The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY

CQ
no. 1214

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

HUDSON, MARTHA BENNETT. From Novel to Film: A Study of To Have and Have Not. Directed by: Dr. Charles E. Davis. Pp. 76.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze in depth the three versions of To Have and Have Not, the novel written by Ernest Hemingway, the screenplay written by Jules Furthman and William Faulkner and the film directed by Howard Hawks. It is not, however, a presentation of three separate studies focusing on the works alone. Instead, an attempt is made to deal with the three great creative personalities involved as contributors to a final art form which is the film.

An attempt is made to bring to the study a general understanding of the other works of each, with consideration both of general philosophy and thematic content and more specific aspects of technique and style. With that general understanding as background, the film is analyzed and the attempt made to delineate elements within it especially characteristic of its three major contributors. Other artists, especially actor Humphrey Bogart, are also considered. The studio system as it existed in Hollywood in 1944 which, because of its power, had a great influence on the making of the film, is also described.

Out of the combined efforts of these artists, in spite of temporal limitations, evolves a film that is on the surface a romance disguised as an adventure story. Underneath that surface, however, basic questions about the nature of man and the social systems in which he operates

are dealt with. Out of the story evolves a definition of a composite hero, who, as an individual, embodies some basic moral truths that are finally a potpourri of Hawks, Hemingway and Faulkner.

Beyond general philosophical matters, the thesis attempts to analyze the film as art, and to consider the final product as it relates to novel and screenplay. Comparisons of the three are made and discussed in terms of their significance to character, plot, theme and technique, especially as these differ in a verbal and a visual medium.

FROM NOVEL TO FILM: A STUDY OF
TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT

by

Martha Bennett Hudson

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
1974

Approved by

Charles E. Davis

Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser Charles E. Davis

Committee Members Robert D. Stephens

Murray D. Arndt

August 8, 1974

Date of Acceptance by Committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to Edmund Berkeley, Jr., Curator of Manuscripts at The University of Virginia Library for his help in locating a copy of the screenplay and granting permission to quote from it. Thanks are also extended to Charles E. Davis, thesis adviser, and to Robert O. Stephens and Murray D. Arndt for their invaluable assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TEXT	1
FOOTNOTES.	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
APPENDIX	76

461338

William Faulkner, in commenting on the period he spent in Hollywood, said that the writer who wrote for the movies had to be willing to accept the implicit compromise involved. That acceptance was a necessity, he said, "because a moving picture is by its nature a collaboration and any collaboration is compromise because that is what the word means--to give and to take."[1] The remark suggests a great deal of insight into movie making. Carried a step further, it becomes obvious that it is not only the writer who must be willing to compromise. It is the nature of film, at least as Hollywood has known the medium, that it is a collaborative art. Unlike a poem for which the poet can claim sole responsibility or a painting whose worth can be attributed directly to the artist, a movie is usually the result of many artists working together to create a final art form that reflects something of each. The degree of contribution, of course, varies, but it remains true that it is almost impossible to ascribe a Hollywood movie to any one person. One can argue that a good movie must be based on a good screenplay and that a good scenarist is, therefore, crucial to the final product. One might also insist that the original story is finally responsible for the success or failure of the movie and the creator of that is, therefore, the key contributor. The "auteur" theory, with its emphasis

on the director as artist creating on the set an expression of his art is another popular viewpoint which is certainly viable. But there are also editors and cameramen and actors and a host of others who contribute, to some degree, to the final product which is the movie. It becomes essentially impossible, then, given a movie, to definitively state what elements are attributable to what contributor. That impossibility does not, however, imply that film as an art form ought to be ignored because it is difficult to identify the creator. Neither does it imply that a new critical approach is necessary, that film should be considered as an art form in its own right, apart from a consideration of the creator. Difficult as it may be, it is possible to consider both the creators and the final form in a critical analysis of a particular movie. In part, the purpose of this thesis is to focus on the film To Have and Have Not as art, particularly as it expresses the personal view of director Howard Hawks. More importantly, an attempt will be made to view the process of creating the film in light of the personalities and perspectives of Hawks, Hemingway and Faulkner. As far as possible with the collaborative art of film, the thesis will concentrate on these three contributors with some consideration of Bogart as man and actor.

If Faulkner is correct that a moving picture is, by nature, a collaboration, then To Have and Have Not must be considered one of the most interesting ones in the history

of Hollywood for it brought together in one film a number of creative personalities that had never been, and were never again to be, brought together. In this film the work of one Nobel Prize winning author is adapted for the screen by another and transformed into film by one of America's greatest directors using one of the most celebrated actors that Hollywood had to offer. But beyond that, the film itself is valuable and a consideration of the personalities that helped to create it makes it even more so. An analysis of the film from that perspective serves two purposes. It lends itself to a fuller understanding of Hemingway and Faulkner and Hawks and Bogart. Further, it adds to one's appreciation of the nature of Hollywood movie-making, especially the fact that it is a compromise, that it is finally the giving and taking of many people, the collaboration of many personalities working from different perspectives that create the final art form, the film.

The history of this particular film, To Have and Have Not, has been related by Howard Hawks, who is finally, as director and as personal friend, the key link to both Hemingway and Faulkner. In a typical interview, he tells of how the film came to be:

> Hemingway and I are good friends, but whenever I tried to persuade Hemingway to write for the movies, Hemingway insisted that he could be a good writer of books, but he didn't know if he could be a good writer of movies. Once when Hemingway and I were hunting together, I told him that I could take his worst story and make a movie out of it. Hemingway

> asked me what was his worst story. "To Have and Have Not," I said. Hemingway explained that he had written the story in one sitting when he needed money, and that I couldn't make a movie out of it. I said I'd try, and while we hunted, we discussed it. We decided that the best way to tell the story was not to show the hero growing old, but show how he had met the girl, and, in short, show everything that had happened before the beginning of the novel. After four or five days of discussion I left. Faulkner and Jules Furthman then wrote a script incorporating the ideas Hemingway and I had evolved on our hunting trip.[2]

Like so many Hollywood anecdotes, the account may not be precisely factual. Hemingway, for instance, did not write the story in one day, though he did write the third part hurriedly because he was anxious to return to Spain.[3] But there are elements of truth in it. Hemingway was a personal friend of Hawks, and they shared more than a love of hunting. As will be discussed later, the philosophies of the two, as embodied in the Hemingway and Hawks hero are often similar. But Hawks was also a personal friend of Faulkner's and they, too, shared some very basic ideas or so an analysis of the ideas implicit in their works seems to indicate. Faulkner and Hemingway were, if not friends, at least contemporaries who were aware of each other's work. Something of that awareness seems obvious in _To Have and Have Not_, the one place in which the ideas of all three are brought together.

Hemingway, of course, in spite of pressure from Hawks, never did write "for" the movies, and Hawks is probably accurate in attributing his reluctance to the fear that he

might not be able to do it well. Faulkner would perhaps have agreed for it is this very quality of Hemingway's, this failure to experiment in new areas, that Faulkner most often referred to when asked to evaluate his contemporary. In 1947, he said of Hemingway that "he has no courage, has never climbed out on a limb. He has never used a word where the reader might check his usage by a dictionary."[4] In the years that followed, he made several attempts to explain what he had meant. He quite readily admitted that Hemingway did very well within a limited range. He notes, for instance, his perfect control of his style, saying that, in a sense, it was perfect because it never failed him and he could do whatever he wanted to with it.[5] In Nagano, he attempted to explain the earlier comment by saying of Hemingway,

> I thought that he found out early what he could do and stayed inside that. He never did try to get outside the boundary of what he really could do and risk failure. He did what he really could do marvelously well, first rate, but to me that is not success but failure . . . failure to me is the best. To try something you can't do, because it's too much [to hope for], but still to try it and fail, then try it again. That to me is success.[6]

This is what he had in mind when he placed Hemingway last in the ranking of himself and his contemporaries (Dos Passos, Thomas Wolfe, Erskine Caldwell). The rating is based on splendor of failure, and Hemingway comes in last because he dared less, he risked less. He found early the style which suited him and he did not depart from it.[7] It is this

characteristic that Faulkner again pointed to when he contrasted Hemingway's style to his own. Hemingway, he said, did his best by holding to one "supple, undeviable style," by telling everything he had to say in the same method. In contrast, he said of his own work that it was a jumble of styles, clumsy and hard to read.[8] A few years later, on the same topic, Faulkner added that Hemingway did not need to, did not have to, was not driven by some demon to go beyond that method which he found early worked for him and that he could control.[9]

Faulkner's adjective for his own work, "jumble," may apply as well to Hemingway's views of him. He did not think much of Faulkner's very early work, especially his poetry.[10] His opinions of later works were mixed and were apparently influenced by feelings about himself and the progress of his own work as much as anything else. His comments ranged from the fact that he had plenty of respect for Faulkner and wished him luck,[11] to a bitter denunciation of the "no-good son of a bitch."[12] When Faulkner won the Nobel Prize, Hemingway replied that he himself had written a better and straighter novel "without tricks nor rhetoric."[13] Hemingway thought later that he was being too harsh, but then said that anyone with a quart of whiskey, a loft in a barn and a total disregard for syntax could do the kind of thing Faulkner did in _A Fable_.[14] Hemingway, at one point at least, felt that Faulkner could have limited himself more.

Malcolm Cowley, in one of his letters to Faulkner, quotes a story Sartre had told him of Hemingway, drunk in Paris, insisting that Faulkner was the better writer. He goes on to quote a letter Hemingway had written him in which he said that "Faulkner has the most talent of anybody but hard to depend on because he goes on writing after he is tired and seems as though he never threw away the worthless. I would have been happy just to have managed him."[15]

Perhaps, in retrospect, it is true that Faulkner did have more talent, though I shall make no attempt here to argue such a point. In 1944, at least, Hemingway was the more successful, at least as far as money measures a writer's success. Cowley mentions the problem in another letter: "And a mild speculation: why shouldn't the movies buy some of your old stories, the way they buy Hemingway's, so that you wouldn't have to work for the bastards any more?"[16] Edward Murray, in his not very reliable recent book, goes a step further when he considers Faulkner's work on _To Have and Have Not_. He suggests that "it must have irritated the writer to have had to adapt such a mediocre work from the hand of Hemingway, who was never forced to perform such chores at the studios."[17] This seems highly unlikely. On the contrary, knowledge of the Hawks-Hemingway friendship and the part it played in the germination of the idea for the film plus a chance to work again with his friend Hawks may have made the adaptation of Hemingway's novel one of

Faulkner's more pleasant Hollywood experiences. Even if this was not the case, there seems no evidence to support a feeling of active resentment on Faulkner's part. Critics, however, tend sometimes to attribute motives and feelings retroactively without much justification. George Sidney, focusing on Hawks, commits a similar error. He has suggested, quite legitimately, I think, that Faulkner was selected to work on _To Have and Have Not_ partly because of the knowledge of Vichy France he had acquired during his earlier work on _The DeGaulle Story_. But he goes on to suppose that, "If Hawks had not known of _The DeGaulle Story_, he was probably aware that Faulkner and Hemingway were the foremost living American novelists, and he may have realized that by providing the one the opportunity to translate the work of the other he was creating a situation rare and exciting."[18] It is not very likely, it seems, that Hawks had any such noble motive in mind. Hawks and Faulkner were friends, and he appreciated his ability as a writer. Much later, in speaking of Faulkner's role in writing the scenario for _The Land of the Pharohs_ (1955), he said, "As always, he contributed enormously. He's a great writer; we are very old friends and work easily together. We understand each other very well, and any time I need any sort of help, I call on Faulkner."[19] The essence of the statement is equally true for 1944. Hawks, as Coughlan notes, did not suffer from literary hero worship. He regarded Faulkner, not as a hero,

but as "an exceptionally useful literary mechanism."[20] Added to this is the fact that Faulkner was available and working for Warner's at the time. As a result, the two of them worked together on To Have and Have Not from mid-February, 1944, until mid-May, although the idea of the film had been active since August, 1943.[21] Faulkner evidently returned Hawks' friendship. As Blotner notes, even after Hollywood was no longer a necessity, Faulkner remained indebted to Hawks who had been his friend and aid, had gotten him screen credits he really did not deserve and had seen that he got money when he needed it.[22] Blotner offers another comment on the relationship when he says that when Faulkner was working with Hawks, "he was working with a man who liked him and understood what he could do in film writing better than anyone else."[23] Although there are interesting aspects of the Faulkner-Hemingway relationship suggested in the film, it was not apparently intended that way. Hollywood, as always, was more interested in money than the noble idea of bringing together two great writers, more impressed by the success of Hawks' films at the box office than the possible greatness that might result if the work of the three artists was combined. It seems, finally, that the fact that Faulkner came to adapt Hemingway's novel for the screen was due to his friendship with Hawks, to his availability to Warner's and to his knowledge of Vichy France rather than to any aspect of the Faulkner-Hemingway relationship.

