

CONCLUSION: HOLLYWOOD'S CIVIL WAR – PAST AND FUTURE

*The world is white no longer; and it will never be white again*¹

This study argues that after 1945 the complex inter-action between the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement changed Hollywood's interpretation of the Civil War. In doing so not only were the early myths overturned and, by the late 1960s, African Americans had come centre-stage, but through these films Hollywood addressed the major issues of the time - in particular race relations, civil rights and national identity. These changes in interpretation indicated that present-day attitudes and events were more significant to Hollywood than the historical issues of the Civil War – why it started, slavery and Reconstruction - especially as Hollywood consistently refused to discuss the first two and presented Reconstruction mainly from a southern perspective. Hollywood's history films therefore can be used as documenting American attitudes at the time of production.

Hollywood's interest in the Civil War spanned an almost continuous period from 1908 to 1975, with films clustered in four cycles. These cycles corresponded to, and were influenced by, significant events: the semi-centennial, the Depression, the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement. The first two cycles ended with America's involvement in World Wars. After 1945 the situation was more complex as the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement took over America's domestic agenda. From 1975, in the aftermath of Vietnam and with an increasingly conservative agenda at home, Hollywood made very few Civil War films.

Hollywood and its Civil War myth

Hollywood, in the earliest films, established its own mythical representation of the Civil War, which was based upon the South's Lost Cause romanticism and reflected the views of early twentieth century America about, race and national identity. Sixty years later these myths had unravelled. The plantation had become a symbol of questionable morality that threatened the unity of the nation. Southerners were depicted as violent power-seekers, untrustworthy and bitter racists. The fears of miscegenation and mixed race relationships

had been discredited and overturned. African Americans were seen centre stage earning the respect of even the most unreconstructed southerners. How did this happen?

The changing nature of Hollywood's Civil War myths was linked to America's changing attitude towards race. Up to World War II, Hollywood had presented an unchanged picture of the Civil War and African Americans had made little progress in obtaining their civil rights. In the cause of national unity Hollywood abandoned the Civil War film with its civil conflict and racially demeaning portraits for images of racial inclusion. This continued after the war until this liberal agenda was halted by the anti-communist hysteria in the late 1940s.

Hollywood's response was to relocate Civil War films mostly in the west. But this west was the mythical west that Hollywood had created to show how white Americans had conquered the forces of nature. This naturally excluded the African Americans and allowed the difficult issue of civil rights to fade away. However as the western genre uses the Manichaeian theory of opposites – good versus evil, civilisation versus savagery - story lines could not continue to propose that all southerners were heroic and good. Therefore the southerner, freed from the plantation and its Lost Cause myths, developed different character traits. As North 'fought' South in the immediate post-Civil War period, the balance began to change: not all southerners were good, nor all northerners bad.

In the mid-1950s a combination of events significantly influenced Hollywood's attitude to the Civil War. The *Brown* judgement of 1954 changed the racial landscape and gave the Civil Rights Movement national legitimacy and great encouragement. In the same year Senator Joseph McCarthy was discredited and the wave of virulent anti-communism lessened. Joseph Breen, the conservative head of the Production Code Administration, retired and the Production Code was amended to allow issues, such as miscegenation, to be addressed. Hollywood responded with films that looked at the issues of national identity and race and African Americans returned to question slavery.

The continual pressure of the Civil Rights Movement and the increasing violent reaction of southern authorities forced Hollywood to cease its renewed discussion on civil rights and national identity and then to abandon any plans it might have made to celebrate the centennial. Eventually, the pressure brought the commitment from the White House to

proceed with civil rights legislation and Hollywood felt that it could return to the Civil War, and to the Civil War it had left in the mid-1950s. Ten years of harassment, intimidation and murder had made America ready to accept the African Americans into full citizenship and also completed the change of Hollywood's representation of the southern character and the myth of the Lost Cause.

