone.

Scene 3 (14:00 – 18:45)

INT; WAREHOUSE; DAY

Harry assembles the tapes in the warehouse with Stan. The scene is intercut with the earlier “conversation” scene.

Scene 4 (18:45 – 20:15)

EXT

Harry gets off the bus and calls his client (“The Director”). They set up a meeting for the next day, and Harry asks him about the payment.

Scene 5 (20:15 – 28:25)

EXT, NIGHTTIME; GIRLFRIEND’S APARTMENT

arrives with cake and candles. Someone gives him a gift – it is a small plastic Madonna. Harry says he will speak to the landlord on behalf of the tenants. He tells them he has to go to a birthday party with his family.

Scene 4 (pgs 18 – 23)

EXT., NIGHTTIME; GIRLFRIEND'S APARTMENT

Harry rides the bus and visits his girlfriend in her apartment. (similar to the film)

* Scene 5 (pg. 23)

Harry sits alone in his apartment playing the saxophone to a jazz record.

Scene 6 (pgs 24 – 35)

INT HARRY'S WAREHOUSE DAY

Harry goes to the warehouse. Stan is already there. Harry becomes annoyed with Stan because Stan is talking about the content of the conversation. Eventually, Stan leaves the warehouse.

Harry assembles the entire tape. He uses a filter to remove the background music and hears "He'd kill us" on the tape.

The scene is intricately written to cross-cut Harry's action with the couple in the park and "the conversation" (It is similar to the film. The only minor difference is that the hotel where the murder is going to occur is referred to as "Continental Lodge, Room B-7" not the Jack Tarr Hotel.)

Scene 7 (pg 35 – 36)

EXT TELEPHONE BOOTH DAY

Harry goes to visit his girlfriend. She is in bed. She says she did not know it was his birthday. She asks him many questions. He gets annoyed and lies to her about his job. She says she wants to know him, but he doesn't want to ask anymore questions. He leaves rent money for her, but she says she does not want to wait for him anymore. He leaves.

Scene 6 (28:25 – 33:15)

INT.; OFFICE BUILDING

Harry attempts to deliver the audio surveillance tapes to the Director, but only his assistant (Martin) is available. In the office, Martin gives Harry an envelope full of cash and takes the folder from Harry. Harry tries to grab the folder back. Martin says the Director is not in town and instructed him to take the tapes from Harry. Harry looks over the money. Then, he puts the envelope on the table, and he takes the folder back. Martin grabs it, and they struggle for possession. Harry takes the folder and Martin becomes angry. He tells Harry not to get involved because the tapes are dangerous and someone might get hurt. Harry seems nervous and confused. He leaves the office and walks down the hallway alone. Martin tells him to be careful.

Harry walks to the elevator and sees Mark—the young man from "the conversation." Harry enters the elevator. The woman from the conversation (Ann) steps into the elevator on the next floor. They ride in the elevator alone, and Harry walks to opposite side of elevator. He seems uncomfortable.

Scene 7 (33:15 – 40:00)

Harry enters the telephone booth and calls the Director (his client). The secretary tells Harry to come by at “2:30 this afternoon.”

*Scene 8 (pgs. 36 – 38)

INT BROKERAGE FILM DAY
DELETED FROM FILM:

Harry goes to visit a man named McNaught at his brokerage firm. They eat lunch together.

Harry gives him a sheet of paper that contains his neighbors’ complaints. McNaught tells him it will cost him \$3500 to fix the plumbing, so Harry tells him to just pump out the basement. McNaught says that will not fix anything, but Harry does not care. Harry tells him he is selling the building soon because the neighbors are getting too friendly. McNaught asks Harry when he is going to settle down but Harry says he does not want to get married because he does not want someone watching him all the time. Harry says McNaught is his best friend but McNaught replies that he has not seen Harry in two years.

Scene 9 (pgs 39 – 42)

INT BUILDING DAY

Harry attempts to deliver the tapes to the client but only his assistant Martin is available. In the office, Martin tries to pay Harry with an envelope of cash but Harry refuses it because he was told to deliver it to the director in person. He leaves the office, and Martin follows him outside.

[In the script; Matthew never grabs the tapes from Harry and says the tapes are

INT; WAREHOUSE; DAY

Harry goes back to the warehouse to assemble the tapes. Stan is there. Harry continues to listen to the tapes over and over again, trying to figure out what is so “important” about them. Harry becomes annoyed with Stan because Stan is talking about the content of the conversation. Stan leaves the warehouse.

Harry assembles the entire tape. He uses a filter to remove the background music and hears the line “He’d kill us if he got the chance” on the tape. The footage cuts to a close-up shot of Harry, and then includes a few close-up shots of the audio technology. It cuts back to a CU on Harry. Harry re-winds the tape again (this footage cross-cuts between the young couple in park) and listens to it. Harry nods and then shuts off the audio equipment.

Scene 8

EXT. TELEPHONE BOOTH DAY

Harry enters the telephone booth and calls the Director (his client). The secretary tells Harry to come by at “2:30 this afternoon.”

Scene 9 (40:00 – 41:45)

WIDE SHOT; INT; CHURCH; ALTER

Harry sits in a pew. He stands up, walks into the confession booth, and confesses his sins. He says he did work in the past that hurt people and is afraid it might happen again.

Scene 10 (41:45 – 52:20)

Harry attends a surveillance convention, and notices Martin spying on him. Later,

dangerous and someone could get hurt – or to be careful - like in the movie]

Harry walks to the elevators and sees Mark—the young man from “the conversation.” Harry seems stunned. (The script cuts to “the conversation” voice over.) Mark briefly glances at Harry but does not recognize him.

Scene 10 (42 – 44)

EXT/INT GIRLFRIEND’S APARTMENT

Harry enters his girlfriend’s apartment building. The “conversation” occurs in voice over throughout the scene. The apartment is empty, and she is gone.

Scene 11 (44 – 60)

INT THE ST. FRANCIS HOTEL NIGHT

This is the surveillance convention scene. It is very similar to the film, but there are minor changes.

*Unlike the film, in the script (pgs 57 – 60) some of the guys (Stan, Moran, Millard, etc.) bug the ladies room and listen to their conversation.

Scene 12 (pgs 61 – 61B)

EXT THE CAR NIGHT

Similar to film. This is the scene when they all pile into Paul’s car and then chase the guys who cut them off in traffic.

Scene 13 (pgs 61C – 87)

INT HARRY’S WAREHOUSE NIGHT

This scene is very similar to the film scene

Harry meets Moran—one of his rivals in the industry. They, and a few others, decide to go out for a drink. Harry sees Stanley who now works for Moran. Harry talks to Stan, and admits that he wants him to come back to work. Harry tells Stan that somebody is following him and he does not like it. Stan agrees to come back to work for Harry.

Harry tries to call his girlfriend from the convention, but the phone number is disconnected. The operator tells him there is no listing for that number.

Harry turns and sees Martin staring at him. Harry walks away, but then comes back and confronts him. Martin says he has been looking for Harry, and has a message from the Director The Director wants Harry to deliver the tapes on Sunday at 1:00. Harry says he will think about it.

Scene 11 (52:20 – 1:21:40)

CAR CHASE/WAREHOUSE PARTY

Harry, Stan, Moran, Meredith and others all pile into a car after the convention. Someone cuts them off in traffic, and they chase him down.

Then, they all go to Harry’s warehouse to party. Moran calls Harry the best bugger on the West Coast but says he is the best on the East. Harry and Meredith slow dance and talk. Moran seems annoyed. Moran brings up Harry’s old job for the Attorney General’s Office where three people were killed, and Harry becomes upset. Then, Moran reveals that he bugged Harry and re-plays Harry’s personal conversation with Meredith. Harry kicks everyone out but Meredith stays, and they make love.

except in the script. However, the script does not imply that Meredith stole the tapes—only that she bugged his apartment.

* Scene 14 (Pgs 88 – 89)

EXT GOLDEN GATE PARK

This scene is deleted from the film. Harry confronts Stan at a daytime concert at Golden Gate Park with Stan's elderly mother present. Harry accuses him of being a spy for Moran.

Scene 15 (89 – 98)

INT THE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE DAY

Harry goes to the office to collect his money. He sees pictures of Ann in his client's office. Harry, Martin, and the client listen to the tapes. Harry takes his payment for the job, and asks the director "What will you do to them. I am responsible for this." The client doesn't respond. The Director does not respond. Then, Martin walks Harry to the elevator.

Scene 16 (98 – 99)

INT CATHOLIC CHURCH DAY

Harry confesses minor sins but does not mention his role in the previous deaths.

Scene 17 (99 – 104)

EXT/INT THE MOTEL DAY

Harry checks into the hotel room. He hears voices next door, drills a hole in the wall, and listens. He hears people struggle, and then he crawls into bed, under the blankets. Later, he breaks in to the room next door and discovers the murder scene in the

Harry falls asleep and dreams about Ann. They are in a foggy park. He chases her and speaks to her, but eventually she disappears. When he wakes up, Meredith is gone. And, she stole the audio surveillance tapes.

Scene 12 (1:21:40 – 1:24:35)

INT/ HARRY'S APARTMENT

Harry calls his client but he is not available. The receptionist says they will call him back, but Harry says they do not have his telephone number.

Harry is in the bathroom and the telephone rings. Harry seems confused as to how anyone knows the number. It rings for a long time until he finally answers it. Martin calls him and says they have been watching him. Martin says they have the tapes and the client is ready to pay him in full.

Scene 13 (1:24:35 – 1:30:10)

Harry goes to the office to collect his money. He sees pictures of Ann in his client's office. Harry, Martin, and the client listen to the tapes. Harry takes his payment for the job, and asks the director "what will you do to her?" The Director does not respond. Then, Martin walks Harry to the elevator.

Scene 14 (1:30:10 – 1:41:50)

INT THE HOTEL DAY

Harry checks into the hotel room. He hears voices next door, drills a hole in the wall, and listens. He hears people struggle, and then he crawls into bed, under the blankets. Later, he breaks in to the room next door and discovers the murder scene in the

bathroom.

Scene 18 (104 – 106)

INT OFFICE BUILDING DAY

Harry tries to confront his client. The receptionist calls security, and the guards direct him out of the building.

Scene 19 INT ELEVATOR DAY / EXT BUILDING / BUS (106 – 115)

Harry is in the elevator going down to the ground floor. Ann gets on, and they are alone in the elevator. She exits the elevator, and he follows her—first on a bus and then, into a foggy park. Eventually, Ann disappears.

*Scene 20 (115 –120)

HARRY’S WAREHOUSE; NIGHT

Harry walks toward his warehouse. The lights are on inside, and he hears voices. When they hear him, they flee. Harry listens to the tapes again and hears the line “Do you think we can do it?” Then, the screenplay instructs to cut to a close-up shot of Harry because “Suddenly, these words have new meaning for him.” The scene intercuts with Harry’s point-of-view from the murder scene in the bathroom.

Scene 21 (120)

EXT A STREET DAY

The primary shot in this scene is supposed to be a mangled car with Harry’s client slumped and bleeding over the steering wheel. Then, the car bursts into flames.

bathroom.

Scene 15 (1:41:55 – 1:45:55)

EXT; DAY

Harry tries to confront his client. The receptionist calls security, and the guards direct him out of the building. Harry walks outside and sees Ann waiting in a car. She looks up and sees him. He walks away, and then sees the newspaper headline “Executive killed in auto crash.” Harry returns to the office and sees Ann surrounded by reporters. Martin and Mark are there also.

The scene is intercut with “the conversation” and the murder scene. During this scene Harry hears the line differently. This time, he hears “He’d kill *us* if he could.”

Scene 16 (1:45:55 – 1:50:05)

Harry sits in his apartment and plays the saxophone. Then, the phone rings. Harry answers it, but there is no one there on the other line. He returns to his saxophone, and the phone rings again. He seems upset, but he answers it. This time, it is Martin. Martin says “we know you know Mr. Caul. For your own safety, don’t get involved any further. We’ll be listening to you,” and then he hangs up. A somber piano score accompanies the remainder of the scene as Harry destroys his own apartment. The scene is briefly intercut with image of the couple kissing at the park.

Harry’s apartment is totally destroyed; Harry sits in the middle of the living room playing his saxophone.

Scene 22 (120 - 121)

INT Mr. C.'s BUILDING DAY

Harry sees the newspaper headline "Executive killed in auto crash" and an image of a burnt Mercedes. He is in the lobby. A large, chaotic crowd (of photographers and the press) are gathered in the lobby. Then, Harry sees Ann coming through the crowd. She sees Harry and she becomes frightened. She turns to Mark and then nods toward Harry.

Scene 23 (121 - 127)

INT HARRY'S APARTMENT NIGHT

He goes up the stairs and sees his neighbor Ron. Ron tells him they are all very upset. Harry walks by him and locks his door. Then, he calls the office and asks to speak with the Martin. The operator says he is unavailable, but takes Harry's name and says Martin will call him back. Harry starts to protest because Martin does not have his phone number.

