

the six-gun simulacrum

toby reed , 1994

t h e s i x - g u n s i m u l a c r u m

Flaming Star

At the end of FLAMING STAR, Elvis rides off into the sunset like a cowboy, but, unlike the cowboy riding into a horizon representing wilderness and freedom, Elvis rides off to die. This final image illustrates thematically ideas of purity, impurity and their relation to tragedy. Elvis is a half-breed (Indian mother, European father) who is doomed because society believes in the purity of distinct races. Society's belief in purity is, in FLAMING STAR, the source of tragedy. Here, as part of a series of racial westerns, is an explicit generic example of the ideology of purity. The theme of racial purity in the final image of the film is only one aspect of genre contamination in FLAMING STAR, and is doubled at the start of the film by the image of generic and musical impurity. In the image of Elvis in the opening credit sequence, there are archetypal western images, of Elvis and another cowboy on horses, riding over horizons. When the title "FLAMING STAR" is superimposed over this image of the two cowboys, there is no doubt that the "STAR" of the title refers to Elvis. These images coincide with a theme song which combines a standard western theme with Rock 'n Roll and Rockabilly, boosting the crystal image of Elvis appearing in a western. In FLAMING STAR the culture of Rock 'n Roll folds into the western, and with this, the role that Elvis and Rock 'n Roll has in working between racial and musical stereotypes. FLAMING STAR, in the use of Elvis Presley's star image, flaunts its generic impurity, and critiques the whole notion of purity through the question of racial purity, mixing and the integration of series. As the theme of racial impurity in the final image, and the image of generic impurity in the opening images would indicate, the notion of a pure genre, free of contamination, is impossible. It is impossible to "contain" genres, to keep them pure, to allow nothing from the "outside" in, and nothing from the "inside" to leave. The image of purity or of a pure western, when it does arise, is always just a myth or an image.

The Western Series

Is Elvis, is the Marlboro Man, inside or outside the western ? Jacques Derrida addresses the notion of the inside and outside of the generic boundary in "The Law of Genre": "As soon as the word 'genre' is sounded, as soon as it is heard, as soon as one attempts to conceive it, a limit is drawn. And when a limit is established, norms and interdictions are not far behind." (DL: 56). Every time we try to draw a boundary, we realise how the signification spreads out

further, and a new wider boundary must be drawn. It is ultimately impossible to draw any boundary as everything exists *inside* and *outside* the generic "boundary". Whereas Derrida concludes from this that genres do not exist, I would argue that the aspects of genre exist as signs or images which act as monads; when certain combinations come together they produce a series, such as *the western*. This series has no centre and no origin. The impression of origin or centre is like an image that is formed when certain relationships of images-signs come together. These images form a type of surface which is inherently chaotic and paradoxical. So the signs can re-form in any number of paradoxical relationships and still signify *western*.

The Platonic system is ruled by an essentialism that by nature *excludes*. Andre Bazin writes of the western as being "subjected to influences from the outside - for instance the crime novel, the detective story, or the social problems of the day." and refers to these as "passing moments of contamination" (BW: 140). This is what Gilles Deleuze, in "Plato and the Simulacrum", calls *the will to select* (LS: 253). To select what is a western and what is not a western requires a definition so that a boundary can be drawn. The pure western can be 'included' and the impure western 'excluded', the authentic copy distinguished from the inauthentic simulacrum. The basis for inclusion or exclusion is the myth of the (excludable) copy which bypasses the metaphysical "idea" behind the surface of the object, out of reach of the viewer. The copy is, then inauthentic: it merely looks like something. In the same way a western like *THE OKLAHOMA KID* might be thought inauthentic, as it is too much like a Warner Bros. gangster movie, its "westernness" merely a copy of "the real thing", the idea behind the genre. The "idea" forms the notion of a centre of the genre and an origin of the genre.

In the majority of writing on the western the intrinsic is given precedence over the extrinsic. Deleuze defines the Platonic motive: "To distinguish essence from appearance, intelligible from sensible, idea from image, original from copy, and model from simulacrum." (LS: 256) The prior term in each case is the intrinsic, while the lesser term is extrinsic. It is interesting that the western is a genre that puts so much emphasis on the surface, yet so much writing about it has been concerned with defining the essence behind the surface. Even when applying Metz' theories to Leone's westerns, Roth states "images function as signifiers for the signified narrative", as if the image is of less importance than the story (Roth 35). Bazin's justification for the search for the "idea" behind the form of the western is very interesting. He came to the same problem that Derrida outlines in "The Law Of Genre" (DL: 55-81): that "the same ingredients are to be found elsewhere." (BW: 142) That is, no genre can be pure and self contained as every element inside the genre also exists outside the genre in another context. Therefore there can be no generic boundary. However Bazin does not come to the same conclusion as Derrida, that genre does not exist as a pure entity. Bazin uses the

observation (problem) to justify his metaphysics, to search behind the surface, to find the "idea" of the western: "the western must be something else again than its form" (BW: 142).

What is "intrinsic" is commonly considered closer to the "idea". This proximity to the "idea" in turn produces a "good copy". It is the "good copy" that is commonly thought to produce the classical. It is this logic which assumes that the classical western has an intrinsic relation to the "idea" of the western, whilst the baroque western has only an extrinsic relation to the surface (object) of the western.

The problem of the inside/outside of the generic boundary is implicit in Will Wright's structural definition of the western. He uses Vladimir Propp's typology of character actions to define the genre. However, all the actions that exist inside Wright's western genre can be found outside it as well. The same character actions structure Raoul Walsh's gangster movie *HIGH SIERRA* and his western, *COLORADO TERRITORY*. John Fell makes a similar point concerning *UNDERWORLD*, *TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT*, and *RIO BRAVO* (Fell 19-28). *STAGECOACH*, considered *the* classic western by Andre Bazin, has a similar relationship to "Boule de Suif" (and other films made from that story), while *A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS* and *YOJIMBO* are only two examples of a generic crossover common since the sixties. Proppian actions transgress generic boundaries as much as they create them. Cinematic series exist as paradoxical coexistences, at times forming an image which primarily signifies as "western", at other times "samurai" or "gangster", but always coexisting. If genre is looked at from the point of view of series then Elvis and the Marlboro Man are paradoxically inside and outside the western, like *HIGH SIERRA*.¹