Hollywood has not been just a reflector of popular consciousness but has been ready to engage in the debate. Whilst the causes of the Civil War were generally overlooked, films after 1945 did deal with the contemporary reality of race, race relations and national identity when the climate of opinion seemed favourable. Hollywood began to show a different vision of the Civil War by adapting novels to reflect a more pro-civil rights view.² After *Brown* African American roles become stronger,³ but it was in the last cycle of films that saw the greatest increase in positive roles.⁴ Gradually the African American was shown as not only having equal worth to that of a white American⁵ but also that he considered himself to be an American⁶ and had signed up to American values and the American dream.⁷ African Americans were at last seen fighting for their freedom against Confederates,⁸ and Confederates had African American wives.⁹

The last quarter century: 1976-99

The middle 1970s marked another discontinuity in Hollywood's Civil War. The need for harmony and unity after the divisiveness of the 1960s did not provide an environment for the characteristic disunity and bitterness of the Civil War. In twenty-five years Hollywood produced only eleven Civil War films – three of which appeared in 1993. The most significant film was *Glory*, which concentrated on African Americans fighting for their freedom in the Civil War. It has not been repeated. Instead Hollywood returned to more familiar territory with films like *Gettysburg* (1993),¹⁰ depicting the honourable, heroic fight between North and South; *Sommersby* (1993) - a remake of *The Return of Martin Guerre* in a southern setting with post-Civil War harmonious race relations; and *Pharoah's Army* (1995), a North/South romance. *Ride with the Devil* (1999) was different. It tried to give a neutral view of the guerrilla warfare between the Jayhawkers and Bushwhackers¹¹ in the mid-west – although it did so from the (southern) Bushwhacker's perspective – stressing the 'moral ambiguities' of war and the complexities of relationships.¹²

As Hollywood's interest in the Civil War declined it was replaced by television. Made-for-television films, begun in the mid-1960s, had become the mainstay of network television programming by 1970. They were cheap to make and produced substantial profits.¹³ These movies were mainly melodramas whose genres included 'historical romance' and 'family melodrama' - both long-associated with Civil War films.¹⁴ Since the supply of Hollywood films was insufficient for the television market, made-for-television films increased and the Civil War provided a familiar setting.¹⁵ The impact of television was underlined when *Roots* was shown in January 1977: the final episode attracted a larger audience than the first showing on television of *Gone with the Wind* (GWTW) the year before.¹⁶ The message of *Roots* was conservative and healing: all families could find solace and identity in family roots. Race appeared to be no longer a problem. All ethnic groups shared the same interests and the same American values.¹⁷

It was not just that television had supplanted Hollywood in producing Civil War films; Hollywood itself had been supplanted as a separate entity. The combination of corporate mergers and new technology transformed the leisure industry.¹⁸ By the 1980s the motion picture industry was indistinguishable from the television industry. Hollywood had moved from making films to producing entertainment within synergistic conglomerates. *Gettysburg* (1993), for example, was originally made for television but after completion was seen to have such cinematic potential that it was adapted and released as a film. Hollywood and the 'Hollywood film' are no longer stand-alone entities as films have become 'products' and marketing strategies encompass a variety of outlets.¹⁹ The conglomerates also gained access to most of Hollywood's film archives, which included the films on the Civil War era. These are broadcast on the many TV, cable and satellite channels replaying those same myths and with the implied call for unity against the alien 'other' as they had at the time of their original reception.

By the early 1980s the political landscape had changed. This was symbolised by the election of Ronald Reagan, who brought a neo-conservative agenda to Washington and progress on civil rights to a standstill.²⁰ Reagan restored pride and patriotism to America by returning to the earlier Cold War rhetoric and emphasising individual responsibility and opportunity. Hollywood responded with the *Rambo* and *The Terminator* films – a return to America's military and imperial domination. In this context, films about the Civil War, which pitted American against American and films that emphasised collective civil rights,

would have been counter to the political context. The end of the Cold War, however, saw the removal of a 'pivot' of political dialogue.²¹ With the external enemy gone and civil rights seemingly accepted, Hollywood looked again at its recent, and also its more distant, past becoming increasingly interested in historical memory.²² It was in this environment that the Civil War film began to make a comeback and the second attempt at a sequel to *GWTW*, *Scarlett*, by Alexandra Ripley, became an instant best seller and propelled the original book onto the best-seller list again.²³

The Sesquicentennial: 2011-15

As America approaches the sesquicentennial, how will Hollywood represent the Civil War? One hundred years earlier audiences saw Confederates going off to war cheered by loyal African American servants. Confederate and Union soldiers fought with honour and were finally reconciled. Southern daughters married Union officers. African Americans were content with their slave status and Reconstruction was a disaster. Fifty years later, with African Americans seeking their legitimate rights and continuously contesting the centennial, Hollywood, with financial success uncertain, withdrew from the celebrations.²⁴