Harry's neighbors are outside ease dropping on him. They accuse him of owning the building. Harry goes into a rage and screams at them. Then, he hears the phone ringing, and answers it. (In the screenplay, it's Mark – not Martin). Mark tells him to forget everything and says "I'll keep my eye on you..." then hangs up.

Scene 24 (123 – 125)

HARRY'S APARTMENT

Harry sits in his apartment and plays the saxophone. Then, the phone rings. Harry answers it, but there is no one there on the other line. He becomes suspicious and

disassembles the phone looking for the bug. Then, similar to the film, he destroys his entire apartment.

Harry sits in the middle of the living room and starts to cry.

APPENDIX D *The Conversation* Deleted Scenes from the Final Script

Scenes Cut from *The Conversation* Final Script (Final Draft November 22, 1972)

1) (Pg. 11 – 12); EXT/INT. DRY CLEANERS

This scene occurs immediately after Harry finishes the surveillance job. In this scene, Harry travels on a bus (like the movie) but the bus breaks down. Harry exits the bus and it soon drives past him. He shops at a little neighborhood market and buys pork chops, tomatoes, and a single can of beer. Then, he enters into a laundry mat and plays a magic trick for a little boy. The little boy asks the secret but Harry says “A magician never tells his tricks... It’s a secret... and when it stops being a secret it’s not anything.” Then, he takes his laundry and leaves.

2) (Pg 13 – 18): Harry is cooking in his kitchen. He hears his neighbors loudly complaining about the landlord. They knock at his door. They are upset because they do not have any water. They want to go on a rent strike but do not know the landlord’s identity. Harry is annoyed and just wants to be left alone. Then someone wishes him happy birthday. Soon after, someone else arrives with half a pound cake and improvised candles. Someone gives him a gift – it is a small plastic Madonna. Harry says he will speak to the landlord on behalf of the tenants. Then, he tells them he has to go to a birthday party with his family.

3) (Pgs. 36 – 38) INT BROKERAGE FILM DAY

Harry goes to visit a man named McNaught and they eat lunch together. Harry gives him a sheet of paper. It is the complaint from his neighbors. McNaught tells Harry it will cost him \$3500 to fix the plumbing so Harry tells him to just pump out the basement. McNaught says that will not fix anything but Harry does not care. Harry tells him he is selling the building soon anyway because the neighbors are becoming too friendly. McNaught asks how Harry is doing and when he is going to settle down but Harry says he does not want to get married. He because he does not want someone watching him all the time. Harry says McNaught is his best friend but McNaught replies that he has not seen Harry in two years.

4) (Pgs 57 – 60) INT. THE ST. FRANCIS HOTEL

At the surveillance convention, some of the men (Stan, Moran, Millard, etc.) bug the ladies room and listen to their conversation. Meredith was in the ladies room briefly talking about sex. She comes out and asks Moran what time she should be there tomorrow. He says she can not leave yet because they are attending a party at Harry’s warehouse. Harry seems confused but Moran presses the issue. Meredith looks at Harry and says “I’ll go if you go.” Harry still seems uneasy but agrees.

5) (Pgs 88 – 89) EXT GOLDEN GATE PARK

Immediately after the scene in which Meredith steals the tapes, Harry confronts Stan at a daytime concert at Golden Gate park. Stan is there with his elderly mother. Harry accuses him of being a spy for Moran.

(p 89) Harry tells Stanley that Meredith went through his things and then said “And what about you, Stanley? Why’d he hire you? For your brains?” Stanley tries to defend himself but Harry is furious. Harry tells Stanley that he’s changing the locks in the warehouse and that Stanley “can shove your keys up your ass!” Harry tells him to “Just stay away from me, and stay away from the warehouse. And tell that to Moran.”

6) HARRY’S WAREHOUSE NIGHT (115 –120)

In this scene, Harry hears people in his warehouse. He is scared and runs upstairs to see who it is. The “conversation” tapes starts to play. He runs over to it and then hears that the people have gotten away. He is spooked.

APPENDIX E - Annie Hall Screenplay Verses Film Comparison

Annie Hall Screenplay, Final Draft August 2, 1976

Annie Hall; Dir: Woody Allen, United Artists, 1977

* “D” indicates a scene deleted from the screenplay that does not advance the Annie/Alvy romantic relationship

Title

Opening Credits :00 – 0:50

Alvy’s opening monologue. (It is similar to film but cross-cutting with Annie is deleted from the film.) (pp. 1-3)

(:50 – 2:30) Alvy in direct address delivers the key (Groucho Marx) joke He admits that “Annie & I broke up” and that he’s trying to figure out where the screw up came from.

Alvy’s Childhood – This is a montage (in flashbacks) of Alvy’s childhood. It shows the rollercoaster, the boardwalk, and the bumper cars. Also includes an exterior school shot. (pp. 3-4)

(2:30 – 3:17) Alvy is in the doctor’s office with his mom. He is nervous because “the universe is expanding.”

- *D - (Fantasy sequence) This sequence is like a science fiction film. His mother talks about “The Element” and images of African Americans moving into the neighborhood terrify the neighbors.

(3:17 – 5:30) – This is a montage (in flashbacks) of Alvy’s childhood. It shows the rollercoaster, the boardwalk, and the bumper cars. (Alvy’s voice over unites this series of cuts as one scene.)

Alvy’s School – Alvy is in school with his former classmates. The scene includes a fantasy sequence in which an adult Alvy joins classroom and learns where his former classmates are. (This scene is extended in screenplay.) (pp. 4 – 11)

(3:53 - 5:30) Alvy is in school with his former classmates. The scene includes a fantasy sequence in which an adult Alvy joins classroom and learns where his former classmates are.

- *D Alvy visits his childhood classmate Donald, as an adult. Alvy talks to the TV and interacts with the talk show host. He also critiques modern culture.
- *D Fantasy sequence. Alvy visits former classmate Judy Horowitz. She is now fat and has children. He removes

(5:31 – 5:44) Adult Alvy is a guest on the Dick Cavett show.

(5:45 – 5:56) Alvy’s mother (in direct address) talks to Alvy about how he always saw the worst in people.

(5:57 – 7:14) Rob & Alvy walk down street. Max tells Alvy he should move to Los Angeles.

(7:15 - 12:55) Alvy waits for Annie at movie

her excessive makeup.

*D – A teenager gives fourteen year-old Alvy a condom. Alvy says by the time he used it, it turned to dust. (pp. 11)

Alvy's mother says he only saw the worst in people and was out of step with the world.

Alvy and Rob walk down Third Avenue. (pp. 12 - 13)

Alvy waits for Annie at the movie theater. He runs into people who recognize him and gives them his autograph. (pp. 13 – 15)

Annie arrives at cinema and Alvy interacts with Marshall McLuhan. (pp. 15 – 19)

- *D - McLuhan asks if he ever went to college (pp. 19). Alvy is in the college deans office and explains why he hung Dean Rogers in effigy. This sets up a joke later in film when Alvy tears up driver's license in front of Cali cop and admits to having trouble with authority. (pp. 20)

Annie is reading in bed. She and Alvy talk about movie (*The Sorrow and the Pity*). She mentions his first wife Allison. (pp. 21)

Alvy and Allison meet for the first time He is a stand-up comic and she is a volunteer at a political rally. (similar to film) (pp. 21 – 25)

*D - Childhood Alvy is sick at home w/the measles. His mother is with him and cousin Doris babysits. (p. 25); Alvy is sexually attracted to her; She reads to him from children's war adventure book.

- *D – Alvy is brought as prisoner to a Nazi Colonel's office. He tries to bargain with them but admits to having

theater. He runs into a fan and gives him autograph. Annie shows up late and they miss the beginning of the movie. Alvy interacts with Marshall McLuhan in a fantasy sequence.

(12:55 – 13:50) Annie is reading in bed. She and Alvy talk about movie (*The Sorrow and the Pity*). She mentions his first wife Allison.

(13:50 – 16:28) Alvy and Allison meet for the first time He is a stand-up comic and she is a volunteer at a political rally.

(16:30 – 18:09) Alvy and Allison are in bed. Alvy will not have sex with her because he is obsessed with the Kennedy assassination. She says he is using it as an excuse to avoid sex and intimacy.

(18:09 – 19:29) Annie and Alvy are at beach house fighting with lobsters.

(19:29 – 21:02) Annie and Alvy walk on beach at sunset and discuss her old boyfriends. Some of the footage occurs in a flashback montage.

(21:02 – 22:50) Alvy attends a high-brow cocktail party with his second ex-wife. He does not want to be there and would prefer to watch The Knicks game.

(22:50 – 23:50) Alvy and his ex-wife Robin attempt to have sex in their apartment at night. It does not go well.

(23:50 – 25:00) Alvy and Rob are at the tennis club; Annie and Alvy meet for the first time.

(25:00 – 26:35) Annie approaches Alvy after the tennis match in tennis club. They strike up an awkward conversation and she offers him a ride home.

(26:35 – 29:00) Annie drives Alvy home. Alvy is nervous. They go to her apartment and she

a low pain threshold. (pp. 25 – 26)

*D INT. Alvy wakes up and tells Allison (his ex-wife) about his (recurring) dream about being captured by the Nazi's; (2 pages dialogue) (p p. 26 – 27)

Lobster scene. Annie and Alvy at the beach house (pp. 27 – 28A)

Annie and Alvy on beach. They flashback and visit into her old boyfriends. It return to them beach where Annie comments on Alvy's former wives. (pp. 28A – 31)

Alvy and Robin at an academic cocktail party (cut down in film) (pp. 31 – 35)

- *D (deleted from film) Montages of absurd academic conversations.
- Alvy hides in the bedroom at the party and watches the Knicks game.
- *D – (Fantasy sequence.) TV sports announcer comments on the Knicks game as if Alvy were playing alongside Nietzsche and Kierkegaard.

Alvy and his ex-wife Robin attempt to have sex in their apartment at night. It does not go well. (pp. 35 – 36)

Alvy and Rob are at the tennis club; Annie and Alvy meet for the first time. (pp. 36 – 37)

Annie and Alvy meet after tennis match and have an awkward conversation. (pp. 37 – 39)

Annie drives Alvy home. Alvy is nervous. They go to her apartment and she invites him upstairs. (pp. 39 – 41)

In Annie's apartment she shows him pictures of her family. On the terrace, they have a very

invites him upstairs.

(29:00 – 33:20) In Annie's apartment she shows him pictures of her family. On the terrace, they have a very awkward conversation. He asks her out on a date but she is unavailable because she is performing that night at a club.

(33:20 – 34:15) Annie sings at a nightclub but no one pays attention to her.

(34:15 – 35:00) Annie and Alvy walk home after her performance. She wants to quit and he tries to console her. Then, they kiss.

(35:00 – 35:30) At a diner, they order food and she asks about his first and second wife.

(35:30 - 36:25) Annie and Alvy are in bed post-coital. Annie lights a joint but Alvy does not want any.

(36:25 – 37:10) Annie and Alvy go to bookstore. He is trying to enlighten her with serious literature.

(37:10 – 37:40) Annie and Alvy people-watch in Central Park.

(37:40 – 38:30) Annie and Alvy walk home and admit that they love each other.

(38:40 – 39:55) Annie is packing her apartment but Alvy is nervous. He tries to convince her to keep it. She accuses him of thinking that she is too dumb to get serious about because he keeps encouraging her to take adult education courses.

(39:55 – 42:40) Annie and Alvy drive along the beach at sunset and discuss adult education classes. Later, Alvy wants to have sex but she wants to get high first. They start to have sex but her spirit leaves her body and observes

awkward conversation. He asks her out on a date but she is unavailable because she is performing that night at a club. (pp. 41 – 47)

Annie singing in nightclub; awful, people not paying attention (pp. 47)

- [Changed in film] In the screenplay, they are backstage in dressing room at the club when Alvy comforts Annie. But in the film, he comforts her while walking down the street.

They go to a deli and eat after her performance. Annie comments on his first wife Allison. (pp. 48)

Alvy and Allison are in bed. Alvy will not have sex with her because he is obsessed with the Kennedy assassination. She says he is using it as an excuse to avoid sex and intimacy. (pp. 48 – 49)

Annie and Alvy in bed; post-coital – joke about “there goes another novel”; says she’s polymorphously perverse (pp. 50)

(Deleted from film) Very brief material – “CUT TO Knicks game. Wild excitement. They are at it.”

Annie and Alvy go to bookstore. He is trying to enlighten her with serious literature. (pp. 51)

Annie and Alvy people-watch in Central Park. (pp. 5 - 53)

*D (deleted from film) Annie and Alvy visit Rob in Beverly Hills. (pp. 53 – 54)

- (Fantasy zombie sequence.) Annie like LA but Rob speaks like a zombie. Rob asks them to stay and says “I prepared these two pea pods – one for each of you. When you sleep they will take

them from a chair. Alvy upset because she is not present in the intimate situation.