In this way the western forms many series, each giving the impression of possessing a centre: Bazin's classical and baroque westerns as series, the series formed by a star (John Wayne series, Clint Eastwood series); auteur westerns (John Ford series, Anthony Mann series); feminist western series (the female gunfighter); racial western series (Indian westerns, black cowboys); national cinema western series (spaghetti westerns, Japanese westerns); westerns by

¹An interesting example of the inside/outside paradox can be seen in Andre Bazin's famous essay "The Western, or the American Film *Par Excellence*" in which he wrote "the western must possess some greater secret . . . (that) identifies it with the essence of cinema" (BW: 141). This is a succinct expression of the myth that the western is the metaphysical "idea" behind the cinema. Bazin implied that the western is the essence of cinema due to it being the most succinct expression of movement in the cinema, movement being central to the cinema. If the western is the essence of all cinema, then all films, regardless of genre, are somehow westerns, through their relation to movement. No generic boundary can exist if even films that seem to have nothing in common with the western have as their essence the western. All cinema is paradoxically inside and outside the western, if the western is the essence of cinema.

"theme" (bounty hunters, retired gunfighters, revenge); a series concerned with the myth of the western or the origin (THE MAN WHO SHOT LIBERTY VALENCE, SHANE, UNFORGIVEN) and numberless others. The western is here a dispersed, decentred, constantly shifting and reforming genre which changes each time it is looked at from a new angle. These methods for analysing the western, which sought the truth of the genre, such as Warshow, Bazin, Kitses and Wright, can also be used to denote certain series which form points of view.

Both BADMANS TERRITORY and JESSE JAMES VS. THE DALTONS, on one level signify as westerns, but on another level thematise the coming together of various western series. BADMANS TERRITORY features a point on a map: the north of Texas, where the badmen from various western series collect in one place, in one film: Belle Star, Jesse James and his gang, the Daltons, all of whom usually form their own series here coexist and intersect. JESSE JAMES VS. THE DALTONS describes the intersection of two western series in the title of the film, but is in fact about Jesse James' son. The inclusion of Doc Holiday in THE OUTLAW brings him into the Billy The Kid series, although he is usually associated with Wyatt Earp. This point is made more obliquely in TOMBSTONE where we see a character with his ears shot off, as happened in THE OUTLAW. TOMBSTONE and THE OUTLAW in this way connect the series including MY DARLING CLEMENTINE and GUNFIGHT AT THE O.K. CORRAL to the Billy the Kid series. TOMBSTONE also intersects with FORTY GUNS. It quotes the Fuller film by repeating his shootout at the wedding ceremony. Signification in the images of TOMBSTONE evokes the early Ford image (STAGECOACH), as well as the "professional" Sturges image (THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN), the start of Leone's ONCE UPON A TIME IN THE WEST, and Peckinpah's THE WILD BUNCH. All this is overlayed with THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY, which appears at the start as fake documentary footage, disturbing the reality/fiction dichotomy, postulating all cowboys as conscious stylisations of the cowboys in the "first" western.

Derrida argues that the act of mixing genres asserts generic purity. However, his argument about the generic boundary, that everything exists simultaneously inside and outside the boundary, makes it impossible not to mix genres, as every image exists as part of multiple other genres. The image of a vampire walking down the street of a western town and taking part in a shootout, gives the impression of two separate, self contained genres having come together in a violent clash. But a "mixed" western, such as BILLY THE KID VS. DRACULA, JESSE JAMES MEETS FRANKENSTEIN'S DAUGHTER, CURSE OF THE UNDEAD, 3.10 TO YUMA, HIGH NOON, HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER, WESTWORLD or BACK TO THE FUTURE III articulates the "pure" western, by virtue of the contrast set up in such a film. Bazin and Warshow both criticised HIGH NOON for bringing an essentially non western plot to a western setting. Howard Hawks criticised the film, along with 3.10 TO YUMA, for similar reasons. The

imposition of the logic of the thriller into 3:10 TO YUMA (perhaps partly attributable to a script by Elmore Leonard) did not, in Hawks opinion mix well with the logic of the western:

Then I saw another picture where the sheriff caught a prisoner and the prisoner taunted him and made him perspire and worry and everything by saying, "Wait till my friends catch up with you." And I said, "That's a lot of nonsense, the sheriff would say, 'You better hope your friends don't catch up with me, 'cause you'll be the first man to die'." (McBride 15-16)

But of course, there had been westerns about "cowards" and people threatened before. Hawks thought he was seeing what others had missed, but perhaps he was only seeing the western in 3:10 TO YUMA. Mixing is an extreme folding that gives the impression of two pure entities having been put together, but mixed westerns are only particularly extreme examples of the chaos of the series. The violent coming together of various sign-images always forms disjunctures. The tendency to implode a whole genre down to one or a few signs, working with a series of multiple shrunken genres can be seen in much recent work. HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER is an early example of this tendency to mix more than one genre. Eastwood mixed the western with horror, and the Japanese ghost story :

I liked the . . . irony of doing a stylised version of what happens if the sheriff in HIGH NOON is killed, and symbolically comes back as some avenging angel or something - and I think that's far more hip than doing just a straight western. (Eastwood quoted in Combs 14)

The Beaudine westerns are more extreme (and "more hip") in their mixing of the western with horror. The title BILLY THE KID VS DRACULA, using the connecting abbreviation *vs.* thematises the western as opposed to horror. JESSE JAMES MEETS FRANKENSTEIN'S DAUGHTER thematises the two genres as distinct entities that *meet*. These titles reference cheap comedy-horror films such as ABBOTT AND COSTELLO MEET FRANKENSTEIN and THE BOWERY BOYS MEET THE MONSTER. Besides the box office reasons for mixing the two genres (which corresponds to Deleuze's crystal regime of the film about money), and making it obvious in the title, these films act as a certain point of genres as self conscious simulacra. The genres are marketed as signs, and the intersection of two series becomes a joke. If we really thought that Beaudine's films were asserting generic purity, then William Beaudine would be one of the most Platonic directors in the history of the cinema.