In establishing the Civil War Sesquicentennial Commission (CWSC) Congress recognised that America had changed. The CWSC is far less politically dominated than its centennial predecessor with half the membership composed of experts on the period. The language has changed: the Civil War is no longer glorified by 'sacrifice' or 'crisis.' The objectives reflect the change in attitudes and historical scholarship of the last fifty years, which acknowledges that there are still issues to resolve around 'race' and 'civil rights.' The Commission's task in co-ordinating the celebrations is to see that all observances are inclusive and appropriate.²⁵ The same cannot be said for the southern states, which are again looking back to celebrate the Confederacy.²⁶

Academic scholarship from the 1960s has given a deeper understanding of slavery and of the subsequent African American experience. David Blight and others have significantly changed the landscape of the memory of the Civil War from white visions of reconciliation and supremacy to the emancipationist vision of the African Americans. Recognition of the role played by African Americans in the Civil War finally came in the 1990s. The fiftieth anniversary of *Brown* was marked in 2004 and there will be a series of civil rights

anniversaries in the coming years. The infamous acquittals following civil rights murders in the 1950/60s are being reopened.²⁷ African Americans can look proudly to role models at the very centre of government in such persons as Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice. Multi-culturalism and ethnic diversity have been accepted, the army is fully integrated, affirmative action has helped to produce a large and dynamic black middle class and black/white inter-marriage has increased.²⁸ Many African Americans have returned to the South where thousands have been elected to office.²⁹ The civil rights legislation had transformed the lives of African Americans and many whites thought that the question of race was no longer relevant.³⁰

Yet inequality and discrimination still exist. Most African Americans still live in segregated communities and a disproportionate number remain poor and disadvantaged.³¹ New immigrants compete for jobs and housing while the final irony is that the public education system is now more segregated than it was before *Brown*.³² The beating of Rodney King (1991) by the police and their subsequent acquittal by an all-white jury only confirmed the institutional nature of racism and the continuing racial prejudice of whites. Somewhat disturbing is the growth of neo-Confederate groups across the South.³³

The Act establishing the Commission notes 'a resurgence of interest in the Civil War' and this interest has seen the development of heritage centres, the preservation of battlefield sites, the tracing of genealogies and re-enactments. But does this interest translate into a better understanding of the past and its relation to the present? While professional historians have changed their views as a result of new research, amateur historians tend to have a more static view of the past and are more concerned with the minutiae of the Civil War than with its outcome. Jim Cullen suggests that the fascination with the Civil War has been a white affair helping to make their past more relevant in an increasingly diverse society.³⁴

Since the last cycle ended, Civil War films have done little to suggest that Hollywood will approach the sesquicentennial with a radical agenda. With the exception of *Glory* and *Dances with Wolves* (1990) the films have tended to return to southern romance and a southern perspective – the latest being *Cold Mountain* (2003) and *Gods and Generals* (2003).³⁵ Even *The Birth of a Nation* (*Birth*) has been added to the National Register of films.³⁶ David Blight recounts how his script for a film about Frederick Douglass in the

mid-1990s was rejected as the company wanted ‘a more romantic story....about the war and women in his life.’³⁷ The emancipationist view of the Civil War has yet to be exploited but it appears that it can only happen if it is surrounded by melodrama, and, with the sesquicentennial corresponding to the seventy-fifth anniversary of *GWTW*³⁸ and the hundredth anniversary of *Birth*, will the leisure conglomerates consider a remake of these iconic films? And if so, what perspective will they adopt?

Hollywood, history and the Civil War

Unlike all other events in American history the Civil War has a unique relationship to, and meaning for, America that continues to exercise influence even today. As Hollywood has been a leader in cultural expression for a century, any change in its representation of the past would indicate a change in attitude to the issues that it has been addressing. In considering the Civil War, the issues are clearly race, national identity and the ‘unfinished business’ – the civil rights of African Americans.

