

Teaching English through Controversial Movies

平野井, ちえ子 / Hiranoi, Chieko

(出版者 / Publisher)

法政大学教養部

(雑誌名 / Journal or Publication Title)

法政大学教養部紀要 / 法政大学教養部紀要

(巻 / Volume)

99

(開始ページ / Start Page)

169

(終了ページ / End Page)

186

(発行年 / Year)

1997-02

(URL)

<https://doi.org/10.15002/00003614>

Teaching English through Controversial Movies

Chieko Hiranoi

I. Introduction

—Rationale for a study on distortion by the mass media—

There are many English-teaching materials using commercial films. Indeed, the medium of movies is accessible for students even as their English-learning materials and could be helpful for teachers in raising their students' awareness on some crucial topics. But to what extent can we base our teaching syllabus on a medium that aims at box-office success? I would like to emphasize here the problematic aspects of using commercial films too readily as our materials.

There is no problem if the purpose of the teacher lies in teaching English by amusing fictions such as romances or science fiction which are often irrelevant to serious current issues in our society and world. The experience of listening to favorite actors or actresses and catching what they say can be a good motivation for language learning, especially for learning colloquial expressions which have rarely been included in Japanese high school textbooks.

On the other hand, if the syllabus centers on discussion of global issues, the teacher should not carelessly introduce misleading commercial films which deal with serious issues superficially or irresponsibly. I believe that the role of teachers should include both raising the students' awareness on important topics and helping them make their own thinking attitudes more critical and profound.

I would not deny the effectiveness of commercial films as teaching

materials. The important thing is teachers' attitudes in utilizing them. At least, regarding university teaching, students have some vague or superficial knowledge on various current topics. However, they often don't have their own opinions on each topic or enough information to form their own viewpoint. So, I believe teachers should raise their students' critical thinking attitudes in any area the students are especially interested in. I also use some commercial films as an introduction to various topics to stimulate students to think. However, it is vital for teachers to keep in mind the following types of distortion often found in the mass media: (1) distortion of historical facts (e.g. the film *Mississippi Burning*) (2) optimistic or melodramatic treatment of serious topics (e.g. the film *Philadelphia*) (3) sentimental transformation from theatre to film (e.g. the film *Biloxi Blues*) (4) stereotyping (e.g. the film *Gung-Ho*).

II. *Mississippi Burning*

—Distortion of historical facts—

The film *Mississippi Burning* was directed in 1988 by Alan Parker and deals with a critical part of the modern history of the U.S.A. This issue is the civil rights movement. The plot is based on a historical incident which actually happened in Neshoba County in 1964: the murder of three civil rights workers by the KKK (Ku Klux Klan).

Before criticizing its distortions, I would like to point out its advantages as material for global education. (1) accessibility as a commercial film, (2) presentation of key words on the topic, (3) reference to the values underlying the community.

The accessibility of a commercial film is influenced by its cast or artistic impression. The main characters of *Mississippi Burning* are two FBI agents played by famous actors: Gene Hackman and Willem Dafoe. As an example of artistic impression, its opening scene shows us two types of drinking fountains in the Southern U.S. of the 1960s: a

clean modern one for white Americans and an old shabby one for 'colored' Americans. The background music for the scene is a melodious gospel song by Mahalia Jackson.

As to key words, the movie presents many important terms for studying racism and the civil rights movement, e.g. KKK, colored, segregation, Martin Luther King, Jr., John Edgar Hoover, NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) and SNCC (Students Nonviolent Coordinating Committee)

The final point, the presentation of values, should be most emphasized. There are many impressive lines in the film reflecting the deep rooted sense of values in Mississippi and the South at that period. The character, Mrs. Pell, for example, a nice lady married to the Klansman-Deputy, gives expression to her own resignation as follows:

MRS. PELL: Have you any idea what it's like to live with all this ? People look at us...and only see bigots and racists. Hatred isn't something you're born with. It gets taught. At school they said segregation was what it said in the Bible. Genesis nine, verse twenty-seven. At seven years o'age, you get told it enough times you believe it. You believe the hatred. You live it. You breathe it. You marry it⁽¹⁾.