(42:40 – 44:00) Alvy meets with a stand-up comedian. He wants Alvy to write jokes for him but Alvy wants to perform for himself.

(44:00 - 45:00) Alvy performs stand-up comedy at the University of Wisconsin.

(45:00 – 45:40) Annie is backstage after the show. Alvy signs autographs and they talk about meeting her parents for Easter.

(45:40 – 47:35) Annie and Alvy attend Easter dinner at Annie’s parents house.

(46:55) Alvy (via a split-screen comparison) realizes how different his family is from Annie’s family.

(47:35 – 48:35) Alvy has an awkward encounter with Annie’s brother Dwayne.

(48:35 – 48:50) Annie and Alvy leave the house and agree to drive Dwayne to the airport.

(48:50 – 49:05) Annie and Alvy drive Dwayne to the airport.

(49:05 – 50:20) Annie accuses Alvy of following her and he accuses her of having an affair with her professor. He also makes fun of the adult education course she is taking and she defends herself. She says it was his idea. She also accuses him of not wanting a real commitment with her.

(50:20 – 52:25) (Flashback) Annie and Alvy discuss her therapy, her dreams, and their relationship. Alvy suggests that she take adult education courses because it is a good way to learn about the world.

CONTINUED (52:25 – 53:42) Now, back on

over your bodies and you will then be happy citizens of Los Angeles.” Alvy tells Annie to run “or we’ll wind up living in Beverly Hills!”

(Shortened in film) Annie driving Alvy to beach; (Alvy complains about the sun) (pp. 54 – 55)

- D* - Annie and Alvy at the beach. Annie is happy because it is beautiful outside. Alvy asks “Does life have ultimate value? I don’t mean cultural or social or even historical value – or is it all just – meaningless?” Annie responds “Gee – you must be a lot of fun at parties.”

Childhood Alvy his Mom are at doctor’s office. Alvy is nervous because “the universe is expanding.” (pp. 55 – 56)

Annie and Alvy are at beach house. Annie asks about taking a poetry course. Alvy wants to have sex. Annie gets high and leaves her body. (pp. 56 – 59)

- *D Alvy comments, “My whole childhood was at the beach.”
- *D Childhood Alvy is at Coney Island with a date. They are surrounded by thugs who push him around. Alvy uses humor to deflect situation (1 page dialogue) but they come after him anyway. (pp. 59 – 60)

Alvy meets with a stand-up comedian. He wants Alvy to write jokes for him but Alvy wants to perform for himself. (pp. 60 – 61)

Alvy performs stand-up comedy at the University or Wisconsin. (pp. 61)

Annie and Alvy attend Easter dinner at Annie’s

street, they continue to fight. He critiques adult education and she suggests they break up. Then, she gets in a cab and leaves. Alvy continues walking down street and asks random pedestrians about love and relationships. He admits that he used to be in love with the Wicked Queen from *Snow White*.

(53:43 – 54:05) (Animated *Snow White* scene) Annie is the Wicked Queen. A cartoon Max enters and tells Alvy to forget Annie and that he has a woman (Pam, a reporter for Rolling Stone) he wants Alvy to meet.

(54:07 – 55:28) Alvy meets Pam character backstage at concert waiting for the Maharishi.

(55:29 – 56:36) Pam and Alvy are in bed, post-coital at night. He gets a phone call from Annie. She is upset and he agrees to go over to her apartment right away.

(56:37 – 1:01:06) Alvy goes to Annie’s apartment. She is upset and makes him kill a big spider in her bathtub. Later, they kiss on her bed and agree to get back together and never break up. Alvy says they’ll go out tomorrow with Rob and show her the old neighborhood in Brooklyn.

(1:01:07 – 1:03:22) Annie, Alvy, and Rob visit Alvy’s childhood home. He says his parents used to fight over the most ridiculous things. Then, in flashbacks, we see his parents fight and images from his family and his childhood.

(1:03:25 – 1:04:15) Annie and Alvy walk home. Annie says it was a nice way to spend her birthday. They go upstairs and she opens her birthday presents.

(1:04:40 – 1:06:46) Annie sings “Seems Like Old Times” at nightclub. The patrons are riveted by her performance.

parents house. Alvy (via a split-screen comparison) realizes how different his family is from Annie's family. (pp. 62 – 64)

- In screenplay, they eat turkey but in film they eat ham.

*D –Dad and Alvy have a conversation. Her parents confused why he does not drink so he takes sip of wine. Mom begins taking photographs and they start talking about dreams. (pp. 64 – 66A)

Alvy has an strange encounter with Annie's brother Dwayne. (pp. 66A – 67)

Annie and Alvy leave the house and then they drive Dwayne to the airport. (pp. 67)

Annie accuses Alvy of following her and he accuses her of having an affair with her professor. He also makes fun of the adult education course she is taking and she defends herself. She says it was his idea. She also accuses him of not wanting a real commitment with her. (pp. 67 – 69)

- (Flashback) Alvy is reluctant for Annie to move in. He wants her to keep her own apartment. She accuses him of not thinking that she is smart enough. He encourages her to take adult education courses. (pp. 69 – 71)
- It cuts back to their fight on the street. He criticizes adult education classes and bad professors. Annie says "we're too different to ever work out." She gets into cab and leaves. (pp. 71)

After Annie gets in cab, Alvy walks down street and talks to strangers. They admit that they look happy but are not. (The dialogue is in the script versus this scene in the film). Alvy admits he did not like Snow White but liked

(1:06:47 – 1:09:08) Alvy compliments Annie. Tony Lacey (a music producer) shows up with entourage and says he wants to work with her. He invites them to party but Alvy does not want to attend. Instead, they see *The Sorrow and the Pity*,

(1:09:09 – 1:10:09) (Split screen) Annie and Alvy separately attend therapy and complain about their relationship.

(1:10:10 – 1:11:37) Alvy and Annie go to a party. They admit they are going to Los Angeles. Annie is excited but Alvy is not. Later, Alvy sneezes into cocaine.

(1:11:38 - 1:12:49) Rob drives Annie and Alvy around Beverly Hills. Annie likes it but Alvy hates it.

(1:11:38 – 1:13:52) Alvy visits Max at television studio and fakes an illness.

(1:13:53 – 1:14:47) Alvy is in his hotel room with Annie and doctor. He feels very sick but as soon as he hears someone will cover for him (at the award show) he immediately feels better.

(1:14:48 – 1:18:00) Rob, Annie, and Alvy attend Tony Lacey's party. Annie and Tony talk about recording an album in LA and Tony shows them around his house. Once again, Annie likes it but Alvy does not.

(1:18:01 – 1:18:57) Alvy and Annie break up on plane en route to New York.

(1:18:58 – 1:20:15) Back in NY, they divide up their belongings.

(1:20:16 – 1:20:55) Alvy walks out of movie theater and states "I miss Annie. I made a terrible mistake." Then he talks to random strangers about Annie. Someone tells him to

the Wicked Queen. (pp. 72)

Snow White animation Scene. Rob tells Alvy there are a lot of woman he can date. (pp. 72 – 74)

Pam (a journalist from *Rolling Stone*) and Alvy wait to see Maharishi (pp. 75 – 76)

*D Alvy's fantasy. Garden of Eden/ Creation scene. (p. 77 – 78)

- God creates Adam and Eve; Alvy argues with God. Pam is there, too.

Pam and Alvy in bed at night, post-coital. She apologizes for taking so long to orgasm. Annie calls and Alvy and he goes to her apartment (pp. 78 – 79)

Alvy goes to Annie's apartment to kill a spider. Annie cries. They admit that they miss each other and kiss. (pp. 79 – 82)

Annie, Rob, and Alvy are in a car. They take her to Brooklyn to show her the old neighborhood. (pp. 82 – 84)

*D - They take her to a pizza restaurant. They see younger (past) versions of Rob and Alvy on a date. Alvy goofs off and trying to impress his date (pp. 84)

The scene abruptly transitions from the pizzeria scene to the middle of a scene where Rob, Alvy, and Annie visit Alvy's childhood. His parents are fighting about why the mom fired the colored maid. (85)

- *D - "CUT TO flashback scene of the Halls referring to themselves as darling and dearie." (85)

Ron, Annie, and Alvy all watch childhood Alvy interact with his family at a party. (There

date other women and he says that he tried.

(1:20:56 – 1:21:35) Alvy is at the beach house cooking lobsters with Dorrie. She is bored. Later, Alvy walks alone through the city.

(1:21:36 – 1:21:57) Alvy calls Annie. He tells her he is going to go out to LA and bring her back.

(1:21:58 – 1:26:57) Alvy arrives in Los Angeles and calls Annie. When they meet for lunch he says they should get married but they have an argument and she leaves. Then, he gets into car accident and winds up in jail.

(1:27:58 – 1:28:01) Alvy is in jail but Max bails him out.

(1:28:02 – 1:31:07) Alvy watches actors rehearse a scene from his first play based on his relationship with Annie. Later he runs into Annie outside *The Sorrow and the Pity*. In voice over and b-roll footage Alvy states that they met old and reminisced about the relationship. The last scene is one long shot as they say goodbye and walk out of the frame.

is additional dialogue and characters in the script but not the film.) (86-88)

*D Rob, Annie, and Alvy stand before Hebrew school and discuss the afterlife. (88)

*D - They get on it and elevator with the devil. Each floor they pass is another layer of hell which includes: the military, oil companies, gossip columnists, the NRA, homicidal maniacs, advertisers, the mob, fascist dictators, people who don't appreciate oral sex, guys who walk around with portable radios, and disc jockeys. (88-89)

- Richard Nixon gets on the elevator and says "Joe McCarthy, please."
- Layer seven = FBI informers, CIA assassins, fast food chains
- Layer 8 = prison guards, people who try to be funny with waiters,
- Layer 9 = politicians, torturers and contemporary architects

*D - They go to Burner N' Bun restaurant. Alvy does not want to eat there because he hates fast food, but Annie and Rob like it. (89-92)

- A big bully is bullying an elderly gentleman. Alvy reluctantly steps in to intervene and is beaten up. However, the bully recognizes him from TV and wants an autograph instead.

*D - Later that night, at Alvy's apartment. Annie says she had a wonderful day. Alvy mentions that it's Annie's birthday. He gives her presents—gaudy underwear and a silver star. This scene is different from the film. (92-93)

Annie is on the couch talking to her therapist. She says her birthday was the last time she had a good time with Alvy. Then, the scene

proceeds with a split screen of Annie and Alvy both talking to their therapists and contradicting each other. (94)

*D - Alvy's apartment, night. Annie secretly gets high before sex. Then, she tells Alvy that he reminds her of her brother. (94)

D* - It return to the split screen, therapist scene. Annie says "Alvy has trouble enjoying life – or people. The other day ..." (94-95)

Annie sings at a nightclub and the audience is rapt with attention. (95)

Tony Lacey (a music producer) shows up with entourage and says he wants to work with her. He invites them to party but Alvy does not want to attend. (95-96)

CUT TO film marquee "Sorrow and the Pity"

The scene returns to the therapist split screen scene. Annie he complains Alvy is obsessed with the dark side of life. (96)

*D - Alvy and Annie try to donate blood. Annie succeeds but Alvy faints. (97)

- Split screen: Alvy mentions that he has to go to California to attend an award show. Annie looks forward to it but Alvy dreads it. He says, "My agent says it's stupid but the masses like it."
- *D – A scene with "the Masses." In unison, they state: "We're the masses and we respond only to junk. We voted twice for Nixon and we get a big kick out of seeing people give and receive meaningless awards. Thank you for giving us this time." (97)

Rob drives Annie and Alvy around in L.A. He talks about living next to the Playboy Mansion.

Annie is impressed with how clean L.A. is but Alvy is miserable. (97-98)

Alvy visits Rob (a television producer) at a TV studio. Alvy is disgusted that Rob is inserting laughs and applause into his terrible comedy show. Rob says “Charlie, gimme a good laugh on that.” Alvy starts to feel sick and Rob worries about him. (98-100)

*D - Outside the TV studio. Alvy talks to his agent. The agent tries to convince him to attend the award show; Alvy rallies against it. (2 pages dialogue) (100a-100c)

Ron, Annie, and Alvy attend an LA party. (100c)

*D – Inside Tony’s LA party. (The script contains extended dialogue deleted from film.) It includes almost one and a half pages of superficial conversations about meetings, movie profits, the Oscars, etc. (101-104)

Tony and his girlfriend show the house to Rob, Annie, and Alvy. They enter the screening room. (104-105)

*D - SHOT of Rob holding court with two pretty girls. (105)

SHOT of Annie dancing with Tony Lacey. (PAGES? pp.)