Usually in the history of the western the formation of a particular series is not as abrupt as these two films. If all genres, as well as everything else ("reality"), exist on the one, folding, surface, and the dispersion gives the impression of separation between genres, then there will be many places where the various genres intersect in more subtle ways such as 'noir westerns' like RAMROD and PURSUED, or in ULZANA'S RAID in which the western cavalry

film intersects with the horror of the other and splatter. The Rural Bandit series, usually considered a sub genre of the gangster movie, works off the gangster movie and the western simultaneously. Certain images and signs form to produce this series that exist in the western series and the gangster series. The Rural bandit film is not a sub genre but a series that exists in the *in between* regions, in the *out of focus* condition that neither signifies gangster nor western (YOU ONLY LIVE ONCE, THEY LIVE BY NIGHT, WHITE HEAT, BONNIE AND CLYDE, BLOODY MAMA, THE GETAWAY, etc.). The wild west show in GUN CRAZY makes this point obvious. Clint Eastwood works with the same type of peripheral signification in A PERFECT WORLD. The star image of Eastwood himself is another series in which images and signs from the two genres coexist. Nicholas Ray produced self-conscious critiques of the western from the 'inside' (JOHNNY GUITAR) and from the 'outside' (THE LUSTY MEN) as if the Rodeo film and the western are part of the same surface. As a rodeo film, THE LUSTY MEN is both inside and outside the western, working off peripheral images such as the modern day cowboy, in the out of focus reaches of the western. Frontier films such as DRUMS ALONG THE MOHAWK, THE BIG SKY, DISTANT DRUMS and the many versions of THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS work with the *out of focus* condition. Their images signify as inside and outside the western, playing with the folding over of contexts. DISTANT DRUMS takes this further by being set in the Florida jungle, and playing off a previous war movie by Walsh, OBJECTIVE, BURMA !, as well as the frontier film, the western and a type of comic book jungle adventure film. The jungle becomes the image in which these two film, from different genre series, meet.

There is an international cinematic series, in which the U.S. western influenced the Japanese samurai film, and the samurai film in turn came back to the western. Kurosawa's samurai films SEVEN SAMURAI, SANJURO and YOJIMBO share many aspects of the western but are not considered "westerns". The six-gun that the samurai has in YOJIMBO, is a sign that plays with the intersection of the film with the western. YOJIMBO and SANJURO are sometimes taken as the beginnings of the postwar "existential" samurai film, making that Japanese genre part of the western series. SEVEN SAMURAI was remade by Sturges as THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN, which was what Wright terms a "professional" western, and like VERA CRUZ before it, was set in Mexico. RASHOMON was remade as THE OUTRAGE by Martin Ritt; and YOJIMBO was remade as A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS by Sergio Leone. THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN was important in crystallising the professional series of westerns, but A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS is important to my argument as it was a western made in Italy and Spain, by Italians with an American star, proving the western to cut across both generic and national boundaries.

The circuit between Japan, America and Italy also extends to the Hong Kong martial arts films of the 1960's and 1970's which in turn, through Bruce Lee, come back to America

(Chuck Norris) and to the western in KUNG FU. The series KUNG FU (attributed to an idea by Bruce Lee) with David Carradine as a Buddhist monk in the American west, was literally a martial arts western, a coming together of series. The interconnecting and folding over of series throughout the world demonstrates a particular law of impurity that has always accompanied the western as "American myth", and as "pure genre". The influence of other nationalities, culminated in the Dollars Trilogy and the return to America of Clint Eastwood and Leone's image.

Brando himself signified a certain series of films and an acting style which, when put in contact with the western, foregrounds the genre as surface, making actions and situations read as crystal-images. Brando affirms the power of the western to become false narration by the situating of his film within the Billy The Kid series of westerns. The names are changed, but the signification in ONE EYED JACKS works off an oblique relationship to the series, Brando's Rio being Billy the Kid seeking to avenge the wrong dealt to him by his old partner turned sheriff Karl Malden, who stands for Pat Garrett. The premise of two ex partners in crime finding themselves on opposite sides of the law is used to highlight the difference of ONE EYED JACKS to the other films in the series. In Brando's film it is 'Pat Garrett' who wronged 'Billy the Kid', prompting the outlaw to seek vengeance by seducing Garrett's daughter, and eventually escaping by riding off into the horizon. This is another way in which the western has always tended towards the power of the false. The same story is repeated with multiple contradictory versions. Each version is not trying to get closer to the truth but is asserting the power of paradoxical coexistence. On its release the story of ONE EYED JACKS coexists with the story of Vidor's BILLY THE KID, THE OUTLAW, THE LAW VS. BILLY THE KID and THE LEFT HANDED GUN and countless others before and after Vidor's film (as can be seen in Buscombe 66-67). This list can now be extended to BILLY THE KID VS DRACULA, YOUNG GUNS and YOUNG GUNS 2. Eastwood's UNFORGIVEN sets itself up with an oblique relation to this series. William Munny's myth as a gunfighter is referred to when the prostitute tells him "you was more cold blooded than William Bonney" (Billy the Kid). The series helps foreground the genre as nonchronological time-image.

The image of women in the western forms a series that extend into other genre series and other contexts. CAT BALLOU starts with the "Columbia" logo of the Statue of Liberty. The statue proceeds to undress and reveals itself as a cartoon of Jane Fonda as a female gunfighter, shooting two six-guns. The image of woman as liberty folds into the deconstructive image of the female gunfighter

The heroines in RANCHO NOTORIOUS, JOHNNY GUITAR and FORTY GUNS control their bands of gunmen, while deconstructing them at the same time. The male western hero is deconstructed by the female hero in the comedy THE PALEFACE. By using a comic book

literalising of the image, FORTY GUNS deconstructs the role of the male hero, the role of guns and of the codes in the western. Pop-Freudian psychology is used to interrogate the image. Just as there are female gunfighters in the western, existing as part of the same surface as the western schoolteacher, the various images of women fold out into other generic surfaces such as melodrama (DUEL IN THE SUN), film noir and the rural bandit film.

Interestingly Wright classifies DUEL IN THE SUN as a classical western (Wright 41), as by using his method Jennifer Jones becomes the hero-gunfighter (with sex as her gun). The famous final shootout between the lovers shows a folding over of simultaneously paradoxical series, the western duel and melodrama. The lovers shoot it out as they crawl towards each other, covered in blood in the realisation that they love each other. The melodrama is coexistent with the image of a western duel. The lovers duel folds over the image of the western duel between two men.