This thesis has argued that the way to use historical films is to go beyond the impasse of the accuracy debate. Twenty-five years ago historians admitted that films could give valuable insights into the past – the feel and metaphor of history - but the filmmakers’ reliance upon invention and manipulation to provide an engaging narrative and entertainment, has prevented films from being accepted as having the same status as evidence-based history. Some film historians, like Robert Toplin, have tried to bridge the gap by distinguishing ‘good’ from ‘bad’ historical films, by suggesting that filmmakers have to use different techniques in representing the past and that, in assessing them, a different set of criteria than that for written history should be used.³⁹ As far as this thesis is concerned there is no distinction between good and bad history films: they all contain information that could be useful to the historian. History films should be accepted as historical texts, not in relation to the narrative’s historical period, but within the context of their production and exhibition, since films can give crucial insights into the cultural attitudes of the day.⁴⁰ Using the past in this way allows the discussion of difficult and contentious issues to be explored in a safer environment.

However, moving away from the accuracy debate should not be taken as a re-entry into the postmodern world of equally valid interpretations. Using film techniques such as ‘mixing

genres, presenting odd juxtapositions....[and] creating temporal jumps' – as in the film *Walker* (1987) - or creating fiction as fact, bears little relation to an historical text.⁴¹ Care should also be taken to ensure that reading history films is consistent with the political and social context. We cannot impose a connection with, or an interpretation that links to, the future, if there is no contemporary reference.⁴² Films must be sensitive to the period and to the context.

Using this methodology the complex inter-action of the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement on Hollywood's Civil War has been mapped. As Hollywood continually reassessed its position in relation to current events significant discontinuities, such as its attitude to the centennial, have been identified. But changes in cultural attitudes and representation do not follow a straight line. They are like a scatter diagram, where the line of best fit indicates the trend. So older representations, though gradually decreasing after 1945, continued alongside newer ones. That is why Hollywood's representation of the Civil War is sometimes contradictory and ambiguous as it reflected the differing influences in tone and effect of the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement. This contrasts to the period before World War II when Hollywood had maintained a more or less consistent pro-South representation of the Civil War. However while Hollywood picks up the *zeitgeist*, there is a tension between cultural perception and Hollywood's main purpose of profit and entertainment. Hollywood, therefore, see-sawed in its attitude towards events by sometimes following the dominant cultural force - as with the anti-communism in the early 1950s – sometimes picking up early on cultural change – following *Brown* in the mid-1950s and the commitment to civil rights in the mid-1960s – and sometimes following its own course – as at the centennial.

It was World War II that brought civil rights into Hollywood and into the Civil War film but it was the Civil Rights Movement that influenced Hollywood to re-interpret its myths and to admit African Americans into that unique white experience of nation building. The demands of the African Americans for their civil rights in the 1950 and 1960s contrasted sharply with their acceptance of the racial order in the 1900s and 1910s. By the late 1960s African Americans were not only present in Civil War films, as in society, but were shown to share the same American values as whites. The original myths had been overturned. In rewriting its own myths Hollywood was in tune not only with popular culture but also with

those historians who were contesting the more traditional approaches to history and to the African American experience.

Whilst the effects of the Cold War on Hollywood have been extensively discussed by film and cultural historians, surprisingly, they have not dealt in the same manner with the impact of the Civil Rights Movement.⁴³ They do not offer a similar nuanced account and generally only note the main events and outcomes of the civil rights struggle – often in relation to an individual film. The overall context and the place of the Civil Rights Movement in relation to popular culture are overlooked. A systematic approach to Civil War films demonstrates that Hollywood had a cyclical relationship with the genre - see Appendices 1 and 2. Why these cycles start and finish and why there are gaps in Civil War film production is rarely commented on by film historians. Yet from 1945, Hollywood's production of Civil War films closely mirrors the struggle over civil rights. After *Brown* the Civil Rights Movement was reinvigorated and Hollywood produced a number of films that questioned the status and identity of African Americans. But the white backlash leading to violent confrontations in the late 1950s halted these pro-civil rights films and stopped the Civil War cycle. They resumed in 1964 after the Civil Rights Movement had persuaded the Kennedy administration that legislation was the only solution to achieving equality and civil rights for African Americans. In the middle of this period came the centennial celebrations.

Judging by past experience the centennial should have been an era of celebration and profit for Hollywood and especially so, as at the end of the 1950s, Hollywood needed successful films to match the challenge of television and to win back its audience. But Hollywood barely participated – just a dozen films in six years and no blockbuster. Film historians do not seem to notice this hiatus even though the memory of the Civil War became an area of cultural contention. They give no explanation as to why, in a period of national celebration about the most emotive event in American history, and used to such effect by Hollywood in the past, Civil War films should dramatically reduce and then resume again. There is also no overall analysis of why Civil War films ceased in the mid-1970s – yet historians can point to significant events with regard to America's position and image in the world. By not taking a systematic approach, film historians failed to see the cyclical nature of Hollywood's relationship to the Civil War. Historians look for trends and

analyse data into a justifiable pattern of causes and consequences. Film historians seem to concentrate more on the films and do not place sufficient emphasis on the context.