*D - Alvy talks to two beautiful girls from New York (Sue and Dorrie). They flirt and bond. (105-106)

- Dorrie is same girl from future lobster scene in film

Annie and Alvy are on plane, returning to NY. We hear their interior thoughts about wanting to break up and then they express their feelings to each other. (106-107)

They break up and divide their belongings.
(107-108)

Alvy on the street says, “I miss Annie. I made a mistake.” Strangers on the street come up and tell him that she is living in LA. They tell him to date other women and he says he tried. (108-109)

Alvy is at the beach house cooking lobsters with Dorrie. She is bored. (109-110)

*D - Night, Times Square. Alvy talks to more strangers about Annie They critique him for forcing her to change. He says he forced her to grow and tried to mold her into the perfect women for him. One woman tells him to go to LA to get her back. (110-111)

*D – A cab pulls up. It’s Alvy’s dad. He tells him to marry Annie. (111)

*D – The scene shows an image of plane in the sky. The captain talks over loud speaker about crashing into Rocky Mountains. (111)

Alvy arrives in L.A. and calls Annie. They agree to meet. (111)

Alvy is sweating and nervous as he drives to meet Annie for lunch. (111)

Alvy waits for Annie. He orders unappetizing health food. Annie arrives and they exchange awkward hellos. He asks her to come back to NYC and marry him. They argue and she leaves. (This sequence is similar to the movie but includes extended dialogue. (112-116)

Alvy drives off and gets into an accident. (116)

- *D The script does not include instructions to cross-cut this scene footage from the bumper cars.

Rob bails Alvy out of jail (117-118)

Alvy flies back to NYC. (118)

*D – Street image. “We know the time has elapsed because one of those weird ‘end of the world is coming’ guys carries a sign that reads: Six months later.” (118)

*D - Alvy and Annie accidentally meet in a flower shop and have awkward conversation. She is living back in NYC with a new boyfriend. Alvy also has a new girlfriend. Annie’s boyfriend Paul pops his head in to the flower shop and greatly resembles Alvy. Annie and Alvy agree to meet up as friends for lunch sometime. (118-120)

- As they shake hands goodbye, a montage sequence occurs of earlier, happy footage. (“Perhaps the beach house with the lobsters and other spots.”)
- The script returns to the handshake and Alvy tells Annie to call him. They say goodbye. Annie leaves. Then Alvys turns to the camera and says, ‘Charlie, can you give me a big laugh on this?’
- The end. (120)

APPENDIX F – *Annie Hall Film* – Basic Classroom Scene

INT. SCHOOLROOM – DAY

ALVY'S VOICE I remember the staff at our public school. You know, we had a saying, uh, that "Those who can't do, teach, and those who can't teach, teach gym." And ...uh, h'h, of course, those who couldn't do anything, I think, were assigned to our school. I must say --

CUT TO A female teacher standing in front of an old-fashioned schoolroom. The blackboard behind her reads "Transportation Administration. The camera pans her point of view: a group of young students sitting behind their desks. Alvy as a child sits in a center desk while all around him there is student activity; there is note-passing, ruler-tapping, nose-picking, gumchewing.

ALVY'S VOICE I always felt my schoolmates were idiots. Melvyn Greenglass, you know, fat little face, and Henrietta Farrell, just Miss Perfect all the time. And -- and Ivan Ackerman, always the wrong answer. Always.

IVAN Seven and three is nine.

Alvy hits his forehead with his hand. Another student glances over at him, reacting.

ALVY'S VOICE Even then I knew they were just jerks. (The camera moves back to the teacher, who is glaring out at her students) In nineteen forty-two I had already discovered girls.

As Alvy talks, the camera shows him move from his seat and kiss a young girl. She jumps from her seat in disgust, rubbing her cheek, as Alvy moves back to his seat.

1ST GIRL (Making noises): Ugh, he kissed me, he kissed me.

TEACHER (Off screen): That's the second time this month! Step up here!

As the teacher, really glaring now, speaks, Alvy rises from his seat and moves over to her. Angry, she points with her hand while the students turn their heads to watch what will happen next.

ALVY What'd I do?

TEACHER: Step up here!

ALVY What'd I do?

TEACHER You should be ashamed of yourself.

The students, their heads still turned, look back at Alvy, now an adult, sitting in the last seat of the second row.

ALVY (AS ADULT) (*First off screen, then onscreen as camera moves over to the back of the classroom*)

ALVY (AS ADULT): Why, I was just expressing a healthy sexual curiosity.

TEACHER (*Alvy—as a child—standing next to her.*): Six-year-old boys don't have girls on their minds.

ALVY (AS ADULT) (*Still sitting in the back of the classroom.*): I did.

The girl the young Alvy kissed turns to the older Alvy, she gestures and speaks.

1ST GIRL: For God's sakes, Alvy, even Freud speaks of a latency period.

ALVY (AS ADULT) (*Gesturing.*): Well, I never had a latency period. I can't help it.

TEACHER (*Alvy—as a child—still at her side*): Why couldn't you have been more like Donald? (*The camera pans over to Donald, sitting up tall in his seat, then back to the teacher.*) Now, there was a model boy!

ALVY (AS CHILD) (*Still standing next to the teacher*): Tell the folks where you are today, Donald.

DONALD: I run a profitable dress company.

ALVY'S VOICE: Right. Sometimes I wonder where my classmates are today.

The camera shows the full classroom, the students sitting behind their desks, the teacher standing in the front of the room. One at a time, the young students rise u from their desks and speak.

1ST BOY I'm president of the Pinkus Plumbing Company.

2ND BOY I sell tallises.

3RD BOY I used to be a heroin addict. Now I'm a methadone addict.

2ND GIRL I'm into leather.

APPENDIX G – *Annie Hall* Screenplay – Extended Classroom Scene

MISS REED (TEACHER) You were the only difficult child in class.

ALVY (pointing to little Alvy in seat) Look at me. I'm a sweet kid. I little precocious...

MISS REED Why couldn't you be more like Donald?

SHOT of little Mister Goody-Two-Shoes

MISS REED There was a model boy.

LITTLE ALVY Tell the folks where you are today, Donald.

LITTLE DONALD I run a profitable dress company.

ALVY Really?

SHOT of row of Long Island homes, all exactly alike.

LITTLE DONALD (V.O.) And I live on Long Island.

CUT TO Alvy with the gown-up Donald, a cheesy business type inside Donald's soulless home. Wife and kids, very routine.

ALVY Are you happy?

DONALD Me? Yeah?

ALVY Here? This is so plastic. It looks like every house on the block.

DONALD So?

WIFE Is he saying something about our house?

ALVY (noticing objects) My god – I always wondered what kind of people bought a leather pig?

WIFE Who is this guy?

DONALD Let me show you the den. We got a ping pong table.

ALVY And what do you guys talk to each other about?

DONALD What do you mean?

ALVY I don't know. I'm examining alternative lifestyles.

WIFE (over terrible kids) We live for our kids, I'd say.

ALVY They're too cute – the future of America.

DONALD (proudly) Josh can sing all the words to that detergent commercial.

ALVY That's great ... two more years he'll have high tri-glycerides. (to CAMERA) See the way they're living? With the frozen TV dinners ... you've seen this kind of guy – wears the fedora hat with the little red feather in it, drives the Chevy station wagon with the foam rubber dice hanging from the dashboard – (to Donald) You're cheating on your wife, right?

DONALD Of course.

ALVY The set is always on – and naturally the worst kind of show.

Suddenly the TV talks back.

INT. DONALD'S HOUSE. DAY. SHOT of TV show in progress. A giveaway show. The lowest.

ALVY A moronic show.

20B INT. T.V. DAY. The TV MC looks at Alvy and speaks to him right from picture tube.

HOST Moronic? This is a popular show.

ALVY Popular? Nixon was popular. Hula hoops were popular. An epidemic of typhus is popular. Quantity doesn't imply quality.

HOST America watches this show. We have high ratings.

ALVY That's why Western Culture is going down the toilet. It's a dumb show and you're a dumb person.

HOST (breaking down) Leave me alone! I wanted to be a doctor ... there was this girl... I fell in love ... we married ... suddenly I was up to my neck in expenses ... I dropped out of Med School ... I came to New York, discouraged, poor –

What do you mean, the worst kind of show? This show is very popular?

ALVY This show is popular?

HOST That's right. We give out prizes – it's fun.

ALVY You're --- you're – this is terrible – you're tranquilizing with the trivial – Kierkegaard said that –

HOST (genuinely bewildered) Who? Who? ... Kierkegaard? ... What show is he on?

ALVY You pander to the lowest taste.

HOST (turning to opposite side) He's talking about you – you and your wife.

DONALD I could never stand him in public school.

WIFE (to contestant) Darling, where'd you get that suit?

CONTESTANT Thus? Gimbels ... it was marked down – why, you like this?

DONALD (to contestant) Don't give her any ideas. (to wife) You just bought a suit.

ALVY This is why Western culture [sic; spelled different ways in script] is going down the toilet. It's a dumb show – and you're a dumb person.

HOST Listen – you think this is all I wanted out of life? For god's sake – I wanted to be a doctor – that's right... I had two years of pre-med – there was this girl, we fell in love, one thing led to another, I knocked her up – I had to get a job – I had no money – we had kids – I'm running around with a family –I don't have what to eat [sic] – gimme a break

CONTESTANT (consoling, to Alvy) Look what you've done – (to Host) I'll give you my prizes.

Alvy snaps off set

ALVY Everybody's got a story. Jesus. What's happened to all my old schoolmates?

CUT TO early classroom again. Various kids tell the camera where they are today.

DICK I'm the President of the Pincus lumbing [sic] company

LUCY I'm very happily married with six kids. My husband is on welfare.

NORMAN I'm chairman of Moscovitz hair Replacement. It's vinyl and we fasten it to your head so you can take a shower.

MARTIN I sell tallises.

JOE I used to be a heroin addict. Now I'm a methadone addict.

CUT TO Alvy

ALVY And Judy Horowitz?

SHOT of school play. She is the beautiful, angelic little girl, [sic] Alvy, a mere spear holder while she is the star, ogles her. We hear his voice over.

ALVY (V.O.) I loved her so much. She was the most beautiful thing that walked.

SHOT of her today. Fat, with several kids. She walks with them in the street. Alvy confronts her.

APPENDIX H – Annie Hall Screenplay – Extended Cocktail Party Scene

ROBIN No jokes – these are friends ... O.K.? ...

MONTAGE snatches of conversation

SIDNEY My book was called *Alternative Modes of Perspectives*. His was *Alternative Styles of Perspectives*.

JOHN I see.

NORMAN: I'm going to say one word that will refute your entire argument: Beowulf.

OGDEN I understand the teacher's union is offering to sign a non-aggression pact.

CUT TO Alvy and Miss Harper and Dr. Post

DR. POST I'm going to send you my essay "The Comic Mask and Chinese Classical Theatre" ... it totally analyzes comedy ...

ALVY (bored): Great ...

MISS HARPER Tell me, Mr. Singer ... what is important to you as a human being?

ALVY Gravity.

LUPOWITZ It's moving, it's great, it's theatrical, it's meaningful, it's well constructed, but is it a play?

HILLMAN If the eyes are indeed the mirror of the soul, then what is [sic] the buttocks?

DR. FELDSPAR His idea was to do an all-black *Madame Butterfly*.

ROBIN Mine was a strict Freudian ... and he had the bust of Freud, the Ben Shahn drawing ... little cloth doll of Freud, small, dark office ... Egyptian art ... small Oriental rugs ... couch ... after a while I began to think he had a psychosis ... he thought he was Freud ... He wore a prosthesis and there was nothing wrong with his jaw ...

DWIGHT You review mine and I'll review yours.

NEEDLEMAN I'm inner-directed, he's outer-directed but his outer direction is inner directed.

HATFIELD I liked T.S. Eliot. It's great to know there's an Episcopalian who's not easy to figure out.

LISA I don't care. I'd rather drown than ask Brad for help.

MENDEL I don't know much about art but I know that I'm supposed to like it.

EDNA What you're suggesting, Professor Kline, is the Big Bang Theory. (32-33)

APPENDIX I - Raging Bull Fight Scenes Breakdown

(Excluding Fight 4 – the montage sequence - the boxing footage takes approximately twelve minutes and thirty-five seconds of accumulative screen time.)

Fight 1 LaMotta vs. Reeves, 1941

- This scene has long takes. The boxers start in their corners and the fight scene ends quickly. The fight seems easy for Lamotta. He knocks Reeves out three times in the final round – but his effort was not enough to win the match. LaMotta loses but will not get out of the ring. The crowd protests LaMotta's loss and riots.
- Boxing footage (04:00 – 06:00) The actual scene is longer but it only contains two minutes of boxing footage.