All the elements in one series exist in other series, affirming a basic chaos and impurity as the normative state, which cuts across the Platonic logic of genre. Everything is inside and outside, and the paradoxical coexistence becomes a prime motivator. Jim Collins has analysed the postmodern tendency for films to engage in transformations across genres, rather than by "mixing" genres (Collins: 245). MAD MAX 2 (ROAD WARRIOR) is exemplary in the way it works across genres. NEAR DARK cuts across the western and the horror/vampire genres, whilst BACK TO THE FUTURE III cuts across science fiction and the western. The image in BACK TO THE FUTURE III, in which we see attacking Indians (western) in the rear-vision mirror of Marty's (Michael J. Fox) time machine (science fiction), to Collins, shows the non chronological nature of our video culture, where the past and present sit side by side. This image does not show the mixing of two distinct types, but the accessibility of various images that can be called on at will in a video culture. The extremity of the present situation perhaps reveals a situation that always existed in a not so obvious way.

Genre and the Crystal Regime

Any discussion of the western as simulacrum ought to take into account Deleuze's two books on cinema. Using the theories of Henri Bergson and Charles Sanders Peirce, Deleuze proposes that the body is an image (consciousness) and objects are images. What takes place between these two images is the translation of movement. This is the movement-image. Our relationship to the screen is a repetition of our relationship to objects. This is the cinema as true repetition, not a copy. Deleuze's first book describes the organic regime of traditional representation in which the expression of movement is dominant. The second book describes what Deleuze terms "the crystal regime". This is the cinema of simulacrum, in which the

expression of movement is subservient to the expression of time. If we look at the cinema in terms of genre, which Deleuze does not specifically do, we find that the crystal regime is always already there. Genre has always worked according to the logic of the simulacrum, but Deleuze only discusses the western in relation to the organic regime of the movement-image. The action-image is perhaps the clearest expression of the movement-image. There is a small form (C1: 164-168) and a large form (C1: 142, 145-7, 151) of the action-image, both of which Deleuze relates closely to the western. Deleuze's formulation of the movement-image seems to back up Bazin's association of the western with movement (BW: 141), explaining what Bazin intuitively grasped but could not explain.

The large form of the action-image is divided into three areas: from situation to action; the laws of organic composition; and the sensory-motor link. The relation between milieux and modes of behaviour produces two inverse spirals, S.A.S.(situation-action-situation) in which the one narrows towards action and the other broadens towards a new situation, very much like "classic narrative." The "Laws of organic composition" are comprised of five points: one, the way that the milieu carries powers into effect; two, the passage from S to A - forming two lines of action (eg: convergent montage); three, "Bazin's law" whereby the two lines must meet in one shot without montage; four, the duel in which the lines of action are staked out and their simultaneity is marked; five, the gap between the situation and action which only exists to be filled. The most important of these points is the duel, and Deleuze put forth the western gunfight as the purest expression of this "law" (C1: 153). The sensory-motor link is the expression of the inner but visible link between the permeating situation and the explosive action. There are two types of movement: the plant-like movement-on-the-spot which is the permeation of the situation; and the animal-like, violent movement which is the acting out of the action. When the sensory-motor link is expressed as cause-effect, the organic regime of images is invoked. When the link is disrupted the crystal regime of simulacra is supreme.

The small form of the action-image (A.S.A.), is the inverse of the large form (S.A.S.). In the small form the blind action comes before and discloses the obscure situation. Deleuze, taking his cue from Godard, applies this formula in particular to *THE NAKED SPUR* and the westerns of Anthony Mann. All aspects of the action-image seem to describe the structure of the western incredibly well, but is this all the western is? Does the action-image, in its small and large form, explain all there is to know about the western? Surely the western if looked at from a new point of view, must break through the organic regime and into the crystal regime.

Whereas the organic regime is expressed in the movement-image, the crystal regime is most clearly expressed in the time-image. The organic is likened to representation and the crystal to the simulacrum. The crystal has an "actual-image" and a "virtual-image". This crystalline structure works on multiple levels. It splits organic conceptions of time, along the

theories of Bergson, by making the past coexist with the present, affirming time as non chronological. The crystal is always dividing itself in two, always changing. The actual image of the present which passes, and the virtual image of the past which is preserved. The actual and the virtual work as surfaces which signify ideas and thought. The "seed-image" may bring to the surface the "film in the process of being made", the "film within a film", or the "film about money" which is always a virtual-image of the film about film. Other crystal-images outlined by Deleuze are the "crystal caught in its formation or growth" (multiple strategies of viewing), and the "crystal in the process of decomposition". Can the crystal regime, which is posited along a chronological series as the organic regimes next step, tell us anything about the western which the action-image does not ?

Let me begin this experiment with some hypotheses: the western is a series of images (signs), comprising of an expansive folding surface which has no beginning, no end, no inside, no outside, no centre and no origin. As a surface, it has no moral centre located in a depth behind the surface, but it exhibits the multiple positioning and shallowness of the simulacrum. There is no single privileged subject position, but a constantly changing series of points which fluctuate according to context. What I am doing is an "experiment" because I am going to apply these hypotheses to the western, not attempt to "prove them" logically. I want to see what happens.

If my hypotheses are so, then the western exists on the same surface plane on which the gangster film and other genres coexist. This plane folds and disperses its elements. The western cannot be separated from the gangster film (as we can see in *THE OKLAHOMA KID* and in the image of Clint Eastwood), nor the comedy (*THE PALEFACE*, *BLAZING SADDLES*) and other genres such as melodrama (*DUEL IN THE SUN*) and film noir (*RAMROD*, *CORONER CREEK*). It is the same surface on which the popular cinema coexists with the art movie and the experimental film and the whole body of the cinema. Popular culture and high culture coexist in complex and contradictory interrelationships, all sharing the same surface. The western is particularly fruitful for analysing these relationships, as can be seen in the films of Bud Boetticher, whose work posits itself simultaneously as high and low culture (intellectual and entertaining), and who when working in genres other than the western emphasises "the western elements" that exist as part of those other films (eg: *THE BULLFIGHTER AND THE LADY*, and *THE RISE AND FALL OF LEGS DIAMOND*). The cinema itself is not a distinct, separate surface - it is the same surface which folds into everything else. The western cannot be separated from the real, embodied in "history" and everyday "reality". On this surface, where there are no hierarchies and pure self-contained centres, a series is formed through dispersions and the coming together of clusters of images (signs). These repetitions and dispersions overlap and form paradoxical coexistences, denying the traditional notion of a pure genre with a centre,

an origin, an inside and an outside. This notion of genre I am invoking draws on Deleuze's discussion of the simulacrum (LS: 253), as well as his use of Leibniz (C2: 130).