As has been mentioned before, film as Hollywood knows it involves compromise. To Have and Have Not is no exception. As any viewer who has read the Hemingway novel knows, the parallels are few. The changes were not made, however, as much for artistic reasons as for practical ones. Considering this general topic, Sidney notes that the studio power system was much too complicated to allow the artist in Hollywood to maintain his creativity and integrity. Within such a system, art became "the product of economic, social and political determinism."[24] The accusation is at least partly true of To Have and Have Not. As Hawks has said, he and Hemingway decided that the best way to tell the story was to go back and show Harry Morgan as he was before he married Marie. This, in fact, was done, though it is difficult to imagine Bogart's Harry Morgan ever evolving into the Morgan of Hemingway's novel. Other changes, though, seem to have been accommodations made for basic economic, social and political reasons. Blotner, for instance, notes that the Hemingway novel underwent many changes partly because of the concern expressed by the State Department and the Hays Office. As he says, the "villains were no longer the idle American rich or bad Cuban revolutionaries but instead the kind of Vichyites Faulkner had dealt with in The DeGaulle Story."[25] A statement about the American social system that might have been acceptable in 1937 was no longer permissible in 1944. To have a movie portray the idle, corrupt

or perverted rich sitting unknowingly by on their fine yachts as a man is destroyed by social forces he cannot control simply could not be allowed, especially by Warner's. The Warner brothers were especially anti-Nazi even before such sentiments were popular. Their feelings were enhanced when Roosevelt entertained them and asked them to help win the ideological war.[26] Such an effort is apparent in earlier Warner films like _Air Force_ and _Life and Death of a Bomber_, and is seen again, if not quite so blatantly, in the anti-Vichy statement of _To Have and Have Not_. The change in setting, from Key West to Martinique, then served a dual purpose. It eliminated the possibility of making a negative statement about the American social system while it made possible a pro-American view of the war. This is in perfect accordance with official Warner policy of the period. Even a newspaper ad which advertised the film stated that "_To Have and Have Not_ . . . serves booming notice that '_combining good picture-making with good citizenship_' is a _permanent_ Warner policy."[27] _To Have and Have Not_ as Hemingway wrote it would have been found unacceptable by an audience of super-patriots. Malcolm Cowley, writing a review in 1944, notes that in recent years, opinion had been that Hemingway's work would have been better "if only he were a little more virtuous or reasonable or optimistic, or if he revealed the proper attitude toward progress and democracy."[28] Even the film version received some bad critical reception because

the audience was too war-conscious to accept a hero who at first refused to take a stand on the right side, and, when he did, did it for personal rather than idealistic reasons.[29] It is not clear just what part Faulkner or Furthman or Hawks played in the addition of the Vichy plot, but it seems logical to assume that none was as important as that official Warner policy. Robin Wood has said that Hawks has never been interested in "Ideas" as abstractions apart from character and action, that he has never made a film on a given moral or social theme.[30] That is true to some degree, but in the case of To Have and Have Not, though they grow out of the character portrayal and the action, given moral and social themes are certainly there. There is, for instance, the addition of the scene in which Harry and Marie walk from the police station to the bar. Absent from the screenplay, it serves to offer just enough history to assure that no one in the audience has trouble distinguishing the good guys, "the Free French," from the bad guys, who "joined with Vichy," the ones with "the navy behind them."[31]

Even the patriotic Warner brothers, however, were not interested only in supporting the war effort. They were also interested in making money. They had done so in 1943 with Casablanca which offered to the movie public Humphrey Bogart, Ingrid Bergman and Paul Heinried in an intriguing and entertaining combination of sex and politics. It was in this film that Bogart's potential as an object of romance

was first realized. There are obvious attempts to recreate in To Have and Have Not some of that same magic that meant box office success. Again, the newspaper ad says that To Have and Have Not "takes up entertainment-wise where 'Casablanca' left off!"[32] The filmed version of Hemingway's novel, then, is very much a product of the times. Created in another era, it might have been more "faithful" to the book or might have offered a different variation of the novel as did the 1951 The Breaking Point or the 1958 The Gun Runners, but that is pure speculation. As it is, it offers a fine example of the best that Hollywood had to offer in 1944.

It seems obvious, then, that practical reasons dictated a number of changes in To Have and Have Not. In addition to these political and economic considerations, however, there are other more general, aesthetic problems that are common to anyone who adapts a novel for the screen. The two, novel and film, are very different media in spite of the fact that they share such vital aspects as plot, character and theme. It is the way in which these are presented and developed that is the basis for distinction. They make use of two very different languages, the novel verbal and the film primarily visual. The verbal, linguistic use of language can be very abstract. The writer has the ability to explore thoughts, feelings and sensations in a very discursive manner if he wishes. The reader of

that discourse can then consider it at leisure and come, hopefully, to some conceptual understanding of its meaning. The film maker, on the other hand, because he relies largely on visual language, is somewhat limited in an exploration of abstract ideas. The presentational nature of his medium demands that his images be more concrete. He has the dramatic impact of his vision to contend with, for the viewer sees it all at once. Meaning, then, is based on perceptual input rather than conceptual development. In terms of character, for instance, the writer can delve into the subjective nature of a mind while the film maker must usually rely on a more direct presentation of that character in a particular experience. The reader/viewer may come to the same conclusion about that character, but he does so based on two different kinds of input. The place of descriptive material is another example. The writer may take pages to set the scene, to describe the physical characteristics of a scene. The film maker, on the other hand, can show all the details of setting very quickly. He places his emphasis not through words but through the use of camera angle and distance, lighting and placement. The reader is given words on a printed page, from which he can construct visual or mental images and conceptualize meaning. The viewer, on the other hand, is given the visual image and must move from that to the meaning that lies beneath that image and its relationship to the whole. These are considerations that

confront the film adaptor who, in a sense, acts as translator from verbal to visual. It is certainly a problem that Faulkner and Jules Furthman had to deal with in preparing To Have and Have Not for the screen.

The general problems of adapting fiction for the film added to the social, political and economic dictates of the time make changes in To Have and Have Not almost inevitable. In light of these considerations, it is perhaps remarkable that any similarities remain, that any details survive the process of changing the novel into the film. There are, however, a few parallels between the book and the screenplay, though most occur during the first ten minutes of the film and are not really significant in terms of the themes later developed. The establishing shot shows us Martinique on the map and we know immediately that the location of the action has been changed. As the film cuts to an exterior shot of the dock and Harry Morgan's boat, we discover, however, that there are definite parallels, at least for the first few minutes. The fishing motif has been maintained, and the characters involved in that particular sequence are very much like those in the Hemingway novel. Johnson is still the "city slicker" intruding on a man's world, represented by Morgan who is at ease with those symbols of masculinity like boats and fish and guns. If on nothing else, Hemingway and Faulkner and Hawks would agree that such are the trappings of a man's world. All were sportsmen who seemed to share a

sense of the meaning to be found in that role, a sense of that something beyond the mechanics of the sport that Johnson cannot grasp. Walter Sande, portraying Johnson in the film captures the significance of such lines from the novel as:

> "Can't you put on a bait like that, captain?" Johnson asked me.
>
> "Yes, sir."
>
> "Why do you carry a nigger to do it?"
>
> "When the big fish run you'll see," I told him.
>
> "What's the idea?"
>
> "The nigger can do it faster than I can."
>
> "Can't Eddy do it?"
>
> "No, sir."
>
> "It seems an unnecessary expense to me."[33]

Johnson's questions make it obvious that he is not, and never can be a part of that masculine world here represented by the fishing. He becomes almost a kind of anti-hero, providing a sort of counterpoint to Morgan who is at home here, who does understand the "masculine" values and virtues. Johnson is unable to "see" anything beyond the financial cost. His only comment after the day's fiasco is, "I'm about fed up with this kind of fishing" (n. 23). He does not begin to realize that, as Morgan says, "he hooks into a fish a fisherman would give a year to tie into," loses him and makes a fool of himself in the process (n. 22). This is the same Johnson that Faulkner and Furthman capture in the

screenplay, largely by lifting the fishing excursion almost directly from the book. Even the shot description of the marlin, "shining silver in the sun and making a splash like throwing a horse off a cliff"[34] is taken directly from Hemingway's description of the fish "making a splash like throwing a horse off a cliff" (n. 16). Dialogue for Johnson, too is often taken directly from Hemingway. There are some notable changes, as in the screenplay's substitution of "this fellow" and the name "Horatio" for "the nigger" in the passage quoted above, but this is more the result of the social climate than any alteration in Johnson's character. If anything, the addition in the screenplay of the description of Johnson's outfit, "the sporting-goods-store conception of a practical fishing costume for the tropics. Pith helmet, etc." (s.p. 5) only enhances the sterotype Hemingway created.

Eddy, the rummy, is another aspect of the book that is quite "faithfully" transferred to the screenplay and then to the film. He is, in fact, the only character who appears physically in the film very much as Hemingway described him. Morgan, in the novel, says of Eddy, "I looked at him standing there tall and hollow-cheeked with his mouth loose and that white stuff in the corners of his eyes and his hair all faded in the sun. I knew he woke up dead for a drink" (n. 19). The shot description in the screenplay adds only that his hair is "scant"; otherwise, they are alike. Walter

Brennan, who plays Eddy in the film, goes further to capture elements of Hemingway's character that were left out of the screenplay. Hemingway says that Eddy came along the dock "looking taller and sloppier than ever. He walked with his joints all slung wrong" (n. 9) and, later, that Eddy "walked just like his joints were backwards" (n. 39). Anyone who has seen Brennan's characterization would find it difficult to describe his peculiar movement better than Hemingway. Since this particular detail is omitted from the screenplay, it seems obvious that someone on the set, probably Hawks, was able to recall and include this element of the Hemingway character. Eddy, then, exists in the screenplay, and later in the film as a man very much like the one Hemingway created. As such, he fits beautifully into the Hawks' tradition. In most Hawks' adventure films, there appears the physically handicapped figure or the aging alcoholic who is befriended by the hero. Eddy embodies both traits and can therefore be moved almost directly from novel to film.