Fight 2 LaMotta vs. Robinson, Detroit 1943

- The soundtrack to this scene is dissonant. It begins with minor chords and contains eerie sound effects. Also, flash bulbs go off during the fight. Scorsese slows down the film camera during this scene. Jake wins the fight.
- Boxing footage (31:20 – 32:40) The actual scene is longer but it only contains one minute and twenty seconds of boxing footage

Fight 3 - LaMotta vs. Robinson, Detroit 1943 (re-match)

- The optical effects in this scene include a heat effect such as flames and heat waves rippling in front of the camera. Smoke surrounds the ring during the fight. Also, the dissonant soundtrack includes wild animal sounds, slow, warped and distorted sounds. The film camera speed slows down when LaMotta knocks out Sugar Ray.
- Boxing footage (38:00 – 39:10) The actual scene is longer but it only contains one minute and ten seconds of boxing footage

Fights 4 – This is a montage of condensed black and white fights, intercut with old, LaMotta, color, home movie footage. There are no sound effects or dialogue in the montage, but classical music instead. The fights are all in slow motion or still shots.

- LaMotta vs. Zivic - Detroit January 14, 1944 – only three still shots; Jake wins
- LaMotta vs. Basora - New York August 10, 1945 – only two white shots; Jake wins
- LaMotta vs. Kochan - New York September 17, 1945 – one slow (short) shot of Jake with hands up in ring; Jake wins
- LaMotta vs. Edgar - Detroit June 12, 1946 – two shots; Jake wins

- LaMotta vs. Satterfield - Chicago September 12, 1946 – one slow (short) shot of Jake hitting opponent; two seconds long
- LaMotta vs. Bell - New York March 14, 1947 – 2 short shots of Jake; Jake wins

Fight 5 LaMotta vs. Janiro - New York 1947

- This fight starts with extreme close up of Jake pummeling Janiro. He is on the warpath to destroy JeNiro's face because Vickie said he was attractive. This scene has no announcer. The dissonant soundtrack begins when LaMotta holds JeNiro's head with one hand and pummels him with the other. Janiro's reverse shots are in slow motion and blood squirts/pours out of Janiro's broken nose. The sound of pouring water accompanies the blood effect. Almost every other punch has an accompanying, and unique, sound effect.
- Boxing footage (57:00 – 57:55) The actual scene is longer but it only contains fifty-five seconds of boxing footage

Fight 6 LaMotta vs. Fox - New York 1947 – LaMotta threw this fight.

- This is the first fight that an announcer introduces in the ring. It is cross-cut with shots of people sitting down before fight in the audience. The fight itself includes flashbulb sounds and the soundtrack uses gunshots to mimic the flashbulb sound.
- Boxing footage (01:09:56 – 01:11:00) The actual scene is longer but it only contains one minute of boxing footage

Fight 7 LaMotta vs. Cerdan - Detroit 1949

- A long tracking shot begins the fight sequence. It follows Jake and Joey from inside the dressing room, down the hall, into the stadium, through the crowds and into the ring. It is the only fight scene with a classical music soundtrack. After the announcer gives the initial introduction, the scene has no announcer commentary. When the boxers are in their corners, the footage occurs in slow motion as they catch their breath in between rounds. The fight scenes are shot with a hand held camera that creates tension and energy. Jake wins the championship.
- Boxing footage (01:20:10 – 01:20:45); the actual scene is longer but it only contains forty-five seconds of boxing footage

Fight 8 LaMotta vs. Dauthuille - Detroit 1950

- LaMotta keeps his arms down and takes the punishment but, according to the announcer, he is only "playing possum." The camera circles the boxers. (According to Scorsese, he put the actors on a "lazy Susan" to accomplish this effect. See Kelly, 135) The footage

slows down during close-ups. At one point, LaMotta hits Dauthuille so hard, his mouth piece (and blood) flies across the ring. LaMotta knocks him out and wins the fight.

- Boxing footage (01:33.45 – 01:34:40); the actual scene is longer but it only contains fifty-five seconds of boxing footage

Fight 9 LaMotta vs. Robinson (Middle Weight Championship Fight) [no date, location]

- See Appendix for detail description of this fight
- Boxing footage (01:37:40 – 1:40:10); the actual scene is longer but it only contains two minutes and thirty seconds of boxing footage

APPENDIX J - *Raging Bull* Climax – Shot-By-Shot Analysis (Jake’s final fight against Sugar Ray)

Introduction

Film Shot 1 – The camera is at a high angle and pans down. A hand picks up sponge from a bloody bucket and the camera pans up (past ropes) to reveal LaMotta sitting in corner with his trainers. The trainer squeezes bloody water down Jake’s back in slow motion.

Film Shot 2 – Profile shot. Jake leans back into ropes in corner. He is beat up and exhausted.

Film Shot 3 – Extreme close-up. A hand squeezes bloody water onto Jake’s chest, and then another hand presses (massages?) his stomach in slow motion.

Film Shot 4 – Close-up. Jake leans back into trainer’s arm. The trainer is still rubbing his chest in slow motion.

Film Shot 5 – Profile shot. The camera is outside the ring and through ropes. Two trainers administer to Jake by rubbing his face and body in slow motion.

Film Shot 6 – (Like shot 4) The trainer’s arm is behind Jake’s neck as he puts in Jake’s mouthpiece in slow motion.

Film Shot 7 – Parallel action. Sugar Ray’s trainer puts in his mouthpiece in slow motion.

Film Shot 8 – Insert TV screen. Jake is on television in corner of the screen. A Pabst Blue Ribbon logo is superimposed over his image.

Round Eleven

Film Shot 9 – Close-up. The camera is outside ring and below the top rope. Jake hit Sugar Ray’s stomach, torso, and face multiple times. Sugar Ray is up against ropes, taking a beating.

Film Shot 10 – Reverse shot, higher angle, shot over Jake’s shoulder. This is a medium shot as Jake punches Sugar Ray in the face.

Film Shot 11 – Return to film shot nine

Film Shot 12 – Return to film shot two

Film Shot 13 – This shot is similar to nine but the camera is raised. Jake hits Sugar Ray and Ray moves out of the frame, screen left. Then the bell sounds. Jake’s handler comes to get him and walk him to his corner of the ring.

Film Shot 14 – Medium shot. Joey and Lenore are watching the fight on TV. Joey says “That was his last shot.”

Round Thirteen - Introduction

Film Shot 15 – TV insert shot. Jake (on television) is sitting in his the corner of the ring while his handlers attend to him. A Pabst Blue Ribbon Logo and a “Round 13” sign are superimposed over his image.

Film Shot 16 – Jake is sitting in the corner. In slow motion, his trainers lift him to his feet, into the frame, and into a medium shot.

Film Shot 17 - Parallel action. Sugar Ray stands up from his corner in slow motion.

Film Shot 18 – Wide Shot; Both Jake and Sugar Ray walk toward each other in the ring. Sugar Ray begins to pummel Jake and backs him into the ropes. The camera circles the fighters in ring and pans into CU as Sugar Ray punches Jake in the face.

Film Shot 19 – Close-up. Sugar Ray punches Jake in the face.

Film Shot 20 – Reverse Angle; over Sugar Ray’s shoulder

Film Shot 21 – This shot is similar to shot nineteen but occurs over Jake’s shoulder. Sugar Ray repeatedly punches Jake but eventually tires out and backs up into middle of ring.

Film Shot 22 – Medium close-up. Jake leans against the ropes and verbally taunts his opponent.

Film Shot 23 – Wide Shot; Jake’s arms are down. Sugar Ray is middle of ring facing Jake. Jake taunts Sugar Ray again and the referee walks out of frame.

Film Shot 24 – Medium shot. Sugar Ray is framed at a slightly high angle.

Film Shot 25 – Ray’s point-of-view. Jake leans against the ropes in medium/wide shot. His arms hang at his sides and he stares directly into the camera and taunts Sugar Ray again.

Round Thirteen: Robinson comes in for the kill¹

(1) Film Shot 26 – This shot is similar to shot twenty-three. It is well lit. The camera pulls back and moves down into straight medium shot of Sugar Ray. Then, the lights dim and the ambient sound cuts out. Animal sounds emerge and the sound becomes distorted. Sugar Ray stares straight into the camera and pants.

(2) Film Shot 27 – This shot is similar to shot twenty-five but it is a straight medium shot of Jake panting directly into the camera. The camera pushes into a close-upshot as smoke rises behind Jake. The sound distortion continues and slows down.

(3) Film Shot 28 – This shot is similar to shot twenty-six. Sugar Ray comes directly at Jake--and the camera—into close up as the sound changes into a normal speeds

¹ The parenthetical numbers start here because this is where Scorsese’s storyboard start for this fight scene. The numbers do not refer to Scorsese’s storyboards but I included them here as a way to simplify the comparative analysis between the storyboard and the film texts.

- (4) Film Shot 29 – Close up. Jakes is punched in the face. His head tilts back and sweat squirts off his body.
- (5) Film Shot 30 – This shot is an extreme close-up of the bottom half of Sugar Ray’s face. His right arm is cocked back, and he throws punch directly past the camera, screen right.
- (6) Film Shot 31 – Close-up; Jakes gets punched in the face and his head snaps screen right (This is a jump cut. The action does not match from the previous shot.)
- (7) Film Shot 32 – This shot is similar to the end of shot twenty-nine. Sugar Rays’s arm is extended past the camera, screen right. Then, the camera pulls back as he pulls his arm back.
- (8) Film Shot 33 – This is a low angle, medium close-up shot of Sugar Ray on axis as he throws multiple punches directly above the camera. (This is a jump cut. The action does not match from the previous shot.)
- (9) Film Shot 34 – Close-up. Jake’s glove slips off the rope.
- (10) Film Shot 35 – This is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray still punching over and past the camera, screen left.
- (11) Film Shot 36 – Extreme close-up. Special effect. Jake gets hit above his left eye and blood squirts out of it.
- (12) Film Shot 37 – This shot is similar to shot thirty-five. Sugar Ray throws a *left* hook with his *left* arm.
- (13) Film Shot 38 – This shot is similar to shot thirty-six. It is an extreme close up as Jake is hit on his right cheek – by a *right* jab. (This is not a match action cut)
- (14) Film Shot 39 – Medium shot of audience., Vickie is in the right foreground covering her nose and mouth with her hands. She closes her eyes and puts her head down.
- (15) Film Shot 40 – This shot is similar to shot thirty-four. It is an extreme close-up of Jake’s right glove slipping off the ropes.
- (16) Film Shot 41 – Extreme close-up of Sugar Ray’s face. He is pummeling Jake.
- (17) Film Shot 42 – Close-up, high angle. Jake’s left arm and glove slip off the ropes.
- (18) Film Shot 43 – Close-up Jake’s chest. The camera pans down to reveals Jake’s bloody knees buckle.
- (19) Film Shot 44 – Extreme-close up. Jake is punched of the left side of his face.
- (20) Film Shot 45 – Close-up. Sugar Ray’s head is thrown back.

- (21) Film Shot 46 – Special effect. Jake, in profile, gets hit above left eye and blood squirts out of it.
- (22) Film Shot 47 – High angle, over Sugar Ray. He punches Jake as seven flashbulbs occur.
- (23) Film Shot 48 – Close-up. Jake’s knees buckle against ropes and drip with blood.
- (24) Film Shot 49 – Medium shot, high angle. The audience is in background. Sugar Ray punches Jake with left and then a right hook and bloodies his face.
- (25) Film Shot 50 – This shot is an extreme close-up of Jake’s bloodied face as he gets hit on the forehead above left eye.
- (26) Film Shot 51 – Low angle. This is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray hitting Jake.
- (27) Film Shot 52 – Special effect. Extreme close-up. Jake is hit in the face above his right eyebrow. When he is hit, his head tilts back and forward and blood gushes out of his wound.
- (28) Film Shot 53 – This shot is similar to shot thirty-eight. Vickie’s head is in her hands and she slumps forward.
- (29) Film Shot 54 – Extreme close-up. The camera is placed directly above (on top of) Sugar Rays’s glove. The glove and the camera move into an extreme close of Jake as he is hit in the face.
- (30) Film Shot 55 – This is a very brief shot of the ropes.
- (31) Film Shot 56 – Close-up. Sugar Ray’s glove come into the frame from screen left and punches Jake in right eye. Blood squirts out of the cut and the camera moves screen right to reveal Jake’s entire face.
- (32) Film Shot 57 – This is an extreme close-up of Jake’s face as it is hit. (His head is tilted to the right.) The camera is static. Sugar Ray’s arm moves across frame and pushes Jake’s face out of the frame.
- (33) Film Shot 58 – This shot is an inverted image of shot fifty-eight. It is the same framing and action but in the reverse direction. Here, it is an extreme close-up of Jake’s face as it is hit but his head tilts to the left.
- (34) Film Shot 59 – Special Effect. Close-up. Jake, in profile, is punched in the forehead. The punch pushes Jake out of profile and his face turns toward camera. Then, blood gushes from the fresh cut.
- (35) Film Shot 60 - This shot is similar to shot thirty. It is an extreme close-up of the bottom half of Sugar Ray’s face. His cocks back his right arm and throws a punch directly past camera. (It may be exact same shot as shot thirty.)