These three factors are helpful in getting students involved in the topic, but they are not sufficient for students to develop critical thinking about this issue. Actually, a message on the screen after the closing credits by the director, Alan Parker, tells us that *Mississippi Burning* is not factual, and that it was only suggested by the facts.

I consulted *Magill's Cinema Annual 1989*, in order to check the main criticisms of this movie. One critic, Cono Robert Marcazzo, wrote,

Mississippi Burning has aroused controversy in the press primarily concerning two points: the liberties the film takes with history and its

focus on white rather than black principal characters⁽²⁾.

As to the former point, articles in *Time* magazine written by Richard Corliss⁽³⁾ and by Jack E. White⁽⁴⁾ are helpful in getting further historical information.

For example, for the depiction of the FBI, this film could give some false impressions to students. White describes this as follows:

Even more twisted is the film's depiction of an FBI so zealous in its defense of black rights that it would resort to vigilantism to promote them. That contention is laughable to civil rights veterans of the early 1960's, who pleaded with the bureau to take a more active role in protecting blacks⁽⁵⁾.

Even a black FBI agent appeared in one sequence to threaten to castrate a white mayor. But the truth is that the Director John Edgar Hoover was a notorious racist and there were no black professional agents in the FBI at that time.

As to the focus on white characters mentioned by Marcazzo, students might get the mistaken impression that the civil rights movement succeeded through the FBI's actions. The plot puts too much emphasis on the conflict and cooperation between two quite different types of white FBI agents, Ward and Anderson. As a result, Alan Parker ignores the efforts of the black organizations SNCC or CORE. Some unsympathetic viewers might even interpret the fictional threatening of Anderson against the Klansmen as profaning the doctrine of non-violence of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I also have an objection against the optimistic depiction of the final arrests of the Klansmen: a sort of happy ending. Things have not changed so much since then. Joseph Lelyveld, a *New York Times* journalist, writes in the book *Move Your Shadow: South Africa, Black and White*,

On my return I sat one evening with a white man named Cecil Price. An intimidating deputy sheriff in 1964, when he advised me one afternoon to get out of town, he had eventually spent four years in a federal penitentiary for the central role he had played in the conspiracy. Now, a member in good standing of the golf club, he was only too happy to talk about Cecil junior's experiences with black teachers in an integrated school or his own impressions of the black experience in America as related in the TV series *Roots*, which he rated as only "fair" because, he said, "the violence part was played up a bit too much."⁽⁶⁾

Compare this description and Parker's presentation of the arrests of Klansmen at the end of this film. Ben Chaney, younger brother of murdered black activist James Chaney, who was eleven in 1964 and is portrayed in the movie, regards this film as a distortion. He says,

It is a dangerous movie because it could lead to complacency. Things haven't changed that much⁽⁷⁾.

III. *Philadelphia*

—Optimistic and melodramatic treatment of a serious topic—

The film *Philadelphia* was directed by Jonathan Demme in 1993, starring Tom Hanks and Denzel Washington. Tom Hanks won the Academy Award for Best Actor for his performance in the leading role, and Bruce Springsteen won the award for his song, "The Streets of Philadelphia."

In general, it is accepted that no major movie had effectively dealt with the disturbing and complicated issue of AIDS until *Philadelphia's* release, because of Hollywood's legendary fear of presenting gay people and AIDS in a positive light and because of the national paranoia concerning the mysterious and frightening disease. So, I can admit that Jonathan Demme must have been highly motivated to deal with this issue. But I cannot help pointing out the optimistic

and melodramatic depiction given by this movie.

Andrew Beckett (Tom Hanks) is a brilliant young attorney working in a prestigious law firm in Philadelphia. His partner Miguel Alvarez (Antonio Banderas) has a teaching job. Both of them are young, good-looking, intelligent, pleasant guys. Though Andrew's homosexuality and AIDS has been concealed as far as possible to his firm, Andrew's family knows everything and has been backing up the couple.