Aside from Johnson and Eddy, there are no characters that survive the transition from book to screenplay, but there are incidents. The book opens with Morgan refusing to carry three Cuban aliens to Florida. While the scene changes into one in which the representatives of the Free French want Morgan to bring the de Bursacs to Martinique, much of the dialogue is retained. Morgan, in the novel, says "Don't make me feel bad . . . I tell you true I can't do it" (n. 3).

Carried into the screenplay, the line, with the addition of "boys" fits the character as Bogart portrays him in the film. The Cubans suggest that "Afterwards, when things are changed, it would mean a good deal to you" (n. 4). The Free French group offers the same argument. The gun battle that ensues outside French's strongly resembles the one Hemingway describes, even to the presence of an ice wagon in the street. The similarity makes obvious though, one of the general differences in novel and film. Hemingway must rely on description: Morgan says, "As they turned out of the door to the right, I saw a closed car come across the square toward them. The first thing a pane of glass went and the bullet smashed into the row of bottles on the show-case wall to the right. I heard the gun going and, bop, bop, bop, there were bottles smashing all along the wall" (n. 6). Transferred to film, this becomes a purely visual scene, happening so fast that it is difficult to tell whether one man really has "a Thompson gun" and another "a sawed-off shotgun" as both the novel and screenplay say (n. 6; s.p. 31). These are minor incidents, and only serve as narrative tricks to establish Harry's character and the police-state atmosphere of the island. Unlike Johnson and Eddy who do serve an important purpose, as a type of foil and an object of duty respectively, the details of the fishing excursion and gun battle do little except perhaps to add a bit of Hemingway "flavor." It would, however, have been possible

to film these scenes without such specifics. But the film was intended as an adaptation of To Have and Have Not. Because it was 1944 and Howard Hawks was making the movie for Warner Brothers, the significant portions of the book could not be used. The story of a slowly crumbling society destroying a man who was trying to maintain his identity as an individual simply would never have reached production. It seems, then, that all Faulkner and Furthman could take from the novel were those details that could be safely transferred devoid of meaning.

Interacting with Johnson and Eddy and taking part in all these incidents in both book and screenplay is Harry Morgan, hero. He takes Johnson fishing, provides Eddy with liquor, turns down a job, and watches the gun battle, but though much of his dialogue from the first part of the book is retained, it is certainly not uttered by the same Harry Morgan. The first indication of the change is Morgan's attitude toward Eddy. The Morgan of the novel has little but disdain for him. He says it was "poison" to see Eddy, and when he slaps him he says, "I felt bad about hitting him. You know how you feel when you hit a drunk" (n. 38). It is a general feeling, not especially poignant because the drunk is Eddy. In the screenplay, there is a much deeper bond between the two men, and it is much more obvious that Morgan cares for him in a way that combines toughness and tenderness. It is a subtle change, but significant. In the

novel, Morgan says, "Shut up, you rummy" (n. 21) while in the screenplay the "you dirty rummy" line is given to Johnson and Morgan says, much more gently, "You talk too much, Eddy" (s.p. 12 and film). This change is a reflection of several things. Topically, the hero in 1944 could not afford to be genuinely cruel, though he might pretend to be tough and harsh. It may also be a reflection of Hawks' personal presence. It has been often noted that friendship between men is a favorite topic which recurs in many of his films, and the relationship between Morgan and Eddy certainly reflects something of that interest. If it is not the friendship of "equals," there are nevertheless bonds between them that are obviously to be seen as "good." Another indication of the change is the different reasons, different motives offered for similar actions. Both Morgans regret not taking the job when, in the book, Johnson flies off without paying or, in the screenplay and film, Johnson is killed before he pays. The differences in the two begin to emerge when one considers the reasons for the regret. The novel's Harry Morgan needs money desperately for his wife and three daughters while the "new" Harry needs the money to help his new "friend" Slim get off Martinique. To get the money, Morgan in the novel double crosses Mr. Sing and leaves his Chinamen in Cuba. The new hero is good for his word. That is such a sure thing that, when Morgan is paid in advance, Mrs. Beauclerc, though she early voices some mistrust, can

leave out lines like "Bon voyage to our money!" as Morgan leaves (s.p. 56). Even in the first part of the book then, where all other parallels and similarities are found, Harry Morgan, as he is characterized in the screenplay, begins to differ from Hemingway's Morgan.

That is just the beginning. Morgan, as he develops in the remainder of the screenplay, is nothing like Hemingway's Morgan. In the novel, Morgan slowly degenerates until he is finally destroyed by social forces he cannot control. Morgan, as he develops in the screenplay, is allowed to assert his individuality more successfully and to assume more personal responsibility for his actions. Part of this, of course, is due to the fact that we are looking at a younger Harry Morgan. Hawks had decided to look at him as he was before the novel began. The differences, however, go much deeper than this and are so basic that it is almost impossible to imagine Bogart's Morgan ever developing into the older Harry Morgan of the book. It is when one begins to consider the significance of these and other differences that he must look away from the film itself at the forces that went into creating it, and ask how it was, in the development of the screenplay, such major philosophical changes came to be made.

As a beginning, a point of departure, we have the novel and Harry Morgan as Hemingway portrayed him. He is a man slowly destroyed. He cannot work on relief because he

could not live with himself if he did, and he can never be one of the "nouveau riche." For him there is no such thing as social mobility. Deterministic forces are at work. There is no choice for him except that which allows him to choose the way in which he will accept and deal with his destiny. In this, he is like other Hemingway heroes who have only this choice left to them. The decision they make is important. For Hemingway, it is the stoic acceptance of one's destiny and courage in the face of destruction that makes a man a hero. Such a perspective means that there are few happy endings in Hemingway's work. In fact, it was that change, the substitution of happy endings, that most irritated him about the Hollywood adaptations of his other works. He disliked the happy ending tacked onto A Farewell to Arms (1932), and at another point, referred to the Daryl Zanuck production of The Snows of Kilimanjaro as The Snows of Zanuck.[35] Speaking of this particular adaptation, for which Casey Robinson wrote the screenplay, Murray defines the difference: "For Hemingway, a hero can be destroyed but not defeated; for Robinson (and other Hollywood hacks), a hero can be neither destroyed nor defeated."[36] To Have and Have Not does not offer quite so drastic a change in tone from extreme pessimism to naive optimism. The hero, Morgan, is not destroyed as he is in the book, but neither must we watch him triumph over his destiny in a blaze of glory. The movie ends on an uplift, the optimistic feeling created

partly by the music Cricket, the piano player, provides as Harry, Slim and Eddy walk confidently out of Frenchy's and into some unknown future. That future, however, is left ambiguous. All we know is that they are going to help get Velmar off Devil's Island and head for Port of Prince. There is no guarantee that they will succeed at either. It remains at least plausible that defeat and not happiness ever after awaits the pair. Though this remains a possibility, Hawks would probably not insist on its likelihood as strongly as Hemingway might. Like Hemingway, though, Hawks finds not what happens but how the individual deals with it important. The similarities of their points of view can be seen by comparing the Hemingway vision to that of Hawks as it is expressed by Peter Bogdanovich:

> Basically, though, Hawk's vision of the world is tragic, his men are gallant but their deaths are inevitable; theirs is a happy-go-lucky recklessness that is really the facade for a fatalistic approach to a world in which they hold a very tenuous position . . . in an uncertain world, a man must not admit to himself that he is too vulnerable to death, otherwise there is no life. The dedication of his men is unquestioning; they have made their peace with the world, they know what they have to do, they have accepted their destiny.[37]

Robin Wood makes a similar point when he maintains that value, for Hawks, lies in the "assertion of basic human qualities of courage and endurance, the stoical insistence on innate human dignity."[38] Perhaps the basic difference lies in the fact that Hawks is finally more optimistic. As Wood notes elsewhere, "the end effect of a Hawks movie is

inevitably optimistic, the self-sufficiency and self-respect by which his characters exist ultimately reaffirmed and uncompromised."[39] Harry Morgan in Hemingway's novel has courage. He at least tries to endure, to survive without giving up his human dignity, but there is no place for optimism about his chances. Hawks' Morgan, on the other hand, does reaffirm that such values can lead to a positive end. The similarities of these views of man's role will be discussed further when Bogart's portrayal of Harry Morgan is analyzed as a sort of composite hero, embodying something of the ideals of Hemingway and Hawks and Faulkner.

In terms of general philosophies and attitudes, Faulkner is harder to assess, partly because he is so complicated and the variety in his works makes it impossible to define a Faulkner creed that is apparent throughout all his writing. Asked once, however, if he considered human life basically a tragedy, he replied, "Actually, yes. But man's immortality is that he is faced with a tragedy which he can't beat and still he tries to do something with it."[40] He seems here to go beyond Hemingway's stoic acceptance of one's destiny and Hawks' refusal to acknowledge death to add that man must act in spite of his fate. His view is finally more optimistic than Hemingway's, more like Hawks' in his belief in self-sufficiency and self-respect as a means of reaffirming human existence. There are, of course, in his works many who are defeated, but there are also the Dilseys

and the Lena Groves, the characters to whom one can turn to justify the statement that man will not only endure, but prevail. The one point on which Faulkner differs most from both Hemingway and Hawks in his insistence on the importance of the past. He says of Hemingway when he compares The Old Man and the Sea, in which Faulkner thought Hemingway had found God, to his earlier works, that "up to that time his people functioned in a vacuum, they had no past . . . ."[41] That rather deceptively simple statement has significance for To Have and Have Not. As has been mentioned earlier, Hemingway characters like Harry Morgan are most often destroyed by social forces beyond their control. Faulkner characters, however, have more individual responsibility. The seeds for destruction are in the individual and his past, both genetic and historical, not in the society in which he functions.

On this point, Hawks really differs from both. His characters do seem, at times, to function in a vacuum. Wood analyzes this aspect of his work when he discusses the reasons for Hawks' almost total avoidance of flashbacks in his films. In his work, there is no sentimental-romantic sense of the past as there is in Casablanca.[42] He says of Hawks' characters that they come from nowhere and are going nowhere, that they exist outside any social context "in a world where the supreme value is spontaneous natural impulse . . . ."[43] Though this may be somewhat exaggerated,

it does apply to To Have and Have Not to some degree. The time span of the action has been reduced to a few days action on a remote island. It is true that we know little of either Harry's or Slim's past and even less about where they are going, at least within the boundaries of the film. But it is important to remember that Hemingway's novel stands outside the film as a possible, if not very probable, future for Harry Morgan. Because of that fact, it may be that work on this particular screenplay gave Faulkner a chance to do something he could not otherwise have done, a chance to reconcile his own enormous sense of the past with Hawk's emphasis on the present. In one sense, the film is an entirely new creation, but in another it goes back and creates a past for a Harry Morgan who already existed. It is as though we are dealing here with three parts of a work, the "pre-novel," the first part of the novel, and the last two parts of the novel. The first part of the novel, concerning Johnson and the fishing expedition has been incorporated, at least partly, into the screenplay. The last two parts of the novel which tell of the loss of his boat in the liquor-running incident and the loss of his life in the gun battle with the bank-robbing revolutionaries, have been completely omitted. What Faulkner, with Furthman, has done in the screenplay, then, is to create the "pre-novel," another aspect of an already existing work. Faulkner then, though there is no solid evidence to support it, might have

perceived his work on To Have and Have Not as a chance to go back and look for the seeds of destruction in Harry Morgan's past. As novelist, it seems definite that he would have. The past, both personal and historical, had fascinated him as he created characters ranging from Bayard Sartoris to Henry Sutpen to Quentin Compson. In that role, then the creation of a past for Harry Morgan might have been an interesting challenge. The problem is that the ideas of Faulkner the novelist are not as evident in the work of Faulkner the scenarist. To some extent, while in Hollywood, Faulkner wrote for his employers and not for himself. To the degree that the two roles, novelist and scenarist, remained separate, then, the potential fascination offered by looking at Harry Morgan's past becomes difficult to justify. But Faulkner the scenarist never forgot that he was really the novelist, and because of that, it seems legitimate to ascribe some of the beliefs and interests of the novelist to the scenarist.