- (36) Film Shot 61 – High angle of audience and reporters, shot from above the top rope. Jake slams back into ropes.
- (37) Film Shot 61 – Close up, low angle. Sugar Ray hits Jake.
- (38) Film Shot 63 – This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Jake bounces against the ropes. He holds on to the ropes with his left arm as the camera moves in from a high angle to capture Jake in a straight on, medium close.
- (39) Film Shot 64 – This medium shot is similar to shot twenty-six. The sound begins to slow down and distort as Sugar Ray lifts his arm up above his head. The camera moves in and begins up to angle toward his glove.
- (40) Film Shot 65 – Medium shot. Jake is leaning on the ropes. The camera moves into extreme close-up.
- (41) Film Shot 66 – This shot is similar to shot sixty-four. Sugar Ray raises his arm above his head and the camera pushes tighter into a close-up on his glove.
- (42) Film Shot 67 - This shot is similar to shot fifty-three; Vickie's head is down and her hands are in the prayer position. Then, she looks up to see what is happening in the ring.
- (43) Film Shot 68 – This shot is similar to shot sixty-six. This is a close up of Sugar Ray's raised glove as it smashes straight down, in the center of the frame.
- (44) Film Shot 69 – Extreme close up of the left half of the back of Jake's head. Jake is hit on the left ear.
- (45) Film Shot 70 – Special effect. Close up. Jake is punched on the right side of his jaw and blood gushes out of his mouth.
- (46) Film Shot 71 – Blood splatters on the photographers and reporters in front two rows.
- (47) Film Shot 72 – This shot is similar to shot sixty-seven. Vickie sees what happens and puts her head back down.
- (48) Film Shot 73 – High Angle. Jake's point-of-view. His boxing short and legs are splattered with blood. His blood is splattered all over the ring and beneath his feet. His knees buckle.
- (49) Film Shot 74 – Medium close up of Sugar Ray's back. The top of his head is cropped out of the frame. He pulls his right arm back and hits Jake across right eye. Then Sugar Ray moves toward screen right and we see Jake in a medium close-up shot after the hit Sugar Ray moves in front of camera again and hits Jake again with right hand. Jake's head snaps back and Sugar Ray continues to hit him. Jake's left arm is up on the ropes and the referee stops the fight.
- (50) Film Shot 75 – Low angle, close-up. Jake's entire face is bloodied and his eyes are swollen shut. He hangs his head and blood drips off of his right eyebrow.

(51) Film Shot 76 – This is a medium shot of Joey at home watching the fight. He sits in his chair, upset.

Round Thirteen Conclusion

(52) Film Shot 77 – Medium Shot. The referee lifts Sugar Ray’s arm in victory and they walk together in ring.

(53) Film Shot 78 – Medium shot. Jake is still leaning and bouncing on the ropes. The audience is behind him. He walks around ring and toward Sugar Ray. The camera follows him.

(54) Film Shot 79 –Medium shot. Sugar Ray is in the close-up in the foreground (screen right) with his trainers as Jake walks up to him, in background (screen left).

(55) Film Shot 80 – Close-up. Ray turns around to face Jake.

(56) Film Shot 81 – Close-up. Jake says “Ya never got me down Ray.”

(57) Film Shot 82 –Close-up. Sugar Ray listens to Jake.

(58) Film Shot 83 – Jake’s trainers pull him away and the camera follows them. Again, Jake says “Ya never got me down.” The trainer holds Jake up as they walk to the corner. Once there, he almost collapses but another trainer helps Jake stay on his feet. Then, together, they move to sit him in the corner.

(59) Film Shot 84 – Joey is at home watching it on television and looks very upset.

(60) Film shot 85 – Joey’s point-of-view shot. This shot is a TV insert of Jake in corner.

(61) Film Shot 86 – This is a shot of the empty corner in ring. The audience, framed through the ropes, claps as the camera pans the ring. The official steps into ring and motions to the corner. Then, the bell rings. Sugar Ray and his trainers lift their arms and celebrate. The camera continues to pan along top rope and stops on the image of blood dripping from rope.

APPENDIX K - *Raging Bull* Sugar Ray Robinson Fight: Round 13 Master Script Cutting Sequence Versus Film¹

MASTER SCRIPT

FILM VERSION

(Copied directly from the Master Script)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) Angle to neutral corner – man with Round #13 card x'ing left to right – cam booming down | 1) TV insert shot. Jake (on television) is sitting in his the corner of the ring while his handlers attend to him. A Pabst Blue Ribbon Logo and a “Round 13” sign are superimposed over his image. |
| 2) Angle to Jake’s corner – with push in and pan to tight over Sugar Ray entering from CL to Jake against side #4 ropes, camera booming up | 2) Jake is sitting in the corner. In slow motion, his trainers lift him to his feet, into the frame, and into a medium shot. |
| 3) Low angle full side #3 – Jake against ropes CR on side #4 – Sugar Ray stepping back | 3) Parallel action. Sugar Ray stands up from his corner in slow motion. |
| 4) Over Jake on ropes CR to Sugar Ray hitting | 4) Wide Shot; Both Jake and Sugar Ray walk toward each other in the ring. Sugar Ray begins to pummel Jake and backs him into the ropes. The camera circles the fighters in ring and pans into CU as Sugar Ray punches Jake in the face. |
| 5) Single Sugar Ray, stepping back, reacting above lens, stepping forward to block lens, cam moving | 5) Close-up. Sugar Ray punches Jake in the face. |
| 6) Med to close – Jake against ropes of side #4, looks into lens, camera pushing in | 6) Reverse Angle; over Sugar Ray’s shoulder |
| 7) Med Jake by ropes on side #4 with crane down as Sugar enters neutral to CL for beginning of series of hits | 7) This shot is similar to shot nineteen but occurs over Jake’s shoulder. Sugar Ray repeatedly punches Jake but eventually tires out and backs up into middle of ring. |
| 8) Med shot – Jake against side #4 ropes, being hit from CL with left hooks, rights & upper cuts | 8) Medium close-up. Jake leans against the ropes and verbally taunts his opponent. |
| 9) ECU Jake with glazed eyes reacting to hits from CL | 9) Wide Shot; Jake’s arms are down. Sugar Ray is middle of ring facing Jake. Jake taunts |
| 10) Swinging camera – close from fist to Sugar Ray hitting L to R | |

¹ The numbers here do not correspond to the numbers in the Master Script. The Round 13 Cutting Sequence in the Master Script begins numbering the storyboard shots at Slate 247B which is the fifth proposed cut in this scene, not the first. I put the numbers in sequential order here (starting with the first cut of both the Master Script and the film) in order to streamline their comparison.

11) ECU Jake's mouth and chin with trickle of blood from hits CL and CR

12) Slant angle – Sugar Ray CR hitting rights CL – Note: Line x'ed from Master

13) Slightly slanted angle – Jake against ropes on side #4 getting hit from CR with rights, lefts, and upper cuts

14) Slight up angle - Sugar Ray hitting with both hands above lens

15) Over Sugar Ray CR to Jake CL against ropes getting hit with left hooks and rights as camera booms up

16) Slight up angle – Close Jake against ropes on side #4 getting hit from CR, blood spurting from mouth

(Page 2)

17) Crane shot direct down angle – med Jake against ropes on side #4, getting hit with left and rights from below center frame – press tables e.g.

18) Slight up angle – close Jake being hit from CL his nose spouting blood

19) Med Sugar Ray hitting above lens with both hands

20) ECU – Jake getting hit from CR with rights and upper cuts

21) Slight up angle - Sugar Ray hitting above lens with both hands

22) I N S E R T – Jake's right glove holding on to and grabbing for top rope on side #4

Sugar Ray again and the referee walks out of frame.

10) Medium shot. Sugar Ray is framed at a slightly high angle.

11) Ray's point-of-view. Jake leans against the ropes in medium/wide shot. His arms hang at his sides and he stares directly into the camera and taunts Sugar Ray again.

12) This shot is similar to shot twenty-three. It is well lit. The camera pulls back and moves down into straight medium shot of Sugar Ray. Then, the lights dim and the ambient sound cuts out. Animal sounds emerge and the sound becomes distorted. Sugar Ray stares straight into the camera and pants.

13) This shot is similar to shot twenty-five but it is a straight medium shot of Jake panting directly into the camera. The camera pushes into a close-upshot as smoke rises behind Jake. The sound distortion continues and slows down.

14) This shot is similar to shot twenty-six. Sugar Ray comes directly at Jake--and the camera--into close up as the sound changes into a normal speeds

15) Close up. Jakes is punched in the face. His head tilts back and sweat squirts off his body.

16) This shot is an extreme close-up of the bottom half of Sugar Ray's face. His right arm is cocked back, and he throws punch directly past the camera, screen right.

17) Close-up; Jakes gets punched in the face and his head snaps screen right (This is a jump cut. The action does not match from the previous shot.)

(18) This shot is similar to the end of shot twenty-nine. Sugar Ray's arm is extended past the camera, screen right. Then, the camera pulls back as he pulls his arm back.

23) Slight up angle - Sugar Ray hitting above lens with both hands

24) Close – Jake getting hit from CR to left temple – blood spouting

25) Side angle – press reacting CR before getting spattered with blood from CR

26) P A R T – app. :37 into take wobbly feet on bloodstained canvas with tilt to knees

27) Slight up angle – ECU Sugar Ray hitting above lens with both hands

28) Low angle – close – Jake’s wobbly feet on canvas

29) Med shot – Jake with arms on ropes getting hit from CL with upper cuts and left hooks

30) Sharp down angle – Jake’s left arm hanging on to rope

31) Extreme up angle – Sugar Ray CR hitting CL toward upper frame with both hands

32) Extreme close on Jake’s mouth and chin being hit with rights from CR

33) Up angle ECU – Jake’s left eye being hit from CR with right punches, blood trickles

(MISSING PAGE 3 - The Master Script is missing page three from the Round 13 Cutting Sequence. For the purpose of this comparison, the missing shot descriptions have been omitted for shots thirty-three through forty-one.)

19) This is a low angle, medium close-up shot of Sugar Ray on axis as he throws multiple punches directly above the camera. (This is a jump cut. The action does not match from the previous shot.)

20) Close-up. Jake’s glove slips off the rope.

21) This is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray still punching over and past the camera, screen left.

22) Extreme close-up. Special effect. Jake gets hit above his left eye and blood squirts out of it.

23) This shot is similar to shot thirty-five. Sugar Ray throws a *left* hook with his *left* arm.

24) This shot is similar to shot thirty-six. It is an extreme close up as Jake is hit on his right cheek – by a *right* jab. (This is not a match action cut)

25) Medium shot of audience., Vickie is in the right foreground covering her nose and mouth with her hands. She closes her eyes and puts her head down.

26) This shot is similar to shot thirty-four. It is an extreme close-up of Jake’s right glove slipping off the ropes.

27) Extreme close-up of Sugar Ray’s face. He is pummeling Jake.

28) Close-up, high angle. Jake’s left arm and glove slip off the ropes.

29) Close-up Jake’s chest. The camera pans down to reveals Jake’s bloody knees buckle.

30) Extreme-close up. Jake is punched of the left side of his face.

31) Close-up. Sugar Ray’s head is thrown back.

32) Film Shot 46 – Special effect. Jake, in profile, gets hit above left eye and blood squirts out of it.

33) Film Shot 47 – High angle, over Sugar Ray. He punches Jake as seven flashbulbs occur.

34) Close-up. Jake's knees buckle against ropes and drip with blood.

35) Medium shot, high angle. The audience is in background. Sugar Ray punches Jake with left and then a right hook and bloodies his face.

36) This shot is an extreme close-up of Jake's bloodied face as he gets hit on the forehead above left eye.

37) Low angle. This is an extreme close-up of Sugar Ray hitting Jake.

38) Special effect. Extreme close-up. Jake is hit in the face above his right eyebrow. When he is hit, his head tilts back and forward and blood gushes out of his wound.

39) This shot is similar to shot thirty-eight. Vickie's head is in her hands and she slumps forward.

40) Extreme close-up. The camera is placed directly above (on top of) Sugar Rays's glove. The glove and the camera move into an extreme close of Jake as he is hit in the face.

41) Slight down angle – Jake's feet on blood stained canvas – more blood dripping

41) This is a very brief shot of the ropes.

42) Med – Sugar Ray hitting above lens with both hands

42) Close-up. Sugar Ray's glove come into the frame from screen left and punches Jake in right eye. Blood squirts out of the cut and the camera moves screen right to reveal Jake's entire face.