This setting could make the gravity of the issue unclear. There have been many AIDS victims abandoned by their families and friends, who had to fight all alone against the disease and the prejudice of society after their partners' death.

I can remember a TV drama titled *An Early Frost*⁽⁸⁾. This drama was about ninety minutes long and broadcast on NHK. It was originally produced by NBC in 1985, when some people believed that AIDS was spread atmospherically. The leading role of this drama is also a young, handsome, promising lawyer. He is homosexual and has AIDS.

However, there are two outstanding differences between *An Early Frost* and *Philadelphia*. One is the thorough-going depiction of the conflict between the hero and members of his family in *An Early Frost*, especially his father and his younger sister. By his confession, the brilliant son and brother has turned out to be a sexual pervert and a disgrace for them. It takes so much time for them to be reconciled. The other is the portrayal of another AIDS victim in *An Early Frost* who is going to die, without money, without status, even without family or friends, in vivid contrast to the hero. His portrayal includes documentary touch and I remember thinking it was far from commercial films.

Finally, *Philadelphia* could be just a tragedy of an elite⁽⁹⁾ in comparison with *An Early Frost* or documentary films.

However, I would not denigrate completely the characterization of

Andrew as an attorney. As a means of depicting the conflict of justice and prejudice, the characterization might be effective. In *Magill's Cinema Annual 1994*, Kirby Tepper writes,

An example of [screenwriter Ron] Nyswaner's ability is his choice of making Andrew an attorney.... This choice also further underscores the film's theme of justice, particularly when, as a witness, Andrew says he loves the law because "every now and then, you get to be a part of justice being done, and that really is quite a thrill when that happens." Setting the film in Philadelphia, the "cradle of liberty" and the "city of brotherly love", underscores its themes further⁽¹⁰⁾.

Then, what aspect of this film can we say is most persuasive as a teaching material? The biggest role of *Philadelphia* must be exposing the hatred and bigotry against gays and AIDS victims in society as an issue for discussion. Kirby Tepper values this aspect in his conclusion,

Unfortunately, Americans do not yet live in a world in which discrimination and homophobia are nonexistent. This well-intentioned film, while far from perfect, will most likely bring a lot of people further along the continuum of understanding and tolerance of gay people and AIDS victims. For a mainstream motion picture, that is a momentous accomplishment⁽¹¹⁾.

The changing attitude of Joe Miller (Denzel Washington), who takes on Andrew's wrongful termination lawsuit in spite of his personal distaste for Andrew's illness and sexual orientation, represents the continuum.

IV. *Biloxi Blues*

—Sentimental Transformation from Theatre to Film—

Neil Simon is one of the most popular dramatists in Broadway and one of the most successful screenwriters in Hollywood. *Biloxi*

Blues is the second work in what would emerge as a trilogy of his semi-autobiographical plays: *Brighton Beach Memoirs* (first produced in 1983; released in a film version in 1986), *Biloxi Blues* and *Broadway Bound* (which opened on Broadway in 1986; released in a film version in 1992). The trilogy follows Simon's young alter ego, Eugene Morris Jerome, the youngest son of a working-class Jewish family. *Biloxi Blues*, which opened in Los Angeles in 1984, won the Tony Award for Best play of 1985. The film version was directed by Mike Nichols in 1988, starring Matthew Broderick as Eugene. (Broderick played the leading role also in the theatre.)

It is 1943. Eugene has joined the army and has been taken from his home in Brooklyn, New York, to Biloxi, Mississippi, for basic training. Eugene, who has never been away from his Brighton Beach home, has higher priorities than learning to shoot the enemy. He is determined to achieve three goals during the war: become a writer, lose his virginity and keep himself from being killed. However, for Eugene and the other recruits, severe and eccentric Sergeant Toomey in charge of training them is a symbol of discipline and authority of the army.