There can be no doubt that Faulkner as novelist was far greater than Faulkner as scenarist. For the purposes of this study, however, it is important to consider Faulkner during the period of his life he spent in Hollywood. It is no secret that Faulkner went to Hollywood because he needed money. Royalties from his books (at the time such greats as The Sound and the Fury, Light in August and Absalom, Absalom! had already been published) were almost non-existent and he

needed to earn enough money to support his family and buy himself time to write seriously. During his Hollywood career, he received screen credit for six films, five of them written for his friend Hawks. The problem of who gets screen credit and who does not is a tangled one, and a closer estimate would probably show that Faulkner worked on forty to fifty film properties.[44] Faulkner remained during this time uninvolved in the life of Hollywood. He met a few people he liked, such as Hoagy Carmichael and Humphrey Bogart, but he remained aloof and unconcerned about most things, including the critical reception his scripts received.[45] As has been mentioned, Faulkner liked working with Hawks and served as a sort of "playdoctor" for him, "working with him on the set, writing new scenes and writing new dialogue."[46] Hawks also appreciated Faulkner. He has been quoted as saying to Robert Coughlan that Faulkner has "inventiveness, taste and a great ability to characterize the visual imagination, to translate those qualities into the medium of the screen."[47] There is no question that Faulkner had the qualities mentioned. The question is whether they are to be found only in his novels or whether he did successfully "translate" them for the screen. Faulkner's own feelings about his Hollywood experience are rather ambivalent though it is apparent that he never took the writing he did there seriously as a writer though he did take it seriously as a job. His most often voiced complaint

about writing for the movies was related to the sense of commercialism and the necessity of compromise. Asked once about film scripts as a promising form of literature and the future of the movies, he replied that there was promise, that the opportunity to make a story that could be seen and heard at the same time would be marvelous but impossible as long as the individual was denied the right to do the thing as he saw fit. In Hollywood, that was impossible because there were too many forces at work with irreconcilable individual opinions and motives.[48] He goes on to say that when a good film is created, it is almost by accident. No one can say why it is good and it therefore becomes impossible to repeat the success or equal it. With a good individually created book, on the other hand, it is sometimes possible to use again that which made it good.[49]

While Faulkner recognized that film offered insurmountable obstacles to the serious, individual writer, he did his work as well as the situation allowed. Talking about the work during the Paris Review interview, he said,

> The moving picture work of my own which seemed best to me was done by the actors and the writer throwing the script away and inventing the scene in actual rehearsal just before the camera turned. If I didn't take, or felt I was capable of taking, motion picture work seriously, out of simple honesty to motion pictures and myself, too, I would not have tried. But I know now that I will never be a good motion picture writer; so that work will never have the urgency for me which my own medium has.[50]

Cowley, I think correctly, analyzes this feeling of Faulkner's by maintaining that it was his talent, not his genius that was revealed in his Hollywood work. When Faulkner says he would never be a good motion picture writer, Cowley thinks he meant he would not be a great one. That he was good was evident in the fact that Warner's made great efforts to get him back to their studios, even in the years before they realized he was a world famous author. He goes on to say that they "wanted him because he could throw away the script and write new dialogue on the set, a technical achievement that few of their writers had mastered. But technique was never what excited him, and very often, I think, he sacrificed his talent to his genius."[51] It seems that this is an extremely perceptive way of viewing Faulkner as scenarist. Sidney comes to a similar conclusion. He argues that the reason Faulkner wrote no great screenplays is to be found in the fact that the problems of writing for the screen meant depriving him of "his basic methods--his use of narrative structures, his stream of consciousness development, his rhetoric . . . ."[52] This in essence robbed him of his creative power. He was forced to write "drama proper for a non-literary medium" and the results were not often very good.[53] But it is finally impossible to clearly delineate between Faulkner the novelist and Faulkner the scenarist, between the genius and the talent of the man. Again, I think Sidney is correct when, in examining

Faulkner's Hollywood work, he finds a Faulkner who is trying to write as Hollywood wants him to, but who also sometimes forgets himself and writes for himself.

The results are often blurred where the two roles overlap and it becomes extremely difficult to tell one from the other.[54] This seems to be true of To Have and Have Not. Though it is impossible to designate a particular line or motif or theme as "pure Faulkner," there are certainly elements in the screenplay and in the film that suggest a Faulknerian tone or that develop ideas parallel to those dealt with by Faulkner the novelist. We have mentioned, for instance, the overriding sense of the past that is apparent in Faulkner's fiction. Faulkner, the author of that fiction, would have seen the irony in Morgan's insistence that he acts only as he wishes, that he is an individual with no ties, no commitments, no duty to anyone or anything. Within the context of the story, however, Faulkner could not illustrate that irony. The only negation possible is Slim's "No, no, Steve. There's no strings tied to you. Not yet." (film), but Faulkner would have recognized the presence of strings much more binding and impossible to break. The idea of independence is also typical of Hawks' male-female relationships, though at times it is only that of the female that seems complete. The theme, then, as it is dealt with in the movie, is probably more a positive statement on the part of Hawks than an ironic one on the part of Faulkner. It is

impossible to "prove" from the screenplay that Faulkner would have seen the irony; it is simply a notion that can be offered in light of Faulkner the novelist. The fishing sequence which opens the film offers another example of possible Faulkner parallels. The fishing in that sequence serves as a metaphor for the man's world to which Johnson is denied entrance. The allegiance to the novel indicates the obvious parallels to Hemingway. But there are also implicit parallels to Faulkner's work. In Faulkner, too, there are such worlds, the one that Bayard Sartoris finds when he visits the MacCallums in the mountains or the ritualistic world of The Bear. Johnson cannot enter that world because he cannot rid himself of his worldly, monetary orientation. It is a rather simplistic version of the problem Ike McCaslin faces on a much deeper level in Faulkner. Again, however, it is necessary to realize that Hawks and Hemingway were also sportsmen who saw similar meaning in, for instance, the ritual of the hunt. It is impossible, then, to say that such parallels to Faulkner indicate his creative hand at work for there are always too many forces at work to be definitive about the contribution of any one.

The problem of "finding" Faulkner in To Have and Have Not is further confounded by the fact that he did not write the screenplay alone, but collaborated on it with Jules Furthman. Sidney finds the fact that he did not write this particular script alone the most regrettable fact in

Faulkner's Hollywood career.[55] Regrettable it may be, especially in terms of Faulkner scholarship, but it was certainly not unusual. Blotner quotes Faulkner and then goes on to explain the situation:

> "I have always worked with someone who knows how to write for the movies." Self-deprecating though it sounds, and though he did work alone on some scripts, this was basically true, whether the collaborator was the director, the producer, or another writer. It was always a joint effort, and Faulkner the artist was always the loner, "the cat who walks by himself," as he said in another context.[56]

Cowley reports that Faulkner did not really know the movie trade, that it was always the collaborator who supplied the "business."[57] Furthman, who was known for his adaptability and ingenuity, was certainly capable of doing just that. He knew the kind of movie "shorthand" that was foreign to Faulkner, that was part of another medium. In _To Have and Have Not_, for instance, the idea of Bogart's tossing the matches to Bacall to light her own cigarette was Furthman's. It is a small scene, but indicates beautifully that he (Bogart) has quickly sized up, or thinks he has, the kind of character she portrays, a woman worthy of no respect. It is the sort of small but significant trick that probably would not have occurred to Faulkner.[58] Furthman was apparently a reliable screen writer who worked on several pictures for Hawks, but Robin Wood, considering his role, says that "his is the most difficult contribution to assess . . . ." Looking not only at _To Have and Have Not_ but at other pictures Furthman worked on, he concludes that "it is not easy to

define a coherent Furthman personality."[59] Part of the difficulty must be ascribed to the general problem Faulkner described, that in meeting the demands of Hollywood, the writer loses something of himself. Furthman, not nearly as great a writer as Faulkner, must have found it somewhat easier to conform to the desires of producers and directors, to produce what was needed at a particular time. For all these reasons, it is nearly impossible to define the Furthman "voice" in To Have and Have Not.

It may be difficult to define the contribution of Furthman, but that is certainly not the case with the director, Hawks. We have noted that there are elements of Hemingway, both specifics from the book and more general ideas derived from his other works evident in the screenplay and in the film. The same is certainly true of Faulkner who, as writer, played a more active part than Hemingway in the creation of the final product. In spite of this, To Have and Have Not is most obviously a personal expression of Hawks. Such a statement supports the "auteur" theory of film. It is a statement that is really unavoidable in the case of Hawks, who takes an active part in every film he makes from the first writing to final editing. He says himself that he always works on the scripts from the beginning and for every film.[60] Until recently Hawks has not attracted much interest among film commentators, though Bogdonovich finds him "the most typically American director

of all."[61] Bogdanovich's partial justification for that oversight on the part of critics is of particular interest to a study of To Have and Have Not. He says of Hawks that "Though his style, viewpoint, and personality are remarkably like Hemingway's, he has not the Hemingway flair for publicity . . . ."[62] Hawks is no help to critics who wish to analyze his films, for he refuses to talk in terms of theoretical conceptions or to make critical reflections. He claims no aesthetics or philosophy for himself, instead insisting that he judges the value of his films by audience response.[63] As Wood notes, he is never really trying to get a message across. If such a message is derived from his concrete, empirical presentation of a situation, then that is good, but Hawks is never out to preach.[64] He goes on to say that "Hawks is above all a physical director: the cinema is the perfect medium for expressing emotion or moral values through actions."[65] Hawks himself supports Wood's analysis. Asked once if he saw in his films a recurring theme of man in action with emphasis on his effort and struggle, he replied that, although that was a possibility, he made films based on stories he liked, not consciously because of theme. In the same interview, he goes on to say that the best drama is that which shows man in danger facing the question of whether he will live or die. This he feels is more important than anything else.[66] It may be true that Hawks has never made a film to express a specific theme. As

Wood said, he is not out to preach. But it is also true that his films offer fine examples of how successfully emotion and moral values can be expressed through action. To say, then, that Hawks does not start making a film based on some aesthetic or thematic conception is not to say that they do not exist in his films. Themes and moral statements do emerge and they are no less real for being unplanned. In fact, that very quality may make the recurrence of specific themes throughout his films even more significant, even more the unconscious expression of Hawks the man. It would be virtually impossible for any director who takes as active a part as Hawks does in the making of his films not to express something of himself in them. Hawks says of his own film making experiences: "The difficult work is the preparation: finding the story, deciding how to tell it, what to show and not to show. Once you begin shooting you see everything in the best light, develop certain details, and improve the whole. I never follow a script literally and I don't hesitate to change a script completely if I see a chance to do something interesting."[67] In the first decisions on To Have and Have Not, deciding what to tell and how to tell it, Hawks has indicated that Hemingway had a part. The screen credit and personal reminescences offer proof that Faulkner was involved, at least in the script writing. What seems possible is that Faulkner was also involved on the set as the film was being shot and changes in the screenplay were

being made. Last minute changes on the set are characteristic of Hawks. Marcel Dalio reports, for instance, that in the filming of To Have and Have Not, as Hawks thought up replies for Bogart, they were immediately inserted in the dialogue.[69] But Faulkner has also said that he felt his best film work was accomplished in this very manner, by actually creating on the set. His ability to do so has been offered as one of the primary reasons Warner's valued his services. Given the knowledge that Hawks and Faulkner were personal friends who worked well together, then it seems very likely that Faulkner was on the set during some of the shooting of To Have and Have Not, and that he and Hawks together are responsible for some of the many changes that occur. Again, it is impossible to definitively state who changed what, but the film in its final form contains a number of changes that might reflect Faulkner as well as the pre-eminent Hawks.