Credit sequences are often an indication of the generic image as crystal, containing multiple surfaces of meaning. The credit sequence of *THE WESTERNER* makes this clear. The title "*THE WESTERNER*" is superimposed over the image of Garry Cooper on a horse. This film may be a classic western, but that does not mean that the image merely refers to the content and nothing else. The image is the sign of the *pure hero* of the western, the cowboy who lives between nature and culture, committing himself to nothing. The image is conscious of its status as code, and is a virtual image of the past of the genre. This is all the more obvious when compared to the end credit in which the hero has given up his status as westerner, to marry and join the social. The image of Cooper kissing his wife dissolves to a corn field with "*THE END*" superimposed. The "corny" irony that the western is finished once the hero is civilised is not lost on the film. It seems necessary for the image to be used as crystal in order for the film to function as a classical western. In order to signify a level of irony in the present image which passes, it must play off a virtual image of the past, of previous western images. When the credit sequence of *THE NAKED SPUR* is compared to that of *THE WESTERNER* we can see how the image is a crystal dividing and deconstructing its many surfaces. The credit works in relation to the type of western credit that we find in *THE WESTERNER*. *THE NAKED SPUR* opens with the credit for Jimmy Stewart and Janet Leigh, then pans violently to the close up of a spur on a cowboy boot. The shot is maintained as the words *THE NAKED SPUR* are superimposed over the image of the spur. This superimposition of word and image, signifier and signified, can be compared to the superimposition of the title of *THE WESTERNER* over Garry Cooper in the earlier film. Interestingly in both titles the word and image retain the power of the signifier, maintaining a surface quality. The Mann title plays on the knowledge of the earlier style, substituting a minor element of the western image for that of the westerner. The credit of *THE WESTERNER* is a virtual image in the credit sequence of *THE NAKED SPUR*. The actual image of *THE NAKED SPUR* immediately passes from the present, both into the past of the genre and into the future of the genre. The word "naked" is significant here as a sensational, faintly erotic adjective, forcing a shift in the western image. This deconstruction of the image is taken further when the shot is maintained as the spur rides off into the screen, producing a reverse image of that of the westerner on his horse. This time the directors credit "*Directed by: Anthony Mann*" is superimposed over the cowboy. The image plays off the image of the man on the horse with the words Man(n). If the western title was always in the realm of surfaces, then this title by Mann is certainly a crystal-image. The credit sequences in Leone's westerns, with the Moricone music, the literalization of the signs of the western, and the

movement of the titles (often with gunshots) is self-conscious simulacra, but it seems, the western always produced the image as simulacra.

The characteristics of the time-image can be found in all westerns, but there are some that exploit these qualities more than others or more consciously. *THE WESTERNER* or *RED RIVER* looked at from one point of view may explain Deleuze's action-image, but looked at particularly from the point of view of genre it consciously asserts a time-image, genre as simulacrum. The western through the powers of the cliché, and its relationship to fluctuating images that form the genre, is able to render the organic regime as the crystal regime. This manoeuvre which displaces Deleuze's modernism, is reminiscent of Pop Art, and attests to a power that popular art forms always already had and that was imitated by the Pop Art movement.

If the western has a particular relationship to surface, it is however, like all genre, a form of time-image as it is never stable, never in the present, always moving, always changing according to the viewpoint taken, the film watched and the new film that constantly redefine its parameters. All generic texts have a virtual-image of the past which is preserved, and an actual-image of the present which passes. The present in any generic text splits "in two heterogeneous directions, one of which is launched towards the future while the other falls into the past" (C2: 81). Each text has in its image the past of the genre and the future possibilities of the genre. It can never be understood alone, always forcing an intertextual relationship that is akin to the time-image. The western as experience is never in the present.

Folding Red River: The Classical and the Baroque

In Bazin's seminal article "The Evolution of the Western" (BEW: 149-157) we can see at work the four successive aesthetic stages devised by Henri Focillon in his book *Vie des formes*. The four aesthetic stages comprise of the primitive stage, the classical stage, the radiating stage, and the baroque stage which Tom Conley describes in this way:

An "experimental" beginning seeks solutions to problems that the "classical" moment discovers and exploits. A radiating (rayonnant) period refines the solutions of the former to a degree of preciousity, while a "baroque" phase at once sums up, turns upon, contorts, and narrates the formulas of all the others. (Conley x)

These stages are generally assumed to be chronological. Bazin uses these stages to further an essentialist reading of the western, proposing the classical as the stage which is closest to the essence of the true western. Omar Calabrese, however, proposes that all four of these stages coexist within any single work (Calabrese 18-22). This is similar to Deleuze's crystal image, in which non-chronological time-images coexist as multi-faceted surfaces. Calabrese's use of

Focillon's stages seems to be most reasonable when scanning the various writings on the western, noting the contradictory interpretations of various films. Whereas Ford is generally considered to occupy the "classical" centre of the genre (Kitses, Wollen), Warshow's assessment of him would seem to be "baroque". To Bazin *STAGECOACH* occupies the classical centre of the genre, whilst *MY DARLING CLEMENTINE* is baroque. Lovell, on the other hand puts *MY DARLING CLEMENTINE* at the centre of the genre, as *the* classical western. *RED RIVER* is generally considered (by Bazin and Hawks himself) to be a classical western, but Schatz sees it as baroque (Schatz 40). Both Warshow and Bazin consider *SHANE* a baroque manipulation of the genre as myth, but to Wright it is a classical western. *THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY* is considered a primitive western, but its manipulation of its intertextual connections with the Lumiere film are undeniably "baroque" in Conley's reading of Focillon. We can trace back the recognition of the genre as simulation right back to the "first" western film *THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY* in 1903. In this film we can detect a self conscious relationship with the Lumiere film of a train entering a station. Porter's train is given narrative to further involve the audience, the train enters from right to left instead of "at" the audience, it appears through a window, and the shock of the train coming towards the screen is transformed to a cowboy shooting at the audience.