Simon is an important figure not only in theatre but also in mass media like TV and films, so he can do the adaptation from his original work for a film version. The screenplay of *Biloxi Blues* was also written by Simon. But there is a big difference between the original and the film version: the depiction of the character of Epstein.

Arnold Epstein (Corey Parker) is a Jewish intellectual also from New York, to whom Eugene can feel closest in the company. Epstein regards Sergeant Toomey as the destroyer of human dignity and refuses to give in to him. Epstein always stresses his own intellectual superiority in what he sees as a conflict between the army's principles and his own logic. Eugene admires him in his diary.

Arnold Epstein is truly the most complex and fascinating man I've ever

met and his constant and relentless pursuit of truth, logic and reason fascinates me in the same proportion as his obstinacy and unnecessary heroics drive me to distraction. But I love him for it. In the same manner that I love Joe DiMaggio for making the gesture of catching a long fly ball to center seem like the last miracle performed by God in modern times⁽¹²⁾.

One night Sergeant Toomey takes Wykowski's money from his unlocked locker to teach the recruits a lesson. Epstein witnesses it and, next morning, when Toomey threatens to cancel a forty-eight-hour pass for everybody unless the theft is solved, Epstein takes the blame for the case, of which he is completely innocent, in order to discourage Toomey. He states in a confrontation with Toomey "the army has its logic, I have my own,"⁽¹³⁾ and "I don't think it's necessary to dehumanize a man to get him to perform. You can get better results raising our spirits than lowering our dignity,"⁽¹⁴⁾ in spite of Toomey's saying "You flyspeck on a mound of horse shit."⁽¹⁵⁾

On the other hand, Eugene always avoids commitment and sits back to observe life. The following dialogue between Eugene and Epstein after the case of theft above represents their contrast and relationship.

EUGENE: Why do you always have to do things the hard way?

EPSTEIN: It makes life more interesting.

EUGENE: It also makes a lot of problems.

EPSTEIN: Without problems, the day would be over at eleven o'clock in the morning.

EUGENE: I admire what you did back there, Arnold. You remind me of my brother, sometimes. He was always standing up for his principles too.

EPSTEIN: Principles are okay. But sometimes they get in the way of reason.

EUGENE: Then how do you know which one is the right one?

EPSTEIN: You have to get involved. You don't get involved enough, Eugene.

EUGENE: What do you mean?

EPSTEIN: You're a witness. You're always standing around *watching* what's happening. Scribbling in your book what other people do. You have to get in the middle of it. You have to take sides. Make a contribution to the fight.

EUGENE: What fight?

EPSTEIN: *Any* fight. The one you believe in.

EUGENE: Yeah. I know what you mean. Sometimes I feel like I'm invisible. Like The Shadow. I can see everyone else but they can't see me. That's what I think writers are. Sort of invisible.

EPSTEIN: Not Tolstoy. Not Dostoyevsky. Not Herman Melville.

EUGENE: Yeah. I have to read those guys⁽¹⁶⁾.

There exist two sequences in the film version which are equivalent to the scenes above in the stage play version. But the film version lacks an extremely impressive scene in which Epstein, sobbing, exposes his humiliation:

EPSTEIN: ... I was in the latrine alone. I spent four hours cleaning it, on my hands and knees. It looked better than my mother's bathroom at home. Then these two non-coms come in, one was the cook, that three-hundred-pound guy and some other slob, with cigar butts in their mouths and reeking from beer... They come in to pee only instead of using the urinal, they use one of the johns, both peeing in the same one, making circles, figure-eights. Then they start to walk out and I say, "Hey, I just cleaned that. Please flush the johns." And the big one, the cook, says to me, "Up your ass, rookie," or some other really clever remark... And I block the doorway and I say, "There's a printed order on the wall signed by Captain Landon stating the regulations that all facilities must be flushed after using"... And I'm requesting that they follow regulations, since I was left in charge, and to please flush the facility... And the big one says to me, "Suppose you flush it, New York Jew Kike," and I said, "My ethnic heritage notwithstanding, please flush the facility."... They look at each other, this half a ton of brainless beef, and suddenly rush me, turn me upside down,