Perhaps the most interesting change that emerges in the film revolves around the central character, Harry Morgan. The way in which Morgan changes from book to screenplay has already been discussed. But the Morgan who is the hero of the film is in some ways still another modification, a creation that is more than a sum of ideas from Hemingway, Faulkner and Hawks. To those three, Bogart has been added. The hero that results is in many ways a composite picture. As Robin Wood notes, "Bogart is very much the centre of To Have and Have Not; the performance is arguably at once the

completest realisation of the actor's personality and the most perfect embodiment of the Hawks hero."[70] The portrayal is both of these, but it is also, in some ways, an embodiment of the Hemingway hero. As Joe Hyams notes, "It is not surprising that Bogart was an admirer of Ernest Hemingway, because the actor and the writer felt very much alike on the kind of code that should govern a man's life. The essence of that code is courage and style . . . ."[71] Bogart had that. He was a child of chaotic times who grew up in the turbulence and insecurity of the twenties and thirties. They were tough times that required tough men and Bogart learned to rely on nothing but himself.[72] Romanticized though it is, Hyams opening statement is appropriate:

> Bogie was the bravest man I have ever met. And that included a lot of unknown heroes who were my friends in the South Pacific during World War II--during those days when I formulated my personal belief that the final test of a man is the way he faces death. Bogie faced death the way he faced life: with courage and dignity as a gentleman.[73]

Words like courage, dignity, style and stoicism seem to occur again and again in reference to the heroes of Hemingway and Hawks. It seems that they apply equally to Bogart. They are traits that do not depend on a meaningful gestalt philosophy. In fact, they are just as appropriate to the man who finds no meaning beyond the present. Recognizing that death, as in Hawks, and destruction, as in Hemingway, are inevitable, the men who believe in such a code perpetuate the illusion that man, within the limits of life and time,

can assert himself, can conquer in a small way by refusing to submit to his destiny. Again, Faulkner's view, because his vision is so multi-faceted, is harder to define. There is, however, something analagous in his statement from his Nobel Prize speech that man must teach himself that the basest of all things is to be afraid and, having taught himself that, forget it.[74] The Hemingway-Hawks hero as Bogart portrays him has done that, or if not forgotten what it is to be afraid, at least learned to deal with it by acting, asserting himself as an individual in spite of it. In a way, Bogart goes a step farther. Not only does he live by the code which demands courage and style, but he also allows the viewer to glimpse the tenderness that underlies the tough facade. Faulkner said that eventually man would have to move back to what he termed universal truths--"love and honor and pity and pride and compassion and sacrifice."[75] Though he would never admit it, never openly show it, there is something of this movement in Harry Morgan. It is his sense of honor that prompts him to insist that he will pay his hotel bill, his sense of compassion that arouses severe anger against the Vichy who are intentionally cruel to Eddy. There is, too, a sacrifice of his personal safety involved in his taking the de Bursacs with him when he leaves Martinique. These are obvious to everyone but Morgan, who insists throughout it all that he is an individual acting only as it benefits his personal well-being. It is true

that the situation around him does not really influence him, that he is not moved by the political rhetoric of either side. He makes his decisions based, not on remote ideals, but on personal reasons, beliefs and needs, and the person of Harry Morgan in the film incorporates an awareness of some of these basic truths.

This emphasis on Bogart as hero is, I think, indicative of a general trend in Hawks' work, his tendency to play down plot and situation in favor of character. With _To Have and Have Not_ he started out, at least in part, to make a patriotic film about Vichy France and ended up with a film about Harry Morgan and his relationship with Marie Browning. It has been said that Hawks' adventure films are about honor and friendship among men in a hostile society, a dangerous situation or both.[76] Hawks himself says that his adventure stories "reveal how people behave in the face of death--what they do, say, feel, and even think."[77] The point is that Hawks is not really interested in the situation except as a backdrop for the actions of his individuals. This is true of _To Have and Have Not_, as a comparative study of the screenplay and the film reveals. It is amazing, especially considering the political climate, how quickly Hawks disposes of the subplot and gets down to the more important business of exploring the developing relationship between Bogart as Morgan and Bacall as Slim. He is finally much more concerned with them as individuals than with the fate of the DeGaullist forces.

Such a statement is supported by a consideration of the film's ending. Any viewer would find it difficult to forget Bacall's hip-swaggering exit as she and Morgan depart. Cricket plays and they walk out, leaving the viewer to wonder what their future holds. The screenplay, however, ends quite differently. Cricket again is playing the piano loudly, but it is to cover up the murder of Renard and friend. The last lines of dialogue are Morgan's to Frenchy: "It's time you fellows started on the offensive, Frenchy. No fooling. All you got to do is tell Cricket and the boys to play real loud for a few minutes" (s.p. 112). The film ends with a shot of Slim swinging between the tables, grinning, and taking Morgan's arm. The camera then follows the two of them through the doorway as Eddy bounces jauntily behind. The screenplay, on the other hand, describes the ending this way:

> Frenchy nods dumbly and Morgan walks out front door and joins Marie. Frenchy looks after them for a moment, and as they exit he pulls self together, walks across to Cricket and speaks to him. Cricket nods understanding, turns to orchestra, tells them what to play, then, setting crescendo tempo, we hear the music roar out full blast and see Frenchy returning across room to go and do what he has to do (s.p. 112).

A consideration of the difference makes it obvious that the emphasis has been changed. Instead of a moral lesson, we get a look at individuals who at this point are really independent of a particular situation. The difference in this final scene is the culmination of many changes that have been made in the screenplay.

The manuscript copy of the screenplay that is used here for comparative purposes is labeled the second revised, final draft. It is presumably, then, the one that formed the basis of the shooting script before the shooting began. As such, it offers proof that Hawks speaks the truth when he says that he does not hesitate to change a script on the set. Changes begin with the first shot and steadily increase. It is as though the further shooting progressed, the more the film developed into something quite different from what the screenplay offered. To be sure, many of the changes are minor. Very often lines are only slightly modified, presumably because the original version did not quite fit the actor in the given situation. Marie, in the film, for instance, never plays rhetorical games. She is as honest and straightforward as Harry. When Harry challenges her offer of money after she has claimed to be broke, she replies "there's thirty odd dollars here--not enough for boat fare or any other kind of fare. Just enough to be able to say no if I feel like it" (film). In comparison, her response in the screenplay is "Oh, I always try to keep enough to be independent of certain situations" (s.p. 49). There is no doubt that the meaning is the same. It is simply a matter of style--the first is Slim and the second is not. Leigh Brackett said of her work with Faulkner on Hawks' next film, The Big Sleep, that his dialogue often did not fit the characters mouths and had to be rewritten on the set.[78]

There is no reason to expect that this was any less a problem with <u>To Have and Have Not</u>, though again it is risky to speculate about what is Faulkner and what is Furthman. Other seemingly small changes, however, are important to the film. Consider, for instance, Bacall's famous "Anybody got a match?" line, uttered as she leans languidly in the doorway of Morgan's room. In the screenplay, she encounters the two in the hallway and says "Have you got a match?" to Frenchy (s.p. 16). It is a small change, but significant because the fact that she "intrudes" into Morgan's room makes her request seem more presumptious and the inclusion of Morgan in the "anybody" sets up immediately a relationship between the two of them without special regard to Frenchy.

Other changes in dialogue seem based on other reasons, however, related either to Hawks' presence or audience appeal. The former seems reason enough for the removal of lines that tend toward the melodramatic or sentimental, like Beauclerc's effort to tell Morgan how much his assistance means, "not only to us--but to France" (s.p. 55). The latter, if we recall that a part of Hawk's appeal to Warner's was his reputation for box office success, is reason enough for the addition of a few strategic kisses and some added notes of humor. When the gun battle in the cafe begins, for instance, and Morgan throws Slim on the floor, the audience would surely prefer her "I think I'm sitting on somebody's

cigarette" (film) together with the movement required to get off it to the screenplay version of her response, "Say, what on earth--" (s.p. 32).

As has been discussed earlier, the demands of the movie public, especially in 1944, had to be considered. If _To Have and Have Not_ can be considered representative, then the taste of that public was not very sophisticated, at least where character was concerned. It is easy to imagine scenarist Faulkner giving in to the temptation to create real characters, characters in whom multiple forces create tensions that result in highly variable behavior. Apparently, complex human beings, however, were not acceptable, for the tendency in _To Have and Have Not_ is to move characters farther along a continuum from individual to stereotype. The good guys get better and the bad guys worse. The case for the good guys is exemplified by Morgan who is finally the "perfect" embodiment of the Hemingway-Hawks hero. All the negative aspects of his character, provided for in the screenplay, are lost in the film. His flirtation with Helene de Bursac, whom he calls "Cheesecake" in the script (s.p. 67, 101) is omitted for he must be a one-woman-at-a-time man. He may even be a one-woman-forever type, if his response to Slim's question about her perfume is any indication. She asks, "Remind you of somebody, Steve?" (s.p. 47 and film). Instead of "A little. It's nice." (s.p. 47), his reply is "Brand new to me. I like it" (film).

In addition to being faithful, a hero apparently never lies, at least not to someone he cares about. When Marie wonders where he got the money for her plane ticket and asks if he took the job, Morgan in the screenplay lies with his "I got the dough from Frenchy" answer (s.p. 58). In the film, he combines the truth with an understatement of sentiment with the answer, "Uh-huh. See, I figured this way you wouldn't get your feet wet" (film). The understatement is typical for Hawks, who said of the dialogue he favors in his films, "It's a different type of dialogue. It's the dialogue that Hemingway used to call oblique. I call it three-cushioned. The sentiment is there. You try to make it understood, but you don't try to come out and say it."[79] The hero is also, as we have mentioned earlier, good for his word. Morgan is persuaded to take the bullet out of de Bursac's shoulder by "Mama's" offer to forget his huge hotel bill in return. In the screenplay, he accepts the offer without comment. The film inserts a response: "You know you almost had me figured right, Mama, except for one thing. I'll still owe you that bill" (s.p. 76 and film). There are comparable changes in the characterization of the anti-hero, Johnson. He has no place in Morgan's world of masculine virtues; therefore, he is totally inept. When he and Morgan leave the boat, they encounter an official who questions Johnson's reference to Vichy. In the screenplay, Johnson thinks fast and replies, "I was just talking about the attitude of the

American government. I said it was very wish-washy." (s.p. 14). In the film, however, this line, which indicates some ability to think, has been removed and Morgan handles the situation for him.