Aldrich's *VERA CRUZ* (along with his other early westerns *APACHE* and *THE LAST SUNSET*) is a study of the western as surface. Bazin categorised *VERA CRUZ* as a classical western. This it is not. Aldrich has taken all the aspects of the classical western and the action-image and rendered them as sheer surface. The film opens with a series of credits that simultaneously evoke the loose style of writing of the western title, and the blood red credits of an E.C. horror comic. After a section of writing has passed explaining the movement of bands of gunfighters down to the war in Mexico, the image of a lone horseman on the horizon appears with the title superimposed: ". . . *And Some Came Alone.*" Aldrich has rendered the image of the cowboy to the milieu as a crystal-image, evoking the various differences that the genre plays on with the image (such as in the credit sequences of films such as *THE WESTERNER*), and the audiences understanding of the role of repetition. The next frame is a perfectly centred image of Garry Cooper riding straight to the camera, surrounded by a flat horizon. This is the image of a moving object (cowboy and horse) on abstract plane. As a time-image this recalls the persistent image of the cowboy-milieu relationship, forcing the Euclidean geometry of the western to become a sign of itself.²

²The images in the western, from the cowboy on horseback on the open plain, to the western town as a series of objects sitting on an abstract grid, are the most succinct expression in the cinema of the modernist transition from figure-ground relationships to the abstract object-plane relationship that characterises

The raising of the organic regime to the surface of the crystal regime may perhaps be best seen in Aldrich's treatment of the duel. The duel takes place between two has-been gunfighters: Garry Cooper and Burt Lancaster. The slow build up using deep focus shots, accentuating the perspective of the duel and the rapid cutting that takes place in the moment of fire treats the gunfight as a crystal-image, recalling in its virtual images the whole history of the western. When the shooting is finished it appears as if neither have been shot. Just as we have finally come to this conclusion, Burt Lancaster falls to the ground dead. Time is rendered as unreasonable, as stretched to the nth degree. Time is either too quick (the shooting) or too slow (the death). The bullet hitting the cowboy is not meant to refer to a real event, but to the signs of this classical western image of the shootout. This sign is treated as a surface which can be stretched and distorted. The speed of the shooting does not refer to the gunfighter as magical god, as in *THE GUNFIGHTER*, but to the classical western as stretched and distorted surface. The final duel in *VERA CRUZ* can be taken as marking a point in the history of the reception of the western in which the image becomes baroque surface. The send-up of the scene in *Mad* magazine, in which the gunfight takes place with no one apparently hurt, Lancaster goes home and (among other things) cleans his teeth before suddenly falling down dead, tends to demonstrate the importance of this point. The surface of Aldrich's western produces an effect that is of the powers of the false. This happens because the foregrounding of the sign removes the sign from a direct and causal relationship with the signified, leaving the meaning as ambiguous and contradictory. Aldrich gunfighters are like the forger that Deleuze writes about (C2: 137-147), the character that asserts the power of paradox, denying truth and purity. These manoeuvres take place at the same time as Aldrich moves the western down to Mexico.

If Focillon's stages are non-chronological and coexist in any one work it is impossible to have a film that is a pure example of any one stage. The stages work as signifiers that can help understand the work and communicate to an audience. The stages might be used to form series of films, such as the "classical" series, which are series with no centre, existing in paradoxical coexistence with other series. Such series would not be pure, but would act as time-images, simultaneously containing other series. For example, the early westerns of Robert Aldrich form a consistent series by one auteur of baroque westerns. *VERA CRUZ* seems baroque in its treatment of the western image as surface, not as metaphysical form, signifying a content behind the depth of its surface image. Bazin, however, cites it as a classical western. Indeed the classical must coexist with the baroque, as it is essential to Aldrich's treatment of it as surface (the final gunfight between Cooper and Lancaster, the opening credits). The classical is needed in the film so that the film can break beyond its mythical boundaries and contort its

modernist architecture and painting (from de Chirico to Russian constructivism, to Brazilia).

rules. The infusion, in VERA CRUZ, of the type of image found in Mexican mural painting as part of the western is a case in point, and becomes relevant to the development of Leone's image. VERA CRUZ is also an experimental western (as are all westerns) particularly due to its early use of Superscope, a similar wide screen technique to Cinemascope. Lawrence Alloway credits VERA CRUZ with "the first vertical downward shot on the big screen", as well as "free and mobile" camera movements (Alloway 22). The "radiating" aspect of VERA CRUZ may be most manifest in its setting (Mexico) and its' use of Lancaster, who had starred in COME BACK LITTLE SHEBA the year before, cast opposite one of the western archetypes, Garry Cooper.

RED RIVER is considered a classical western. This is what it signifies to most audiences. But if, as Calabrese argues, the four stages coexist in any one work, then RED RIVER's status as classical is merely a sign, denoting it as part of a series of classical westerns. In this way the term "classical" loses its status (endowed by Bazin) as the essence of the genre, becoming one of many generic signifiers. The classical is not a pure self contained category, but a certain modulation of the image that by nature is impure. The status of impurity in the classical denies the possibility of the pure. A film using the classical as a sign is not necessarily ruled by the logic of the classical. In RED RIVER presumably the genre effect is achieved through an overlay of all four stages, even though most audiences may see the classical aspect as dominant. RED RIVER is not unique in this respect, and I would argue that a similar situation is true of all classical westerns, even the most unselfconscious B westerns (if such exist), and TV westerns such as THE LONE RANGER.

Important here is the idea that we go to the *centre* of the genre to find how it *decentres* itself; that we find in the sameness of the classical what Deleuze calls the endless depth of the simulacrum. If genre is time-image, then even the most straightforward "classical" texts must be seen in terms of repetition based on difference, rather than repetition of the same. I intend to discuss certain aspects of RED RIVER in detail in order to suggest that the "classical" in it cannot be separated from the "baroque".