This thesis finishes in the mid-1970s with the end of the last cycle of Civil War films, but the interest in, and the issues of, the Civil War have not gone away. Any future research on the Civil War in popular culture in the last twenty-five years of the twentieth century would be qualitatively different from that of the previous seventy-five. As Hollywood withdrew, television began to realise the full potential of the Civil War. The film industry underwent a further restructuring and filmmaking became just one part of the interests of huge entertainment conglomerates. Nevertheless, the methodological approach adopted in this research can be retained. History films are a rich seam of social information as they reflect, and sometimes challenge, attitudes present in society at the time of their production. It points the way to understanding how America saw and continues to see itself.

¹ James Baldwin, *Stranger in the Village* (1953).

² In such films as *The Romance of Rosy Ridge* (1947), *Friendly Persuasion*, *Rio Conchos* and *Journey to Shiloh* (1968).

³ In *Friendly Persuasion* (1956), *Band of Angels* (1957) and *The Horse Soldiers* (1959).

⁴ In *Invitation to a Gunfighter* (1964), *Rio Conchos* (1964), *The McMasters* (1969) and *Buck and the Preacher* (1971).

⁵ There are few significant roles for African American women.

⁶ Even a 'Southerner' as in *Journey to Shiloh*.

⁷ Benjie in *The McMasters* aspires to owning his own ranch even under the direst circumstances of racial hatred, while the former slaves in *Buck and the Preacher* look for the promised land in the west like white pioneers.

⁸ This began with *Tap Roots* (1948) followed by *Friendly Persuasion*, *Band of Angels* (1957), *Rio Conchos*, *Shenandoah* (1965), *The McMasters* and *Buck and the Preacher*.

⁹ As in *Cain's Cut Throats* (1969).

¹⁰ This was based on Michael Shaara's book *The Killer Angels* (1974).

¹¹ Jayhawkers were anti-slavery guerrillas and Bushwhackers pro-slavery guerrillas in the Kansas/Nebraska dispute over admission to the Union of the 1850s. They continued the conflict, especially in Missouri, during the Civil War.

¹² There is also one African American who supports the Bushwhackers. Even Quantrill had an African American as a bodyguard. Robert Brent Toplin, *Reel History: In Defense of Hollywood* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 53-7.

¹³ Douglas Gomery, *Shared Pleasures: A History of Movie Presentation in the United States* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 251-3.

¹⁴ Laurie Schulze, 'The Made-for-Television Movie: Industrial Practice, Cultural Form and Popular Reception' in Tino Balio, (ed.), *Hollywood in the Age of Television* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Unwin Hyman, 1990), 354-9.

¹⁵ For example: *Little Women* (1978 and 1994), *The Sacketts* (1979), *Beulah Land* (1980), *North and South* (1984-6), *Louisiana* (1987), *The Perfect Tribute* (1991), *The Love Letter* (1998).

¹⁶ Ronald L. Davis, *Celluloid Mirrors: Hollywood and American Society Since 1945* (Fort Worth, Philadelphia: Harcourt, Brace College, 1997), 206.

¹⁷ John T. Kirby, *Media-Made Dixie* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, revised 1986, first published 1978), 165-8.

¹⁸ Such as the video, cable television and the CD-ROM.

¹⁹ The film was just one part of the 'product' which was marketed for theatres, videos, television, CD-ROMs and any other spin-off that was commercially viable. Davis, *Celluloid Mirrors*, 211; Stephen Prince, *A New Pot of Gold: Hollywood Under the Electronic Rainbow, 1980-1989* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), xi-xiv; Robert C. Allen, 'Writing the Last Chapter of the History of Hollywood,' lecture at University of London, 16 February 2000.

²⁰ Adam Fairclough, *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002), 332; Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 358.