Other character changes are actually more closely related to the demands of plot and theme than to persons, but these too result in a movement toward sterotypes. Frenchy, for instance, is going to help save France and must, therefore, be a good guy. In the screenplay (s.p. 112), he shrinks from responsibility and has to be "forced" by something more than friendly persuasion into disposing of Renard. In the film, however, when Morgan says, "You know you'll have to take care of those guys in there," French's immediate response is, "I will give you plenty of time" (film). For similar reasons, the Vichy characters become all bad. Warner's anti-Nazi sentiments did not blend well with Vichy, Surete Nationale officials who offered to return what they had taken. In the screenplay version of the confrontation between Renard and Morgan in the cafe, Morgan comments on his financial condition and Renard replies, "That's one reason I came here. To rectify that mistake. Here are the passports of yourself and Mademoiselle. Eight hundred and twenty-five dollars in cash, representing your claim against the Johnson estate. And thirty-two dollars of your own money" (s.p. 91). In the film, this offer is transformed into a bribe with each of these items, plus five

hundred dollars, offered in return for information about the de Bursac's whereabouts. The change not only makes Renard seem more despicable but emphasizes Morgan's nobility by showing us that he will not betray for money. Apparently, someone at Warner's wanted to be absolutely sure the audience knew where to place their sympathies. In addition to removing the shades of grey from the characterizations, they inserted a few examples of pure exposition, unusual in what is predominantly a visual medium. The scene in which Morgan explains to Marie the difference between the Vichy and DeGaullist forces has already been mentioned. The screenplay calls for a dissolve from the police station scene to the bistro (s.p. 41-42). The film, however, includes the street scene, a medium shot of Morgan and Marie walking through the rainy, foggy night. Darkness lurking around the edges of the frame creates a feeling of threat, if not doom. Marie says, "Hey, I don't understand all this. After all, I just got here." and Morgan replies, "Well, you landed right in the middle of a small war." She asks, "What's it all about?" and he proceeds to explain until Eddy interrupts and provides a change of tone and topic. Another example of expository statement is found in the scene in which Paul de Bursace tells Morgan about his mission. Much of the detail of the rescue has been cut, making the scene shorter, more condensed. But there is one speech added which seems to function as a pitch for courage and optimism

in the face of the German threat. Morgan asks how the rescue of Pierre Velmar will be accomplished, and de Bursac replies, "We will find a way. It might fail, and if it does and I'm--I'm still alive, I will try to pass on my information and my mission to someone else, perhaps to a better man who does not fail. Because there is always someone else. That is the mistake the Germans always make with people they try to destroy. There will be always someone else" (film). This is as close as the film ever comes to the statement of a moral lesson. Even this may be too close to have been comfortable for Hawks, who generally tends to understate such incidents.

It has been said that Hawks does not preach. It has also been said that his heroes, like Hemingway's, do not talk about their code. They accept their destiny and do what they must without comment. Because Hawks believed this, he would not accept a melodramatic performance from anyone associated with the "good" side. A good example is offered by the change in Helene de Bursac's characterization. In the film, she is no longer "like a madwoman," yelling and jerking Morgan away, making comments like "I've seen a sample of his work--and I wouldn't let him touch my dog!" (s.p. 77-78). Her role is considerably subdued, the melodrama removed. During the removal of the bullet, the screenplay has Morgan tell her to find something for the moaning, suffering Paul to bite on. She does, and it is

"nothing less than the knuckle of the index finger of her own right hand, and blood is slowly welling up in the teeth marks" (s.p. 82). Her comment on her action is, "It was my fault he was suffering so much. Why shouldn't I share it?" (s.p. 82). All this is eliminated in the film by having Paul pass out and Helene faint, leaving the scene to focus on Morgan and Marie, in whom Hawks was more interested.

Hawk's interest in the relationship between Morgan and Marie is heightened by a few changes in the film, but the basis of it is established in the screenplay. Hawks' conception of their relationship will be discussed in more detail later, but basically he perceived Bogart as a rather insolent character who had finally met his match.[80] It seems obvious that he had conveyed this to Faulkner and Furthman, for Bacall's insolent independence is provided for in the screenplay. Consider, for instance, the scene in the police station. Asked why she got off the plane in Martinique, she replies, "To buy a new hat" (s.p. 40). The slap and her response of offering the label as proof is the same in script and film, the only change being that instead of holding the hat "out for Renard to see the label," she throws it on the desk in front of him (s.p. 40 and film). What changes are made in Marie's character seem designed to make her more worthy of her man, more his partner, his equal than anything else. This conception of male-female relationships is typically Hawks, and it is, I think, his contribution

rather than Hemingway's or Faulkner's. It is like Hawks, for instance, to remove a definite picture of Marie's past. There are no photographs and scrapbooks showing Marie as a beauty contest runner-up (s.p. 46). Hawks could no more allow this than he could the "Cheesecake" business with Helene de Bursac because for him, as will be discussed later, women are not bodies, but people. Marie as partner cannot be allowed to get sick at the sight of de Bursac's operation (s.p. 82). Even when she slips into a subservient role and tries to wait on him, Morgan will not allow it. The film adds this comment: "Look, Junior. I don't want you to take my shoes off, I don't want you to get me any breakfast and I don't want you to draw me a nice, hot bath. I don't want you to . . ." (film). Her response, followed by the "no strings attached" scene assures us that their relationship will be built on something more than the assumption of traditional male-female roles. Again, there is no romantic notion of happiness ever after involved. Even what may seem so, like the added scene in which he offers to take her away with him, is nicely tempered by reality. She answers Morgan's statement that it may be a long time before she gets home with, "Could be forever, or are you afraid of that? I'm hard to get, Steve. All you have to do is ask" (film). Following this, however, she begins singing, and the song for the occasion is the questioning "How Little We Know" in which she reminds us that

"Maybe it's just for a day . . ." (film). With that she re-establishes the tenuous nature of the relationship and her ability to accept it. Bacall, then, emerges in the film as a more perfect example of the Hawks heroine in much the same way that Bogart emerges as the archetypal Hawks-Hemingway hero. They are both further examples of the way in which changes on the set tend to make the "good" characters better and the "bad" worse. Morgan and Marie, it seems, are "created" by Hawks while the changes in some of the other characters are more the result of a need to clarify the "war" message. This, I think, is more closely tied to the time during which the film was made than to Hawks or any of the other artists involved.

The fact that fiction and film share such characteristics as plot, theme and character has been discussed. Most of the changes noted here have been related to these. There are, however, other changes which reflect the differences in novel and film. They are examples of ways in which what has been called the film "business" has been added and, by implication, examples of incidences in which the scenarists failed to consider the demands of a visual medium. It may be that Faulkner is responsible for many such instances if for no other reason than that he always remained word-oriented, while Furthman was more comfortable with the visual world of Hollywood. Early in the film, for instance, the screenplay calls for Morgan to come down the

dock and step on board his boat to find Eddy asleep. According to the shot description, "Morgan pulls the ship into the dock and secures the stern line properly. Then, he lifts Eddy by the scruff of the neck, lowers him over the side, dunks him briefly, and then sits him in the fishing chair again" (s.p. 3). Even hero Bogart could hardly be expected to perform such a feat, so the film substitutes a bucket which Morgan can fill with water and dump on Eddy as he lies on the dock. It also seems evident that one or both of the writers sometimes forgot that there was no need to say what could be clearly seen. Thus, there is no need for Horatio to say "Here he comes now" as Johnson walks down the dock (s.p. 5) or for Morgan to say "Here you are" as he tosses a box of matches to Marie (s.p. 17). Sound, dialogue included, is only an auxiliary language in film and it is often possible to offend the viewer by repeating what is already obvious. Hawks, it seems, recognized this and cut, therefore, much unnecessary dialogue. Other economies are also obvious. By the time Marie and Morgan leave his room to return Johnson's wallet, the audience has already been shown Frenchy's cafe/hotel, including a shot of the stairs that connect the two. The screenplay calls for a shot of Morgan and Marie descending the stairs which is really unnecessary as it contributes nothing new. Hawks eliminates the shot and offers, instead, a cut from Morgan and Marie in the upstairs hallway to the two of them with Johnson below.

Other seemingly minute changes become interesting when the reasons for them are considered. When Morgan goes to see Beauclerc, for instance, the screenplay describes the shot: "We see Beauclerc lying on cot, his rudely bandaged right leg resting on pillow" (s.p. 53). Gerard, Mrs. Beauclerc and Morgan are all in the picture. Given the set arrangement of walls and furniture, the camera had to be placed so that it looked into the room, at Beauclerc in bed with the others gathered between the bed and wall. In order to bandage his leg, then, without coming between the camera and the bed, the injured leg had to be the left one. A small thing, granted, but the kind of detail that must be taken into account as the verbal becomes visual. Other changes related to the film "business" are far more significant in terms of the whole. In the screenplay, for instance, Morgan does not say anything to Renard's silent bodyguard until the final confrontation in Morgan's room, and so no one is prepared to anticipate his response. In the film, however, Hawks provides Bogart and the audience with knowledge of his silence in an earlier scene. As they sit around the table during the questioning of Eddy, Renard asks, "Why does a professional fisherman go fishing for his own amusement?" (s.p. 90 and film). In the film, a close-up of the silent one is inserted. Then we cut back to Morgan who says, "Well . . . Hey, don't you every ask any questions? Don't you ever talk? No, I guess you don't. What were you

saying?" before he answers Renard's question (film). This prepares the audience beautifully for the later scene in Morgan's room. When Morgan asks the silent bodyguard for a cigarette, both he and the audience know not to expect an answer, and the perfect chance to open the drawer is provided. Without this, getting Morgan to the gun in the drawer would be much more difficult. This, then, is a good example of how an expert director can manipulate a script to provide for a smoothly finished film.

Hawks, as director, however, considers much more than the "business" of film as he works. One such area of consideration, of primary importance to Hawks, is the part of the actors. As Wood notes, Hawks' art does not lie in script preparation or editing but in the collaboration of director and actors. As director, he does not use them to complete his preconceived notion of the work but works cooperatively with them to create a film.[81] This concern with the personality of the actors and the resulting attempt to fuse personality with character is, according to Wood, the reason the real significance of a Hawks' film is not something that can exist on paper before the shooting begins.[82] Gili goes a step further and says that so essential is the place of the actors in Hawks' film that the quality of the whole work often depends on the quality of the actors.[83] Wood and Gili both tend to overstate somewhat the situation. Actors are especially important to Hawks,

but they are still only a part of a whole. No actor, no matter how good, can save a film, make it good if the screenplay is inadequate, the roles empty or the editing carelessly done. But it is true, especially if these other aspects are adequate, that actors can and do play significant roles in Hawks' films. It is perhaps, as Wood says, due to Hawks' willingness to work with the actors that some Hollywood stars such as Bogart have experienced their finest moments of self-expression in his films.[84]

If all this is true of Hawks in general, it is especially true of To Have and Have Not where Bogart and Bacall come together for the first time. Hawks' wife had seen Bacall on the cover of a popular magazine and suggested he try her in the film.[85] Hawks eventually met her and decided she was a match for Bogart. Hawks relates, "I told Bogart that I considered that he was the most insolent man on the screen and I said I'm going to try and make the girl just as insolent as you." Bogart, according to Hawks, replied, "You got a fat chance of doing that."[86] Hawks succeeded, but it was not without Bogart's help. As he says of Bogart, "He was really underrated as an actor. Without his help I couldn't have done what I did with Bacall. Not many actors would sit around while a girl steals a scene. But he fell in love with the girl and the girl with him, and that made it easy."[87] For whatever reason, the combination worked. As Haskell puts it, "they did bring something of

their own to the film, a personal chemistry, to create the one truly and magically equal couple in all of Hawks' cinema . . . ."[88] Bacall, though only nineteen, held her own quite well against the veteran Bogart, offering an openness, humor, honesty and independence that matched his own. Given this pair to work with, it is no wonder that the Morgan-Slim relationship quickly pre-empted the political situation. Bogart and Bacall were simply better actors who created more interest. The other actors are not bad. Some, like Seymour as Renard, are quite convincing, but all the others lack the dynamism of Bogart and Bacall.