Slight up angle – same action

43) Right slant angle – close Jake hitting against ropes getting hit from CL to right eye, blood spouts

43) This is an extreme close-up of Jake's face as it is hit. (His head is tilted to the right.) The

44A) Crane shot – over Sugar Ray to Jake with pan to Sugar Ray’s corner – Jake and Mario in – hold on Sugar Ray as they exit

44B) Med Jake to Mario x’ing to Sugar Ray’s corner to over Sugar to full Jake x’ing to his corner sitting down buried behind Mario and Pinto

44C See Board 44A (Crane shot)

camera is static. Sugar Ray’s arm moves across frame and pushes Jake’s face out of the frame.

44) This shot is an inverted image of shot fifty-eight. It is the same framing and action but in the reverse direction. Here, it is an extreme close-up of Jake’s face as it is hit but his head tilts to the left.

45) Special Effect. Close-up. Jake, in profile, is punched in the forehead. The punch pushes Jake out of profile and his face turns toward camera. Then, blood gushes from the fresh cut.

46) This shot is similar to shot thirty. It is an extreme close-up of the bottom half of Sugar Ray’s face. He cocks back his right arm and throws a punch directly past camera. (It may be exact same shot as shot thirty.)

47) High angle of audience and reporters, shot from above the top rope. Jake slams back into ropes.

48) Close up, low angle. Sugar Ray hits Jake.

49) This shot is similar to shot sixty-one. Jake bounces against the ropes. He holds on to the ropes with his left arm as the camera moves in from a high angle to capture Jake in a straight on, medium close.

50) This medium shot is similar to shot twenty-six. The sound begins to slow down and distort as Sugar Ray lifts his arm up above his head. The camera moves in and begins up to angle toward his glove.

51) Medium shot. Jake is leaning on the ropes. The camera moves into extreme close-up.

52) This shot is similar to shot sixty-four. Sugar Ray raises his arm above his head and the camera pushes tighter into a close-up on his glove.

53) This shot is similar to shot fifty-three; Vickie’s head is down and her hands are in the

prayer position. Then, she looks up to see what is happening in the ring.

54) This shot is similar to shot sixty-six. This is a close up of Sugar Ray's raised glove as it smashes straight down, in the center of the frame.

55) Extreme close up of the left half of the back of Jake's head. Jake is hit on the left ear.

56) Special effect. Close up. Jake is punched on the right side of his jaw and blood gushes out of his mouth.

57) Blood splatters on the photographers and reporters in front two rows.

58) This shot is similar to shot sixty-seven. Vickie sees what happens and puts her head back down.

59) High Angle. Jake's point-of-view. His boxing short and legs are splattered with blood. His blood is splattered all over the ring and beneath his feet. His knees buckle.

60) Medium close up of Sugar Ray's back. The top of his head is cropped out of the frame. He pulls his right arm back and hits Jake across right eye. Then Sugar Ray moves toward screen right and we see Jake in a medium close-up shot after the hit Sugar Ray moves in front of camera again and hits Jake again with right hand. Jake's head snaps back and Sugar Ray continues to hit him. Jake's left arm is up on the ropes and the referee stops the fight.

61) Low angle, close-up. Jake's entire face is bloodied and his eyes are swollen shut. He hangs his head and blood drips off of his right eyebrow.

62) This is a medium shot of Joey at home watching the fight. He sits in his chair, upset.

63) Medium Shot. The referee lifts Sugar Ray's arm in victory and they walk together in

ring.

64) Jake is still leaning and bouncing on the ropes. The audience is behind him. He walks around ring and toward Sugar Ray. The camera follows him.

65) Medium shot. Sugar Ray is in the close-up in the foreground (screen right) with his trainers as Jake walks up to him, in background (screen left).

66) Close-up. Ray turns around to face Jake.

67) Close-up. Jake says “Ya never got me down Ray.”

68) Close-up. Sugar Ray listens to Jake.

69) Jake’s trainers pull him away and the camera follows them. Again, Jake says “Ya never got me down.” The trainer holds Jake up as they walk to the corner. Once there, he almost collapses but another trainer helps Jake stay on his feet. Then, together, they move to sit him in the corner.

70) Joey is at home watching it on television and looks very upset.

71) Joey’s point-of-view shot. This shot is a TV insert of Jake in corner.

72) This is a shot of the empty corner in ring. The audience, framed through the ropes, claps as the camera pans the ring. The official steps into ring and motions to the corner. Then, the bell rings. Sugar Ray and his trainers lift their arms and celebrate. The camera continues to pan along top rope and stops on the image of blood dripping from rope.

Works Cited

- Academy Awards Salute to Dede Allen. November 7, 2006. Academy Theater. New York City. Videotape from The AMPAS Moving Image Archive. Video.
- Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences Film Series. "Great To Be Nominated. Part Four. Raging Bull." Los Angeles. Video.
- Allen, Woody, dir. *Annie Hall*. Perf: Woody Allen, Diane Keaton. United Artists. 1977. DVD.
- Allen, Woody, and Marshall Brickman *Annie Hall Final Screenplay*. Film Archive. The Harry Ransom Center. Austin, TX. August 2, 1976. Print.
- Annie Hall "Revised Draft w/Credits: Production Notes with Alternative Title 'Anxiety'"* Film Archive. The Harry Ransom Center. Austin, TX. No Date. Print.
- Annie Hall Untitled Screenplay*. Film Archive. The Harry Ransom Center. Austin, TX. April 15, 1976. Print.
- Almo, Laura. "Schoonmaker's Third Oscar Arrives for 'The Departed'". *Editor's Guild Magazine*. May-June 2006: Volume 27, Number 3. Web. 16 December 2007.
- American Cinema Editors. "The Cutting Edge: The Magic of Movie Editing." DVD.
- American Film Institute. 100 Years, 100 Movies. 10th Anniversary Edition. Web. 09 August 2009.
- American Film Institute. 100 Top Films. AFI.com. Web. 01 Nov 2007.
- Arnolds, Gary. "The Boxing Brute of Raging Bull." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *The Washington Post*. 19 December 1980. Kellman 54-55. Print.
- "Woody Allen on Woody Allen." *Woody Allen Interviews*. Eds. Robert E. Kapsis and Kathie Coblenz. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006. 29-32.
- Ash, René L. *The Motion Picture Film Editor*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1974
- Astruc, Alexandre. "The birth of a new avant garde: la caméra-stylo." *The New Wave*. Ed. Peter Graham. London, Secjer & Warburg, 1968. pp. 17-23. Print.
- Bailey, Peter J. *The Reluctant Film Art of Woody Allen*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2001. Print.
- Balio, Tino, ed. *Grand Design: Hollywood as a Modern Business Enterprise, 1930-1939*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993. Print.
- Balmuth, Bernard. *Introduction to Film Editing*. Boston: Focal Press, 1989. Print.

- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image-Music-Text*, ed. and trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. 142-148. Print.
- Baxter, John. *Woody Allen: A Biography*. London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996. Print.
- Bazin, Andre. "La politique des auteurs." trans. Peter Graham, *Theories of Authorship*, ed. John Caughie. London: Routledge, 1957. 44-47. Print.
- Berliner, Todd. "Visual Absurdity in Raging Bull." *Martin Scorsese's Raging Bull*. Ed. Kevin J. Hayes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 41-68. Print.
- Björkman, Stig. *Woody Allen on Woody Allen*. London: Faber and Faber, 1994. Print.
- Biskind, Peter. *Easy Riders, Raging Bulls: How the Sex-Drugs-and-Rock 'n' Roll Generation Saved Hollywood*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998. Print.
- Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger, and Kristen Thompson. *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.
- Box Office Mojo. *The Godfather*. Web. 14 November 2008.
- Brode, Douglas. *The Films of Woody Allen*. New York: Citadel Press Group, 1985. Print.
- Burcksen, Edgar. "All Roads Lead to Marty: An Interview with Thelma Schoonmaker, A.C.E." *Cinema Editor*, Volume 56: Issue 4, 2006. Print.
- Carringer, Robert. *The Making of Citizen Kane*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. Print.
- "Who Really Wrote "Citizen Kane?" *American Film: a Journal of the Film and Television Arts* 10 (1985): 42-9+. Print.
- Caughie, J., ed. *Theories of Authorship*. London: Routledge/British Film Institute, 1981. Print.
- Cawelti, John G., ed. *Focus on Bonnie and Clyde*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1973. Print.
- Cook, David A., ed. *Lost Illusions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2000. Print.
- Cook, Page. Rev. of *Bonnie and Clyde*, by Arthur Penn. *Films in Review*. 08 Oct 1967. Cawelti, 23-24. Print.
- Coppola, Francis Ford. Dir. *The Conversation*. Perf. Gene Hackman. Paramount Pictures. 1974. DVD.
- Writ. *The Conversation*. Scenario. 5:1. (1999) 12-59. Print.

- Corliss, Richard. "Animal House." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Time*. 27 Nov 1980. Kellman 43–45. Print.
- Corman, Roger. "The Godfather." *Sight and Sound*. 12:9. (2002): 35. Print.
- Corrigan, Timothy. "Auteurs and the New Hollywood." *The New American Cinema*. Ed. Jon Lewis. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998. 38-63. Print.
- Cowie, Peter. *Coppola*. London: André Deutsch Limited. 1989. Print.
- Crist, Judith. Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Saturday Review*. Jan 1981. Kellman 85. Print.
- Crittenden, Roger. *Film and Video Editing*. 2nd Edition. London: Chapman and Hall. 1995. Print.
- Crowther, Bosley. "Bonnie and Clyde Arrives." Rev. of *Bonnie and Clyde*, by Arthur Penn. Friedman 177-178. Print.
- Dancyger, Ken. *The Technique of Films and Video Editing: History, Theory, and Practice*. 3rd Edition. Burlington: Focal Press. 2002. Print.
- Debruge, Peter. "Thelma Schoonmaker: Oscar-winning editor arrives with 'Departed.'" *Variety.com*. Web. 28 August 2009.
- Denby, David. "Brute Force." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese *New York Magazine*. 01 Dec 1980. Kellman 43-45. Print.
- DiMaggio, Paul and Paul M. Hirsch, "Production Organizations in the Arts," *American Behavioral Scientist* 19, no. 6 (July/August 1976): 735-52. Print.
- Director's Guild of America, Inc. "2008 Agreements." *dga.org*. Web. 28 April 2010
- Dmytryk, Edward. *On Film Editing*. Stoneham: Focal Press, 1984. Print.
- Ebert, Roger. Rev. of *Annie Hall*, by Woody Allen. *Rogerebert.com*. Web. 30 April 2008.
- Scorsese*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2008. Print.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, Alexander Hornwath, and Noel King, eds. *The Last Great American Picture Show: New Hollywood in the 1970s*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004. Print.
- Feeney, Mark . "Thelma Discusses Working with Marty." *New York Times News Service*. Web. 02 Feb 2010.
- Fehr, Rudi. Memo. Warner Brothers Archive Material. Bonnie and Clyde Collection. September 30, 1966. Print.

- Finstad, Suzanne. *Warren Beatty: A Private Man*. London: Arum Press Ltd., 2005. Print.
- Fox, Julian. *Woody: Movies from Manhattan*. London: BT Batsford Ltd., 1996. Print.
- Free, William J. "Aesthetic and Moral Value in *Bonnie and Clyde*." *Focus on Bonnie and Clyde*. John G. Cawelti. Ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1973. 99-107. Print.
- Friedman, Lester D. Ed. *Arthur Penn's Bonnie and Clyde*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
- Gaut, Berrys. "Film Authorship and Collaboration." *Film Theory and Philosophy*. Ed. R. Allen and M. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. 149-172. Print.
- Gentry, Ric. "Dede Allen: An Interview." *Post Script: Essays in Film and the Humanities* 19 (2000): 3-28. Print.
- Gerstner, David and Janet Staiger, eds. *Authorship and Film*. An AFI Film Reader. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Goodwin, Michael, and Naomi Wise. *On the Edge: The Life and Times of Francis Ford Coppola*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc. 1989. Print.
- Gross, Terry. "The Woman in Scorsese's Edit Room." Interview. National Public Radio. Web. 02 Feb 2010.
- Guthrie, Lee. *Woody Allen: A Biography*. New York: Drake Publishers, 1978. Print.
- Harris, Mark. *Pictures at a Revolution: Five Movies and the Birth of the New Hollywood*. New York: The Penguin Press: 2008. Print.
- Hatch, Robert. "Annie Hall." *Perspectives on Woody Allen*. Ed. Renée R. Curry. New York: G. K. Hall & Company, 1996. 26-27. Print.
- "Films." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *The Nation*. 13 Dec 1980. Kellman 52-53. Print.
- Hayes, Kevin J., ed. *Martin Scorsese's Raging Bull*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.
- Henderson, Brian. "Critique of Cine-Structuralism (Part I)." *Theories of Authorship*. Ed. John Caughie. London: Routledge/British Film Institute, 1981. 166-182. Print.
- Hirsch, Foster. *Love, Sex, Death, and The Meaning of Life: The Films of Woody Allen*. New York: Limelight Editions, 1990. Print.
- Hoberman, J. "Ten Years That Shook the World." *American Film* 10, 8 (1985): 36. Print.