grab my ankles and-and-and they lowered me by my feet with my head in the toilet, in their filth, their poison...all the way until I couldn't breathe...then they pulled off my belt and tied my feet on to the ceiling pipes with my head still in their foul waste and tied my hands behind my back with dirty rags, and they left me there, hanging like a pig that was going to be slaughtered... I wasn't strong enough to fight back. I couldn't do it alone. No one came to help me... Then the pipe broke and I fell to the ground... It took me twenty minutes to get myself untied—twenty minutes!—but it will take me the rest of my life to wash off my humiliation. I was degraded. I lost my dignity⁽¹⁷⁾.

The original drama focuses on the dilemma between discipline that is personified by Toomey and dignity that is carried chiefly by Epstein. But the film allows Eugene, rather than Epstein, to have the final confrontation with Toomey. Toomey has been ordered to go to a Veterans Hospital the next morning at the end of the plot. In the original play, as his last duty he has made up his mind to make Epstein, who is the most rebellious soldier, one of the most disciplined soldiers. To do this, the drunken Toomey threatens to shoot Epstein, unless Epstein takes Toomey's gun and reports the threat to his superiors. For a while Epstein has seemed to obey Toomey, but he concludes the incident in his own way: requesting that Toomey do two hundred push-ups, which all the company has often been forced to do, instead of reporting the incident. In the film version, Eugene takes the place of Epstein.

Simon might have wanted to give Eugene a chance of commitment to the real world or just to make a popular actor, Broderick, play an important role. But anyway, owing to this transformation, the conflict between discipline of the army and human dignity during war time, has become unclear. In addition, the irony that Sergeant Toomey is also a victim of the army because he has come to be forced to retire because of former injury at the end of the drama, is not as effective in

the film version as in the play.

As a whole, the film version avoids important issues and instead emphasizes the nostalgic feature of the original, ending with Eugene's lines,

...Biloxi was beautiful. . . . As I look back now, a lot of years later, I realize my time in the army was the happiest time of my life. God knows not because I like the army, and there sure was nothing to like about the war. I like it for the most selfish reason of all.... Because I was young....⁽¹⁸⁾

V. *Gung-Ho*

—Stereotyping of the Japanese—

Gung-Ho was directed by Ron Howard in 1986, when the Japanese car industry was prosperous.

An American auto worker (played by Michael Keaton) is sent to Japan to ask a Japanese auto company (called Assan Motors, which is clearly a parody of Nissan Motors) to reopen a once-closed American car factory in his small industrial town (Hadleyville). The fate of the town is on his shoulders, because the whole town is going to be in ruins owing to its economic failure. He is successful in persuading the Japanese company to arrive in his town to reopen the factory. But in the process, many problems arise because of cultural differences between Japanese and American work styles and lifestyles.

Gung-Ho juxtaposes two cultures and explores the differences in their management styles and work ethics. These differences are humorously presented as a series of stereotypical dichotomies. Examples include (1) company-centered vs. family-centered (the Japanese take it for granted that workers should sacrifice their personal lives for the company, while the Americans would not); (2) team vs. individual (the Japanese want all the workers to learn every job, while the Americans want to specialize); and (3) craftsmanship

vs. work just as a contract (the Japanese aim for zero defects, while the Americans are willing to let the dealers handle defects but are passionate in negotiating for better working conditions.)

Gung-Ho tries not only to depict the differences between two static cultures but also to suggest what those cultures really have in common and how they can profitably work together toward attaining the ideal relationship between management and labor, work and family, and productivity and mental health. That is to say, in their hearts, the Japanese care about their families and their own mental health, while the Americans want to be acknowledged as competent workers, not as inferior to the Japanese workers. In the climax of the movie, the products are produced with Japanese speed but with American standards as a result of the two groups' mutual concessions and cooperation. Finally, the impressive cooperation of the two cultures is affirmed by the Japanese president's decision not to close the inefficient plant.