It is likely that even the supporting actors felt free to offer suggestions as the shooting progressed. Bacall, for instance, even though she was new, had a role in the creation of the film. It is reported that the scene in which she goes back into Morgan's room the second time with the problem bottle was her idea, based on what she would have done in a similar situation.[89] But the most obvious example in <u>To Have and Have Not</u> is to be found in Hoagy Carmichael's performance. It is not clear at what point he decided to play himself as Cricket, but it does seem clear that the decision influenced changes in the screenplay. As opportunities for introducing the songs he and Johnny Mercer wrote were provided, so were additional lines for Cricket, especially as friend to Slim. Music, though acknowledged in the screenplay, seems to gain importance by virtue of

Carmichael's presence on the set. The source music, for which he is apparently responsible, becomes a more important part of the whole than it might otherwise have been. The film, for instance, adds a sequence in the cafe with Cricket at the piano and Marie at a nearby table. Her question, "What is that you're playing?" (film) gives him a chance to try out on her the lyrics of his new tune. Other added scenes may be due to Carmichael, Marie's singing (with voice allegedly dubbed by Andy Williams)[90] or perhaps both. In any case, some moments are nicely done as in the scene where the line of her song "he's the one that I . . ." is followed not by "love" as the audience expects but an entry into dialogue with her "Hello, Steve" (film and s.p. 73).

It seems obvious, then, that actors have significant input into the creation of a Hawks' film. But there is one area into which they might be expected not to intrude, that of technique. Bogdanovich calls Hawks a reluctant artist, one who will speak of his work only as a craftsman, in terms of technique.[91] It is a fair assessment as has been noted earlier. About his technique, Hawks says two things. First, he notes that he generally uses a faster tempo than most directors because that is the way people talk (often interrupting without waiting for the other to finish). Doing so also makes it easy to emphasize something by slowing down. Secondly, he says that he avoids use of too many close-ups because, if used sparingly, they are recognized as

important by the audience when they do appear.[92] Hawks adds to Bogdanovich that he does not use trick camera technique. In his films, the camera is almost always at eye level. It sometimes moves as though the character were seeing something and sometimes moves back and forth for emphasis when a cut is not wanted, but there is little other variation.[93] This certainly applies to To Have and Have Not where, as in so many other Hawks' films, stylistic simplicity is the rule. The lighting, often illuminating only one person or one part of the frame, sometimes functions as a means of emphasis, but it is difficult to say that it is Hawks' influence rather than the typical Warner's style of the period. What is definitely Hawks is the unity of tone which prevails, a tone in which there is no place for the pathetic or melodramatic. As Gili says, "Hawks choisit toujours le style allusif."[94] If anything, scenes of high emotional potential are understated. But, as Bogdanovich notes, this simple style is sometimes deceptive. Hawks' films are on the surface "witty, civilized, understated, and masculine," but underneath there is an emotional depth and perception that is not consciously noted.[95]

It is at that level, below the surface, that thematic patterns in Hawks' films are to be found. In To Have and Have Not, for instance, the problem of defining the hero is dealt with only at that level. De Bursac's statement to Morgan, "I wish I could borrow your nature for a while,

Captain. When you meet danger you never think of anything except how you will circumvent it. The word failure does not even exist for you . . . ." (film version of s.p. 97) is as close as Hawks comes to an overt statement. But Morgan, man of action, says more. As individual, responsible for his own actions, apart from controlling social structures, he embodies something of Faulkner. As stoic, courageous man acting as he must in spite of what may seem deterministic forces, he captures something of the Hemingway hero. As man living in the present, without regard for past or future, acting out of loyalty to himself and close friends rather than to some ideal, he includes something of the Hawks' vision. The part of Morgan's composite picture that seems to be strictly Hawks emerges out of that emphasis on loyalty to friends. For Hawks, the friend can be, and is in _To Have and Have Not_, a woman. There are strong women in Faulkner, from the aging matriarchs of crumbling Southern families finding strength in their past glory to poor blacks finding strength in the knowledge of a hereafter, but none of them really form the kind of bond of equality and mutual respect with a man that Bogart and Bacall exemplify. There is even less to say for women in Hemingway who remain largely unappreciated objects to be used within a man's world without ever really entering into it. What has come to be known as the Hawksian woman is quite a phenonomen in Hollywood, too. Like the hero, according to Naomi Wise, she has

experienced suffering, has both maturity and integrity, is independent, self-supporting and competent. Her choices, too, are made for personal reasons rather than because of social or economic pressures.[96] She is first a person and must be recognized for her values and virtues. As Leigh Brackett notes, she must first become a friend before she can become a lover.[97] To the degree that Bacall meets all these requirements, she is almost a kind of arch-heroine. Bogart had apparently met his match for the two of them emerge finally as equals, and any relationship that develops is bound to be based on mutual respect for each other's competency to function in a problematic setting.

Interesting as the Bogart-Bacall relationship is, however, it does not function in a vacuum. The political situation is there as a backdrop, and though the film does make a patriotic statement about the war, it is apparent that the final statement is the result of contributions by personalities with differing points of view. Hemingway's political interest, evident both in his personal life and in his works, tends to be philosophically oriented. Faulkner's, based on his own experiences and evidenced in early works like Soldier's Pay, tends to be focused not on a political ideology but on the effect of war on the individual. Hawks, too, was interested in the effect of war on the individuals who faced death in fighting, in the kind of dangerous situation evident in earlier films like The Dawn Patrol and Air

Force. To these three, especially on this particular topic, must be added the influence of Warner Brothers, who, during this period, were out to help Roosevelt win his ideological war. Given these various kinds of input, the film emerges as a kind of compromise. It makes a definitely anti-Vichy statement, but the qualifications inserted keep it from becoming a simple statement of propaganda. The most obvious qualification is embodied in the person of Bogart's Harry Morgan, who throughout the entire process maintains his stature as an individual immune to political rhetoric from either side, who makes his final commitment based not on ideals but on the simple fact that he likes Frenchy and his friends while he intensely dislikes Renard and his. In addition, the political situation as treated in the film makes possible a consideration of the worth of the individual versus the worth of a structured social system that denies that individual certain rights in favor of some stated common good. Again the thoughts of the three major contributors come together in a way that leads to a more complex and thus more interesting final statement. Hemingway's Harry Morgan is trying unsuccessfully to operate within a social system that eventually destroys him, and that system is not looked upon with favor. Faulkner is, however, generally more interested in the individual than in social questions, though the individual is never able to operate apart from the context of family and society and history.

Hawks offers in the filmed version another composite picture, that of the individual who, in spite of his claims of disinterest, must finally interact with other individuals and society though his reasons for doing so are finally personal and not social in nature.

The political situation, then, like the relationship that develops between Morgan and Marie, is not a simple matter to assess in terms of who contributed what. But that fact does not make the statement that finally emerges in the film any less powerful or any less significant. On the contrary, the tensions that are often created as the result of combining so many varying points of view add to the force of the film rather than detract from it. It seems appropriate, with that in mind, to consider Wood's statement on the subject. He says that, "however frustrating it may be for the scholar to find his attempts at sorting out specific details of authorship defeated by the sheer complexity of the interconnections, this dense cross fertilization is one of the greatest strengths of American cinema."[98]

That is finally true of _To Have and Have Not_. Because the contributions are so finely mixed in the film, it is impossible to clearly delineate lines between them. There is a Hemingway "flavor," obvious especially in the film's early representation of the hero in a masculine world, but it is difficult to say where Hemingway stops and where Hawks' similar views on the way in which a man should deal

with his world begins. Though they share a basic point of view on this topic, it is really the differences that, by creating implicit tensions, provide the film with significant and lasting interest. Both Hawks and Hemingway, for instance, are seen as having a fatalistic vision, but the crucial difference is that Hawks sees man's destiny as death, while Hemingway, at least in _To Have and Have Not_, insists that it is destruction. That difference, together with the degree of faith each has in man's ability to cope with the situation, seems the basic cause of Hawks' final optimism and Hemingway's continuing pessimism. If in _To Have and Have Not_, it is the Hawks' vision that is finally predominant, there remains enough of Hemingway to prevent a simplistic, romantic statement about man's ultimate triumph.

The same is true of the Faulkner "presence" in the film. Faulkner could not possibly reconcile his belief in the significance of the past with Hawks' tendency to consider only the present. But if the time span of the film had been longer or flashbacks of the past used, the basic unity and sense of immediacy would have been lost. Again, it is Hawks' point of view that is most evident, but the contrast Faulkner provides adds a dimension of meaning that otherwise would have been missing from the film.

The added dimensions of meaning that are achieved by the complexity of combining more than one point of view are

sometimes evident in the interrelationships among the various characters. The most obvious example is Eddy, who functions partly as a means of defining the composite hero. In the novel, the attitude that Morgan takes toward him, harsh and cruel at times, is, in a sense, a way of letting the hero lash out at a world that is unfair to him. Morgan is a man alone. There are no other characters worthy of being his friend. Faulkner, too, emphasizes the individual while he recognizes that he cannot avoid the influence on his life that associations with others brings. That individual, if he is to be a hero, must operate in terms of some basic truths like compassion and love, truths that Hemingway's Harry Morgan does not recognize. It is Hawks, with help from his scenarists, who combines the two, who creates a Harry Morgan who, though tough and harsh and self-centered on the surface, reveals underneath that he is indeed a loving and compassionate man. The film at this level deals with some basic conceptions of friendship. In Hemingway's _To Have and Have Not_ and in many of his other works, man exists essentially alone. In Faulkner, partly because of the importance of the past, man is not ever alone though the emphasis tends to be on family rather than friends. It seems, then, that it is Hawks who takes the pieces and creates a new position. In _To Have and Have Not_, man, in the person of Harry Morgan, while insisting on his individuality, makes some implicit statements about the

values of a friendship that incorporates a sense of loyalty, though here the friend is female instead of male. Here, in the person of Marie, Hawks again creates a blend. There are Hemingway women like Catherine Barkley who are strong though they never really operate in a man's world. Faulkner, too, has created many women of courage who exemplify both inner and outer strength. Hawks, then, takes such a woman and, in the film, gives her a position of equality in a world of masculine virtues and values.

It is finally, then, the way in which the viewpoints of these three are mingled that is responsible for the film's lasting interest. If the lines were distinct, the unity of both story and tone in the film would be lost. Here Faulkner as scenarist may have played an important role. His ability to defer to the people who were paying him, to provide a unified story whether or not it coincided with his views as man and novelist has been discussed. But it is finally Hawks as director who successfully brought together into one meaningful whole, the film, a number of disparate elements. It is finally his vision that is predominant, but the qualifications of that vision provided by Hemingway and Faulkner are extremely important in terms of thematic development. As has been said, the varying opinions create tensions that add an unusual depth of meaning. But none of this is explicit for, as we have noted, Hawks is a film maker, not a preacher. Hawks is like Hemingway in his

tendency not to deal overtly with such questions as have been raised here. Though dealing with different media, the simplicity of their style and the understated tone of their works is similar. On the surface, everything is crisp and sharp and fast-moving. It is underneath that meaning lies. In the case of To Have and Have Not, it is at that deeper level that the visions of Hawks, Hemingway and Faulkner meet. When they meet, they lose a great deal of their individuality, but the film gains as a result and offers finally an example of the way in which a compromise of many forces, both individual and social, can lead to the creation of a film that is better because it is a collaboration.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Malcolm Cowley, ed., Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews (New York: The Viking Press, 1958), p. 125.