- ²¹ William H. Chafe, *The Unfinished Journey: America Since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press: 1999), 540.
- ²² With films such as *JFK* (1991), *Malcolm X* (1992), *Schindler's List* (1993), *Amistad* (1997), *Saving Private Ryan* (1998) and *The Patriot* (2000).
- ²³ *Scarlett: The Sequel to Margaret Mitchell's Gone With the Wind*. Jim Cullen, *The Civil War in Popular Culture: A Reusable Past* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 103.
- ²⁴ Gomery, *Shared Pleasures*, 165.
- ²⁵ HR 687: A Bill 'To establish a commission to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War.' Available from: thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin (accessed 4 June, 2005).
- ²⁶ The North Carolina sesquicentennial Foundation states on its website that 'in 2011 North Carolina will commemorate the 150th anniversary of its participation in the Confederacy and its involvement in the War for Southern Independence.' Available from: dir.yahoo.com/Regional/U_S/North_Carolina/Arts_and_Humanities/History/Civil_War (accessed 4 June, 2005).
- ²⁷ In particular those of Emmett Till (1955) and of James Chaney, Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman (1964).
- ²⁸ Gerstle, *American Crucible*, 369.
- ²⁹ Fairclough, *Better Day Coming*, 326.
- ³⁰ Chafe, *The Unfinished Journey*, 528.
- ³¹ In 2005 black unemployment was 10.8% compared to 4.7% for whites. Over 70% of whites owned their own homes but less than 50% of blacks. Life expectancy of blacks was six years less than for whites. Blacks were twice as likely as whites to die from disease, accident or murder and three times more likely to be jailed and given longer sentences. The net worth of black households was ten times less than that of whites. Paul Harris, *The Observer*, 9 October 2005.
- ³² Fairclough, *Better Day Coming*, 328-30.
- ³³ Duncan Campbell, *The Guardian*, 18 September, 2000.
- ³⁴ Cullen, *The Civil War in Popular Culture*, 196-99. Tara McPherson discusses this in 'Both Kinds of Arms: Remembering the Civil War' in *The Velvet Light Trap*, 35 (1995), 3-18.
- ³⁵ 'The deeper truth of *Gods and Generals* seems too be that the war was the south's 'second war of independence'....that the cause of the war was not slavery but the oppressive power of the central government, which wished to tyrannize over the southern states; that the south only wished to exercise its constitutional right to secede, but was thwarted by a power-hungry Lincoln; that southern patriots were the true heirs of the American Revolutionary generation.....that the Confederate cause was noble.' Mackubin Thomas Owens, 'War and Memory: Gods and Generals as History,' *National Review Online*. Available from: nationalreview.com/owens/owens022503.asp (accessed 12 December, 2004).
- ³⁶ Melvyn Stokes, 'The Civil War in the Movies,' in Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish, (eds.), *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 70.
- ³⁷ David Blight, 'The Birth of a Genre: Slavery on Film' *Common-Place*, Vol.1 (July, 2001). Available from: common-place.org/vol-01/no-04/slavery/blight (accessed 9 June, 2005).
- ³⁸ The copyright on the book expires in 2011. Jim Cullen, *The Civil War in Popular Culture: A Reusable Past* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 103.

³⁹ Robert Brent Toplin, *Reel History: In Defense of Hollywood* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2002).

⁴⁰ Pierre Sorlin, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980) explains why history films reflect their own periods more than representing the past.

⁴¹ Toplin, *Reel History*, 164.

⁴² For example Michael Coyne comments that the films *The Alamo* (1960) and *The Magnificent Seven* (1960) prefigure Vietnam. This may be a correct interpretation in hindsight, but in 1960 America was not fighting a war in Vietnam it was only supporting a regime that was fighting a communist insurrection. Most Americans at the time, writes William Chafe, 'in and out of government still believed that South Vietnam represented a model of success.....the cornerstone of freedom.' Coyne, *The Crowded Prairie*, 105; Chafe, *The Unfinished Journey*, 263.

⁴³ Most books on Hollywood in the forties and fifties discuss the effects of the HUAC inquiries on the film industry. The discussion on the Cold War on American culture can be found in such books as: George Lipsitz, *Class and Culture in Cold War America: 'A Rainbow at Midnight,'* 1981; Nora Sayre, *Running Times: Films of the Cold War*, 1982; Lary May, *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War*, 1989; Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War*, 1996; Elaine McClarnand and Steve Goodson, *Impact of the Cold War on American Popular Culture*, 1999; Cyndy Hendershot, *Anti-Communism and Popular Culture in Mid-Century America*, 2003; Thomas Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium, Television, McCarthyism and American Culture*, 2003.