- Horwath, Alexander. "The Impure Cinema: New Hollywood 1967-1976." *The Last Great American Picture Show: New Hollywood in the 1970s*. Eds. Thomas Elsaesser, Alexander Horwath, and Noel King. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University press, 2004. Print.
- Internet Movie Database. "Thelma Schoonmaker." Imdb.com. Web. 28 August 2009.
- Jensen, Klaus Bruhn, ed. *A Handbook of Media and Communication research: Quantitative and Qualitative Methodologies*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Johnson, Albert. Rev. of *Bonnie and Clyde*, by Arthur Penn. *Film Quarterly* Winter 1967-68. Cawelti 31-37. Print.
- Johnson, K. Robert. *Francis Ford Coppola*. Boston: Twayne Publishers. 1977. Print.
- Kael, Pauline. "Bonnie and Clyde." Rev. of *Bonnie and Clyde*, by Arthur Penn. Friedman. 178-198. Print.
- "Circles and Squares," *Film Quarterly* 16:3 (1963): 12-26. Print.
- Kapsis, Robert E. and Kathie Coblentz. Eds. *Woody Allen: Interviews*. The University of Mississippi Press, 2006. Print.
- Kauffmann, Stanley, "Look Back at Anger." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *The New Republic*. 06 Dec 1980. Kellman 48-51. Print.
- Kellman, Steven G., ed. *Perspectives on Raging Bull*. New York: Macmillan, 1994. Print.
- Kelly, Mary Pat. *Martin Scorsese: A Journey*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1991. Print.
- Keyser, Les. *Martin Scorsese*. Twayne's Filmmaker;s Series. Frank Beaver, Ed. Twayne Publishers: New York, 1992. Print.
- King, Geoff. *New Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2002. Print.
- King, Kimball, ed. *Woody Allen: A Casebook*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.
- King, Noel. "The Last Good Time We Ever Had: Remembering the New Hollywood Cinema." *The Last Great American Picture Show: New Hollywood Cinema in the 1970s*. Elsaesser, Horwath, and King, eds. 19-36. Print.
- Kolker, Robert. *A Cinema of Loneliness*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. 1988. Print.
- Koppelman, Charles. *Behind the Seen: How Walter Murch Edited Cold Mountain Using Apple's Final Cut Pro and What This Means for Cinema*. Berkeley: New Riders, 2005. Print.
- Krämer, Peter. *The New Hollywood: from Bonnie and Clyde to Star Wars*. London: Wallflower,

2005. Print.
- Kroll, Jack. "De Niro's Bronx Bull." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Newsweek*. 24 Nov 1980. Kellman 37-39. Print.
- Lane, Christina. "Stepping out from Behind the Grand Silhouette: Joan Harrison's Films of the 1940's," *Authorship and Film*. Eds. David Gerstner and Janet Staiger. New York: Routledge, 2002. 97-115. Print.
- Lebo, Harlan. *The Godfather Legacy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2005. Print.
- Lee, Sander H. *Woody Allen's Angst: Philosophical Commentaries on His Serious Films*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, Inc., 1997. Print.
- Lev, Peter. "The Big Sleep: Production History and Authorship." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 19:1 (1988): 1-21. Print.
- Lewis, Jon. *Whom God Wishes to Destroy: Francis Ford Coppola and the New Hollywood*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. Print.
- LoBrutto, Vincent. *Selected Takes: Film Editors on Editing*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1991. Print.
- Luhr, William, and Lehman, Peter. *Authorship and Narrative in the Cinema: Issues in Contemporary Aesthetics and Criticism*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1977. Print.
- Mayer, Vickie, Miranda J. Banks, and John Caldwell, eds. *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Meade, Marion. *The Unruly Life of Woody Allen: A Biography*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.
- Menand, Louis. "Methods and Madness." *Perspectives on Raging Bull*. ed. Steven G. Kellman. New York: Macmillan, 1994. 60-68. Print.
- Mitchell, Deborah C. *Diane Keaton: Artist and Icon*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, Inc., 2001. Print.
- Motion Pictures Editors Guild. "What Do Our Members Do?" [Editorsguild.com](http://editorsguild.com). Web. 28 April 2010.
- Murch, Walter. *In the Blink of an Eye: A Perspective on Film Editing*. 2nd Ed. Los Angeles: Silman-James Press, 2001. Print.
- Newman, David, and Robert Benton. "Bonnie and Clyde." *Best American Screenplays. First Series..* Sam Thomas, ed. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc. 1986. 251-295. Print.
- "Lightning in a Bottle." *The Bonnie and Clyde Book*. Sandra Wake and Nicola Hayden, eds.

- New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972. 13-30. Print.
- Nichols, Peter M. *The New York Times Guide to the Best 1000 Movies Ever Made*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004. Print.
- Nielsen, Mike and Gene Mailes. *Hollywood's Other Blacklist: Union Struggles in the Studio System*. London: British Film Institute, 1995. Print.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey. *Visconti*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1967. Print.
- Oldham, Gabriella. *First Cut: Conversations with Film Editors*. Los Angeles, CA: 1992. Print.
- Ondaatje, Michael. *The Conversations: Walter Murch and the Art of Editing Film*. New York: Knopf. 2002. Print.
- Orpen, Valerie. *Film Editing: The Art of the Expressive*. London: Wallflower Press. 2003. Print.
- Pechter, William S. "Keeping Up with the Corleons." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Commentary Magazine*. July 1972. Web. 06 December 2008.
- Penn, Arthur, dir. *Bonnie and Clyde*. Perf: Warren Beatty, Faye Dunaway. Warner Bros. Pictures. 1967. DVD.
- "Making Waves: The Directing of *Bonnie and Clyde*." Friedman, Lester. *Arthur Penn's Bonnie and Clyde*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 11-31. Print.
- People Weekly*. Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. 08 Aug 1988. Keyser 113. Print.
- Perkins, Roy and Martin Stollery. *British Film Editors: The Heart of the Movie*. London: British Film Institute, 2004. Print.
- Phillips, Gene D. and Rodney Hill. Eds. *Francis Ford Coppola: Interviews*. Univ. Press of Mississippi, 2004. Print.
- Pizzello, Stephen. "Thelma Schoonmaker: assembling art with Marty." *American Cinematographer* 74 (Oct 1993) 45-6+. Print.
- Prince, Stephen, ed. *The Brave New Ancillary World*. New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 2000. Print.
- Producer's Guild of America. "Code of Credits – Theatrical Motion Pictures." producersguild.org. Web 30 April 2010
- Raging Bull*. Dir: Martin Scorsese. MGM 2005. DVD.
- Special Features: Commentary.
- Special Features: Inside the Ring.

- Rosenblum, Ralph and Robert Karen. *When the Shooting Stops... the Cutting Begins: A Film Editor's Story*. New York: The Viking Press, 1979. Print.
- Salt, Barry. *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. Second Edition. London: Starword, 1992. Print.
- Sarris, Andrew. "Mean Fighter From Mean Streets." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *The Village Voice*. 19 Nov 1980. Kellman 33-36. Print.
- "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962." *Film Culture Reader*. Ed. P. Adams Sitney. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970. 121-35. Print.
- Schatz, Thomas, ed. *Boom and Bust: The American Cinema in the 1940s*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1997. Print.
- *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1988. Print.
- "The New Hollywood". *Film Theory Goes to the Movies*. Ed. Jim Collins. New York: Routledge. 1993. 8-36. Print.
- Schickel, Richard. *Woody Allen: A Life in Film*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2003. Print.
- "Woody' Allen's Breakthrough Movie." Rev. of *Annie Hall*, by Woody Allen. *Time Magazine*. Monday, Apr. 25, 1977. Print.
- Review of *Bonnie and Clyde*. *Life Magazine*. 13 Oct 1967. Cawelti 24-26. Print.
- Schrader, Paul and Martin Mardik. *Raging Bull* "Master Script 'as Shot Pre-Hiatus 8/17/79' Shooting Script with RDN Notes". Ms. Robert De Niro Collection. The Harry Ransom Center. University of Texas, Austin. Print.
- Schumacher, Michael. *Francis Ford Coppola: A Filmmaker's Life*. New York. Crown Publishers. 1999. Print.
- Scorsese, Martin. Dir. *Raging Bull*. Perf. Robert De Niro, Cathy Moriarty, Joe Pesci. 1980. MGM 2005. DVD.
- Seger, Linda. *Making a Good Script Great*. New York: Mead and Company, 1987. Print.
- Seitz, Michael H. "Musclemen." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *The Progressive* February 1981. Hayes 139. Print.
- Sherlock, James. "Why Thelma Loves Marty... And Michael." *Cinema Papers* 113 (1996): 42-46. Print.
- Shurlock, Geoffrey M. Memo. Warner Brothers Archive Material. *Bonnie and Clyde* Collection. October 13, 1966. Print.

- Silet, Charles L.P. Ed. *The Films of Woody Allen: Critical Essays*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, Inc. 2006. Print.
- Singleton, Ralph. *Film Scheduling*. New York: Lone Eagle Publishing Company, 1991. Print.
- Something's Gotta Give*. Internet Movie Database. Web. 09 Sept 2009.
- Spignesi, Stephen J. *The Woody Allen Companion*. Kansas City: Andrews and McMeel, 1992. Print.
- Staiger, Janet. *Media Reception Studies*. New York: New York University Press, 2005. Print.
- "The Hollywood Mode of Production: Conditions of Existence." *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. Ed. Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger, and Kristen Thompson New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.
- "The Labor Force, Financing and the Mode of Production." *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style & Mode of Production to 1960*. eds. David Bordwell, Janet Staiger, and Kristen Thompson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.
- Stefanic, Vern, "Raging Bull is a Gritty, Brutal Masterpiece." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Tulsa World* 20 Feb 1981. Hayes 145-147. Print.
- Stoddart, H. "Auteurism and Film Authorship." *Approaches to Popular Film*. Eds. J. Hollows and M. Jancovich. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 37-57. Print.
- Talty, S. "Invisible Woman." *American Film* 16.9 (1991): pp. 42. Print.
- "The Art and Craft of Filmmaking." *Cineaste Magazine*. Spring 2009. 54 – 64. Print.
- "The Cutting Edge: The Magic of Movie Editing." *American Cinema Editors*. 2004. DVD.
- Thompson, David and Ian Christie, Eds. *Scorsese on Scorsese*. London: Faber and Faber, 1989. Print.
- Thompson, Kristen. "Major Technological Changes of the 1920s." *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. Eds. Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger, and Kristen Thompson New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. 281-293. Print.
- Truffaut, François. "Une certaine tendance du cinéma français." *Cahiers du cinéma*, no. 31, January 1954, pp. 15-28. Print.
- Unknown. Warner Brothers Archive Material. *Bonnie and Clyde* Collection. March 14, 1967. Print.
- Variety*. "Raging Bull." Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Variety* 12 Nov 1980. Kellman

31–32. Print.

Warner, Jack. Memo. Warner Brothers Archive Material. *Bonnie and Clyde* Collection. January 3, 1967. Print.

Wasko, Janet. “Hollywood and Television in the 1950s: The Roots of Diversification.” *Transforming the Screen 1950-1959*. Ed. Peter Lev. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2000. 127-146. Print.

Wexman, Virginia Wright, ed. *Film and Authorship*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003. Print.

Wollen, Peter. “The *Auteur* Theory.” *Theories of Authorship*. Ed. John Caughie. London: Routledge/British Film Institute, 1981. 138-151. Print.

Wood, Robin. *Personal Views*. London: Gordon Fraser, 1976. Print.

“Writing and Directing *The Conversation*: A Talk with Francis Ford Coppola.” *Scenario*. 5:1 Spring (1999): 60-67. Print.

Wuntuch, Phillip. “De Niro Packs a Mean Punch: Stunning But Unsentimental, *Raging Bull* Scores a KO.” Rev. of *Raging Bull*, by Martin Scorsese. *Dallas Morning News* 19 Dec 1980. Hayes 143. Print.

VITA

Alexis Carreiro attended Weymouth High School in Weymouth, Massachusetts. In 1997, she received her Bachelor of Arts degree from Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. Before earning her Ph.D. at the University of Texas at Austin, she taught media literacy workshops throughout Massachusetts and spent several years as a corporate video producer/editor in Boston. In 2002, she co-produced, directed, and edited a short documentary (*Generation Digital*) about high school media education in Austin, Texas. Also, during her time in the Radio-Television-Film department at UT-Austin, she was the Co- Coordinating Editor of *Flow* (Volumes 6 - 7), an on-line journal for television and media culture. Currently, her research explores the artistic, industrial, and ideological practices of cinematic storytelling.

Permanent address: 2100 Nueces Street #207, Austin, Texas 78705

This manuscript was typed by the author.