[2]Andrew Sarris, ed., Interviews With Film Directors (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967), p. 193.

[3]Carlos Baker, Hemingway: The Writer as Artist (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963) pp. 203-205. The first part was written in September, 1933, the second in November, 1935 and the third between August, 1936 and January, 1937. His return to Spain left little time for revision.

[4]James B. Meriwether and Michael Millgate, eds., Lion in the Garden: Interviews with William Faulkner, 1926-62 (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 58.

[5]William Faulkner, Faulkner at Nagano, ed. Robert A. Jelliffe (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1956), pp. 88-89.

[6]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[7]Ibid., p. 61.

[8]Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[9]William Faulkner, Faulkner in the University: Class Conferences at the University of Virginia, 1957-58, ed. Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1959), p. 143.

[10]Carlos Baker, Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), p. 227.

[11]Ibid., p. 234.

[12]Ibid., p. 534.

[13]Ibid., p. 503.

[14]Ibid., p. 534.

[15]Malcolm Cowley, The Faulkner-Cowley File: Letters and Memories, 1944-1962 (New York: Viking Press, 1966), p. 29.

[16]Ibid., p. 102. In fact, the movies were buying rights to Faulkner material, but certainly not at a high enough price or at a fast enough rate to make a significant financial difference.

[17]Edward Murray, _The Cinematic Imagination: Writers and the Motion Pictures_ (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1972), p. 165.

[18]George R. Sidney, "Faulkner in Hollywood: A Study of His Career as Scenarist," Diss. Univ. of New Mexico, 1959, p. 89.

[19]Sarris, p. 188.

[20]Robert Coughlan, _The Private World of William Faulkner_ (New York: Harper and Bros., Publ., 1954), p. 109.

[21]Sidney, "Faulkner," p. 46. According to Sidney, Faulkner was at Warner's actually working from July 27, 1942 until August 18, 1943; from February 14, 1944 until May 13, 1944; from June 12, 1944 until December 12, 1944; and from June 7, 1945 until September 19, 1945. He devoted the whole of the second period to _To Have and Have Not_.

[22]Joseph Blotner, "Faulkner in Hollywood," in _Man and the Movies_, ed. W. R. Robinson (Baltimore: Penquin Books, 1967), p. 302.

[23]Ibid., p. 267.

[24]Sidney, "Faulkner," p. 25.

[25]Blotner, p. 289.

[26]Ibid., p. 283.

[27]Joe Morella, Edward Z. Epstein and Eleanor Clark, eds., _Those Great Movie Ads_ (New Rochelle, N. Y.: Arlington House, 1972), p. 252.

[28]Malcolm Cowley, "Hemingway at Midnight," _New Republic_, 111 (Aug. 14, 1944), 194.

[29]Robin Wood; _Howard Hawks_ (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968), p. 25.

[30]Ibid., p. 13.

[31]Howard Hawks, dir., _To Have and Have Not_ (Hollywood: Warner Brothers, 1944). All subsequent references to the film will be designated by "film" and will be included in the text.

[32]Morella, p. 252.

[33]Ernest Hemingway, _To Have and Have Not_ (New York: Scribner's, 1937), p. 11. All subsequent references to this edition will be designated by "n." followed by the page number and will be included in the text.

[34]Jules Furthman and William Faulkner, _To Have and Have Not_, 2nd revised, final script (Hollywood: Warner Brothers, 1944), p. 7. All subsequent references to this manuscript will be designated by "s.p." followed by the page number and will be included in the text. The manuscript used in this thesis was obtained from the University of Virginia Library, Manscripts Division. Permission to quote from the manuscript has been granted.

[35]Murray, p. 223.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Peter Bogdanovich, _The Cinema of Howard Hawks_ (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1962), p. 5.

[38]Wood, _Howard Hawks_, p. 23.

[39]Robin Wood, "To Have (Written) and Have Not (Directed): Reflections on Authorship," _Film Comment_, 9, No. 3 (May-June, 1973) 33.

[40]_Faulkner at Nagano_, p. 4.

[41]_Faulkner in the University_, p. 149.

[42]Wood, "To Have (Written)," p. 34.

[43]Ibid., p. 31.

[44]Blotner, p. 262.

[45]Ibid., p. 289.

[46]Cowley, _The Faulkner-Cowley File_, p. 106.

[47]Blotner, p. 301.

[48]_Faulkner at Nagano_, pp. 114-15.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Cowley, Writers at Work, p. 126.

[51]Faulkner at Nagano, pp. 158-59.

[52]George Sidney, "William Faulkner in Hollywood," Colorado Quarterly, 9 (Spring, 1961), 377.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Sidney, "Faulkner," pp. 59-60.

[55]Ibid., p. 91

[56]Blotner, p. 300.

[57]Cowley, The Faulkner-Cowley File, p. 106.

[58]Blotner, p. 289.

[59]Wood, "To Have (Written)," pp. 31-32.

[60]Sarris, p. 196.

[61]Bogdanovich, p. 4.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Jean A Gili, Howard Hawks (Paris: Editions Seghers, 197), p. 5.

[64]Wood, Howard Hawks, p. 29.

[65]Ibid., p. 30.

[66]Sarris, p. 190.

[67]Ibid., pp. 191-92.

[68]Gili, p. 10.

[69]Blotner, p. 289.

[70]Wood, Howard Hawks, p. 26.

[71]Joe Hyams, Bogie: The Biography of Humphrey Bogart (New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1966), p. 173.

[72]Ibid., p. 172.

[73]Ibid., p. 13.

[74]*Faulkner at Nagano*, p. 205. This of course is a later statement and it would be hard to prove that he definitely felt the same way in 1944.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Bogdanovich, p. 5.

[77]Sarris, p. 193.

[78]Blotner, p. 292.

[79]"Howard Hawks," *The Men Who Made the Movies*," prod. Richard Schickel (Public Broadcasting System, 17 Nov. 1973).

[80]It turned out, of course, that his perception was accurate off the set as well as on for the forty-five year old Bogart fell in love with the nineteen year old Bacall and eventually married her.

[81]Wood, *Howard Hawks*, p. 14.

[82]Ibid., p. 13.

[83]Gili, p. 22.

[84]Wood, *Howard Hawks*, p. 14.

[85]Hyams, p. 83.

[86]*The Men Who Made the Movies*.

[87]Hyams, p. 126.

[88]Molly Haskell, "Howard Hawks Masculine Feminine," *Film Comment*, 10, No. 2 (March-April, 1974), 36.

[89]"To Have and Have Not," *Time*, 23 Oct. 1944, p. 94.

[90]Pauline Kael, *Kiss Kiss Bang Bang* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968), p. 360.

[91]Bogdanovich, p. 5.

[92]Sarris, p. 195.

[93]Bogdanovich, p. 8.

[94]Gili, p. 18.

[95]Bogdanovich, p. 5.

[96]Naomi Wise, "The Hawksian Woman," _Take One_, 3, No. 3 (April, 1972), 18.

[97]Leigh Brackett, "A Comment on 'The Hawksian Woman,'" _Take One_, 3, No. 6 (Oct., 1972), 19-20.

[98]Wood, "To Have (Written)," p. 32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

________. *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963.

Blotner, Joseph. "Faulkner in Hollywood." *Man and the Movies*. Ed. W. R. Robinson. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.

Bogdanovich, Peter. *The Cinema of Howard Hawks*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1962.

Brackett, Leigh. "A Comment on 'The Hawksian Woman.'" *Take One*, 3, No. 6 (Oct., 1972), 19-20.

Coughlan, Robert. *The Private World of William Faulkner*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954.

Cowley, Malcolm. *The Faulkner-Cowley File: Letters and Memories 1944-1962*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.

________. "Hemingway at Midnight." *New Republic*, 3 (14 Aug. 1944), 190-95.

________, ed. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. New York: The Viking Press, 1958.

Faulkner, William. *Faulkner at Nagano*. Ed. Robert A. Jelliffe. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1956.

________. *Faulkner in the University: Class Conferences at the University of Virginia, 1957-58*. Ed. Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner. Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1959.

Furthman, Jules and William Faulkner. *To Have and Have Not*. Hollywood: Warner Brothers, 1944. (unpublished).

Gili, Jean A. *Howard Hawks*. Paris: Editions Seghers, 1971.

Haskell, Molly. "Howard Hawks Masculine Feminine." *Film Comment*, 10, No. 2 (March-April, 1974), 34-39.

Hawks, Howard, dir. To Have and Have Not. Hollywood: Warner Brothers, 1944.

Hemingway, Ernest. To Have and Have Not. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

"Howard Hawks." The Men Who Made the Movies. Prod. Richard Schickel. Public Broadcasting System, 17 Nov. 1973.

Hyams, Joe. Bogie: The Biography of Humphrey Bogart. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1966.

Meriwether, James B. and Michael Millgate, eds. Lion in the Garden: Interviews with William Faulkner, 1926-62. New York: Random House, 1968.

Morella, Joe, Edward Z. Epstein and Eleanor Clark, eds. Those Great Movie Ads. New Rochelle, N. Y.: Arlington House, 1972.

Murray, Edward. The Cinematic Imagination: Writers and the Motion Pictures. New York: Frederick Ungar Publ. Co., 1972.

Sarris, Andrew. Interviews with Film Directors. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967.

Sidney, George R. "Faulkner in Hollywood: A Study of His Career as Scenarist." Diss. Univ. of New Mexico, 1959.

__________. "William Faulkner in Hollywood." Colorado Quarterly, 9 (Spring, 1961), 367-77.

Wise, Naomi. "The Hawksian Woman." Take One, 3, No. 3 (April, 1972), 17-19.

Wood, Robin. "To Have (Written) and Have Not (Directed): Reflections on Authorship." Film Comment, 9, No. 3 (May-June, 1973), 30-35.

__________. Howard Hawks. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

APPENDIX

To Have and Have Not (1944)

Producer	Howard Hawks
Director	Howard Hawks
Assistant Director	Jack Sullivan
Script	Jules Furthman and William Faulkner from the novel by Ernest Hemingway
Director of Photography	Sidney Hickox
Editor	Christian Nyby
Art Director	Charles Novi
Set Decorations	Casey Roberts
Songs	Hoagy Carmichael and Johnny Mercer
Music Director	Leo F. Forbstein
Special Effects	Roy Davidson, Rex Wimpy
Technical Advisor	Louis Comien
Sound	Oliver S. Garretson

Cast

Humphrey Bogart	Harry Morgan
Walter Brennan	Eddy
Lauren Bacall	Slim (Marie Browning)
Dolores Moran	Helene de Bursac
Walter Molnar	Paul de Bursac
Hoagy Carmichael	Cricket
Marcel Dalio	Frenchy
Walter Sande	Johnson
Dan Seymour	Captain Renard
Aldo Nadi	Bodyguard
Paul Marion	Beauclerc
Patricia Shay	Mrs. Beauclerc