RED RIVER was posited by Hawks as a consciously classical western. However, Hawks use of repetition plays off the notion that the film is somehow at the centre of what constitutes the genre, but a genre constituted as infinite possibilities of variation within the formula. The idea of the centre as put forward by RED RIVER, is decentred, a constantly shifting entity with no pure static state. We have in RED RIVER, and in Hawks other westerns and his comments, the idea that this centre is a limitless source of repetition and difference. The centre of this genre would seem to have characteristics similar to the simulacrum as described by Deleuze:

Resemblance then can be thought only as the product of this internal difference. It matters little whether the system has great external and slight internal difference, or whether the opposite is the case, provided that resemblance be

produced on a curve, and that difference, whether great or small, always occupy the centre of the thus decentred system. (LS 262)

Hawks revels in repetition. Besides reading as almost a checklist of western situations, actions and images, RED RIVER has a few particularly poignant points of repetition. The final showdown between Montgomery Clift and John Wayne plays with the similar ending that Hawks wrote and directed for Howard Hughes film THE OUTLAW. The ending was so similar that Hughes threatened legal action. Besides Hawks wanting to get it right this time, and wanting to get it out under his signature, there was also the recognition that generic expectations and enjoyment rely on difference, not similarity. In the audience's enjoyment of generic films, the manipulation of difference is placed above that of similarity.

In Hawks subsequent westerns he continued this practice of repeating elements, actions and images from his previous westerns, each time marking the difference. This can be seen in the repetition of the scene in which Walter Brennan throws Wayne the rifle in RED RIVER, when in RIO BRAVO Ricky Nelson throws Wayne the rifle. The use of actors in these westerns was another form of repetition; for example, Robert Mitchum's character in EL DORADO is played off Dean Martin's in RIO BRAVO, but this time the drunk is the sheriff. The titles of the film's: RED RIVER, RIO BRAVO and RIO LOBO are another play on the repetition. RIO BRAVO derives its meaning and enjoyment through its difference from HIGH NOON. Here Hawks critiqued HIGH NOON and 3.10 TO YUMA for venturing outside the classic western plot structure in order to enhance or justify the genre. Implicit in Hawks comments on his reasons for making RIO BRAVO is the idea that the classic western plot, those that evolve around the centre of the genre, have an endless depth to their repetition, one that does not need to be justified by the infusion of other more serious genres³. Between Hawks westerns and his comments, we have an implicit theory of the western as simulacra. To Hawks, repetition in the western is never the repetition of the same, but the repetition of difference. If a situation is resolved one way in one film, then the same situation may be resolved another way in the next film. This attitude of Hawks to repetition in his westerns, is indicative of the relation that the repetition in RED RIVER has to THE OUTLAW and other westerns such as those of Ford, and the westerns John Wayne made for Republic in the 1940's. RED RIVER defines the classic western as a baroque, moving, modulation of matter, not the enclosed static frame usually associated with the classical.

The relation of repetition to genre is doubled and commented upon in RED RIVER by the cyclic way in which the events in Dunson's (Wayne's) life repeat as events in Matt's (Clift's)

³Hawks discusses the role of repetition in his westerns in positive terms, and gives reasons for making RIO BRAVO in reaction to HIGH NOON and 3.10 TO YUMA. (McBride 14-26)

life.⁴ This doubling whereby the plot folds itself to produce the possibility of endless repetition of the same differently, is a baroque tendency coexisting with and propelling the classical western plot. Wayne gives a bracelet to a girl but she dies, killed by Indians when he leaves her. Clift gives the same bracelet to Joanne Dru, but she survives the Indians, meets him again after he has left her, causes the happy ending and they get married. The same situation is repeated, but the second one has different resolution. The happy ending, in which Dru stops Wayne and Clift from killing each other, is an acknowledgment of the repetition in genre. Hawks makes it obvious that the narrative need for one of them to die is pointless, and we may as well enjoy the repetition.⁵

The relation of RED RIVER to the centre of the genre is a telling one; it simultaneously posits itself as a central western text, while producing that centre as an *out of focus condition* that cannot be finitely located. The "voyage form" (C1: 210) of the film produces the centre and the boundary as always in the past or future, but never in the present, never definable.⁶ The journey is not Ford's westward journey to paradise (WAGONMASTER), but the northward economic journey to sell cattle. The voyage form of the narrative ensures the film is always moving; the western set becomes a flowing manipulation of images, actions and situations. All the images of the western are encountered in varying combinations along the journey. While the western town is only seen at the end, and the saloon is not seen at all, they are there to be encountered at any time. The treatment of images is non-chronological, constantly shifting and one is always overflowing into the next. If the western town is for most of the film out of frame, then one knows that with a slight change in the action the present image could run into it. The relation of these classic western images is ruled by a baroque tendency that treats the images as matter that overflows boundaries, rather than being constricted by them. We see here a type of baroque chaos that exists within the classical, as integral to its functioning, denying the classical as a pure entity, separate from the baroque.

One of the most famous images in the film is the 360 degree pan that occurs at the start of the cattle drive. The purity of this shot is famous: its geometric circular movement is posited at the centre of the genre, at the centre of classical Hollywood cinema; it denotes the symbolic

⁴Warshow touches on this aspect of generic repetition in his analysis of THE GUNFIGHTER, where the gunfighter is compelled to live out his generic destiny, which will be inherited by the young gunfighter who kills him (WW 146). This repetition can be seen in "oedipal" westerns such as A MAN WITHOUT A STAR, ALONG THE GREAT DIVIDE, PURSUED and even in Anthony Mann's WINCHESTER 73.

⁵It is interesting to compare this to Bud Boetticher's view of the western as repetition. In films such as THE TALL T, BUCHANAN RIDES ALONE, RIDE LONESOME and COMANCHE STATION the genre is treated with a sense of irony towards the code that thematises the play of repetition and difference. The circular plots, and the irony with which the characters play out their archetypal roles can be seen as a type of eternal recurrence. In COMANCHE STATION it is implied that Randolph Scott's character has lived out the same plot for ten years; in BUCHANAN RIDES ALONE the actions happen twice, and Scott comments upon it the second time he is put in jail. Each film in Boetticher's "Ranown" series acts as a type of repetition of the last, through which enjoyment is gained through privileging the differences.