Of course, the ending is a facile resolution. However, its underlying concept of mutual understanding and cooperative attitude beyond cultural conflicts should be respected. In the course of the plot, the dilemma and effort of both leaders, Hunt Stevenson (Michael Keaton) and Kazuhiro Takahara (Gedde Watanabe) is impressive. Hunt reminds me of Willy Loman in the play *Death of a Salesman* in his belief in personality. Kazuhiro is rather sympathetic to the workers as a Japanese executive and is judged as a 'failing executive'. Both of them are far from perfect heroes. Such a setting of two main characters makes us feel close to the cross-cultural situation.

But, unfortunately, *Gung-Ho* includes some insulting and stereotypical caricatures of the Japanese, irrelevant to the categories mentioned above, which are inserted for a cheap laugh. Such scenes include the welcoming ceremony scene at the airport, the bathing scene in the river and the worst, the failing-executive-training scenes. Stereotypical caricatures made by other cultures are offensive to the

people, and in this movie it damages the otherwise effective depictions of the serious cultural differences.

Strictly speaking, every fictional characterization, more or less, includes some stereotyping. Especially in the genre of comedy, stereotyping is an old and easy strategy in creating characters. However, without sound understanding or sympathy towards the target person or group, stereotyping can be offensive to or derisive of them. This insulting aspect is a form of discrimination.

VI. *Geronimo*

—A suggestion for a content-based approach—

To avoid diffusing misunderstanding among students using commercial films, teachers should emphasize the perspectives conscious of the character of the mass media: what kind of depiction they resort to as a means of getting audience. We should not put too much trust in the views of the mass media. We should not cling to one perspective chosen by the media.

In the former sections, I have written about some undesirable depiction of commercial films. But in this section, to be fair, and as a conclusion, I would like to present my original teaching handouts based on a commercial film showing a new perspective free from old misinformation, distortion and racial ignorance about Native Americans in Hollywood. The movie is *Geronimo*.

Geronimo was directed by Walter Hill in 1993 following the trend of films such as *Dances with Wolves* (1990) and *The Last of the Mohicans* (1992), the first serious explorations of Native American culture.

Example 1: dictation scene 1 from *Geronimo*⁽¹⁹⁾

This is a negotiation scene between General Crook and Geronimo, in which we can see two opposite ways of viewing American history.

(Students are requested to fill in the blanks.)

GERONIMO: With all this land, (why) (is) (there) (no) (room) (for)
(the) Apache?

Why does the white eye* want all land?

GENERAL CROOK:

GERONIMO: How long in Florida?

GENERAL CROOK: Maybe two years, with your families.

I think I can get that.

That's (not) (a) (bad) (deal).

A lot of white eye want to see Geronimo (hanged)
(for) (murder).

GERONIMO: Not murder, war.

(Many) (bad) (things) (happen) (in) (war).

GENERAL CROOK: How many white eye did you kill since you left
Turkey Creek?

GERONIMO: Maybe 50. Maybe more. How many Apaches you killed?

GENERAL CROOK: (You) (killed) (women) (and) (children).

GERONIMO: (So) (did) (you).

OLD MAN: (We) (gain) (nothing) (by) (fighting).

(We) (can) (live) (on) (reservation).

I go there. You Nantanrupan are like a brother to me.

GERONIMO: (Many) (of) (my) (people) (want) (to) (surrender).

When I was young, the white eye came and wanted the land
of my people.

(When) (their) (soldiers) (burnt) (our) (villages), (we)
(moved) (to) (the) (mountains).

(When) (they) (took) (our) (food), (we) (ate) (thorns).

When they killed our children, we had more.

We killed all white eye that we could.

(We) (starved) (and) (we) (killed).

(But) (in) (our) (hearts), (we) (never) (surrender).

*'white eye': the Apache name for the settlers from Europe.

Example 2: dictation scene 2 from *Geronimo* ⁽²⁰⁾

This is an ending narration by Lieutenant Britton Davis showing his

sympathetic view towards the Native Americans.

DAVIS: Over the years, the advances surrounding the Geronimo campaign have continued to haunt me.

I carry the (memory) (of) (those) (days), (days) (of) (bravery) (and) (cruelty), of (heroism) and (deceit).

And I'm still faced with the undeniable truth.

(A) (way) (of) (life) that (endured) 1000 years (was) (gone).

This desert, this land, that we look out on will never be the same.

Example 3: reading practice

Reading a selected glossary on Native Americans' history (my choice from the book *Timelines of Native American History*) and underlining some parts which are interesting for the students. The aim of underlining is to make my students give up translation and get information through English.

(In my sessions, many students underlined the parts underlined as follows.)

shaman⁽²¹⁾

A mediator between the worlds of spirits and humans. A shaman interprets and attempts to control the supernatural in order to bring success in food gathering and warfare and to cure the sick; he also is keeper and interpreter of tribal lore. The religious functions and political power of shamans varies among tribes, with some also acting as chiefs. "Medicine man" is a synonym.

disease⁽²²⁾

Infectious illnesses brought to the Americas by Europeans played a large part in Indian history. It is estimated that tribal populations declined by about 10 percent from Indian-white warfare, but about 25 to 50 percent from diseases. Smallpox proved the most deadly disease because it returned time and again to the same populations, but measles, scarlet fever, typhoid, typhus, diphtheria, influenza, and chicken pox also took their toll. Contemporary Indians are known to have the poorest health care

of any ethnic group, with a high rate of diabetes, tuberculosis, and other diseases.

scalping⁽²³⁾

The cutting or tearing away of a circular patch of skin and hair from the top of the human head. Scalping is one of those customs which has mistakenly come to be associated with all North American Indians. Scholars disagree on just how widespread the practice was before the coming of whites, or if it were practiced at all. In any case, the custom became common after various wars of the 17th and 18th centuries during which French, Dutch, and English officials placed a bounty on Indian scalps, because they were easier to transport than heads.

NOTES

- (1) Gerolmo, C. (1992) *Mississippi Burning*, Nagoya: Screenplay Publisher. p. 67.
- (2) *Magill's Cinema Annual 1989*, Pasadena: Salem Press. p. 212.
- (3) Corliss, R. (January 9, 1989), "Fire This Time." *Time*, 133, pp. 56-62.
- (4) White, J.E. (January 9, 1989), "Just Another Mississippi Whitewash." *Time*, 133, pp. 60-61.
- (5) *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- (6) Lelyveld, J. (1985) *Move Your Shadow: South Africa, Black and White*, New York: Times Books. p. 4.
- (7) Corliss, R. "Fire This Time." *op.cit.*, p. 58.
- (8) As NHK has no rights to broadcast this drama now, I do not know if you can see it in the future. But this is one of the best TV dramas I have ever seen.
- (9) I can imagine the reason director Jonathan Demme used an elite as his material. Jonathan Demme won the Academy Award for his direction in *The Silence of the Lambs* in 1991. In that film, the sadistic killer was a sexually confused, which caused many viewers to protest that again Hollywood was only able to portray sexual minorities in one light: perverted and psychologically damaged. Demme might have tried with *Philadelphia* to atone for *The Silence of the Lambs*.
- (10) *Magill's Cinema Annual 1994*, Pasadena: Salem Press. p. 266.
- (11) *Ibid.*, p. 267.
- (12) Simon, N. (1986) *Biloxi Blues*, New York: Random House. pp. 72-73.
- (13) *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- (14) *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- (15) *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- (16) *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

- (17) *Ibid.*, pp. 28–30.
- (18) Author's transcription from the film *Biloxi Blues*.
- (19) Author's transcription from the film *Geronimo*.
- (20) Author's transcription from the film *Geronimo*.
- (21) Waldman, C. (1994) *Timelines of Native American History*, New York: Prentice Hall General Reference. p. 26.
- (22) *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- (23) *Ibid.*, p. 26.