⁶The basic story of RED RIVER recalls the (Oedipal) story of THE MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY.

centre of the film and the subject positioning of the western. However, if analysed in another way, this circular movement seems to correspond to the decentred circle of the simulacrum. The circular point of view shot does not describe the supposed single dominant subject position that westerns are often credited with. The shot starts off as Wayne's point of view and ends as Cliff's point of view⁷ Deleuze's description of the simulacrum seems relevant here:

Plato specifies how this nonproductive effect is obtained: the simulacrum implies huge dimensions, depths, and distances that the observer cannot master. It is precisely because he cannot master them that he experiences the impression of resemblance. This simulacrum includes the differential point of view, and the observer becomes a part of the simulacrum itself, which is transformed and deformed by his point of view. (LS 258)

The single circular pan, describes the circle as impure, the centre and the western as infinite depth, where the multiple point of view is included. I would extend this to say that the shot includes the viewer, making the viewer part of the simulacrum. This shot is indicative of much "classic" Hollywood mise en scene, which shifts from subjective to objective camera work within a single shot.⁸ This often includes the viewer's, the camera's and the character's point of view, while blurring the distinction between them. The impression given is that of the same, but in fact it includes an inbuilt difference, and the differential point of view.

Beyond the inclusion of the differential point of view, genre is at least a three-way relationship between auteur (director, star, etc), film (the individual work and those that precede it and are to come), and the audience. The generic text is created through a complex relationship that accentuates this difference in a product that has the image of sameness. The important point is that this image is based on difference; the three factors that help form the film are not reconciled in a single dominant viewpoint but one that expresses that process. This is why Deleuze talks of the impression of sameness in terms of the simulacrum that masks the depths and differential point of view of the simulacrum. Genre, and the western in particular, is subject to the same vertigo as the simulacrum: it is inherently decentred, has the impression of origin and centre; it has the impression of sameness but is in fact based on difference, containing huge dimensions which the viewer cannot totally master; it has the impression of favouring a single dominant point of view, but in fact contains the multiple, paradoxical and shifting point of view of the simulacrum. Hawks goes straight for the centre, and shows it to have the depth of the simulacrum, the anarchy of the baroque. RED RIVER renders the generic frame of the classical western as an out of focus condition upon which the images flow. The

⁷A good analysis of this shot can be found in Mast, G. *Howard Hawks - Storyteller*. Oxford Uni. Press. 1982. pp.313-314.

⁸The blurring of the distinction between the objective (what the camera sees) and the subjective (what the character sees), is central to Deleuze's discussion of the "powers of the false", which corresponds to the simulacrum. (C2: 147-148)

images flow like matter denying boundaries, causing the frame to disappear through the surge of the baroque, but all the time using the sign of the classical. RED RIVER posits the classical centre as the *in-between* state: unlocatable.

The Clint Eastwood Crystal

The image of the star, like Elvis in FLAMING STAR, is a crystal image which form series' and cuts across generic boundaries. We can see this situation as early as 1939 in THE OKLAHOMA KID in which the self conscious use of "gangster" actors (James Cagney as the hero, Humphrey Bogart as the villain) playing cowboys forces the two genres to fold over each other, the gangster movie and the western becoming part of the one paradoxical surface. This film's experience of the gangster and western genre is mirrored in Robert Warshow's articles on the two genres which work so well together that they cannot be separated as easily as might be thought. Warshow puts "the westerner" at the centre of the western. The westerner is defined in opposition to the gangster, although both are defined by their relationship to guns and the code. The westerner is cool and introverted (*classical*), the gangster is aggressive, brutal, extroverted (*baroque*) (WG 132). Interestingly, Eastwood combines both of these significations into the one image. It is repeated by Bogart in VIRGINIA CITY and by Cagney in RUN FOR COVER, but is in fact a common occurrence (it cannot not happen) and colours the way that the intertextuality of the star constantly cuts across generic boundaries. This is the point that Scorsese makes in his gangster film GOODFELLAS when Joe Pesci as a gangster cites THE OKLAHOMA KID as a gangster role model. The point that the two genres coexist as part of the same surface, and are inextricably mixed, is reiterated at the end of the film when Scorsese quotes the cowboy shooting at the screen scene from THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY.

The emergence of the cool gangster in the 1950's in films such as THE RISE AND FALL OF LEGS DIAMOND can be seen as certain signs associated with the cowboys image migrating to the gangster. (just as the cool of the westerner infiltrated the image of the cop in the TV series DRAGNET and certain aspects of the gangster image migrated through to the cop in the G Man films and the rogue cop movies). During the 1950's the cool associated with the cowboy often replaced the hot, aggressiveness of the "classical" gangster. This brings us back to how the two Warshow articles can be read as part of the same paradoxical surface, often one folding over the other. Warshow wrote that "the introspective gangster is a fairly recent development" (WW 136), implying that characteristics of the westerner were being taken on by the gangster. That Boetticher achieved one of the most succinct expressions of this (in LEGS DIAMOND) is fitting as he worked primarily in westerns. Just as Warshow's two articles on two "distinct" genres coexist and fold over one another, so do the images in the films, the

images of the cowboy and gangster; the images of guns; of violence and movement; the image of existential cool and the image of baroque aggression. The image of the lone cowboy on the abstract plain may have the appearance of purity, but this surface does however overlap with the field of vision that the gangster and cop inhabit.

In *ONE EYED JACKS*, Brando himself signified a certain series of films and an acting style, which when put in contact with the western, foregrounds the genre as image, making actions and situations read as crystal-image. In the process of this clash brought about by Brando and the western, comes a distancing of the image which forces the perception of the genre as sign. This brings the organic nature of the Actors Studio to the level of the crystal. Brando treats aspects of Deleuze's movement-image (that schematically can be paralleled to the classical western) particularly what he terms the laws of organic composition, as time-image (or as baroque surface), through a slowing down of the action to the point where the relationship of the character to milieu and the convergent passages from situation to action are read as signs of the genre.

Like Cagney and Bogart in *THE OKLAHOMA KID*, Frank Sinatra in *JOHNNY CONCHO* and Dean Martin in *RIO BRAVO* are stars who model their "real life" image on the gangster and Las Vegas (where the western town and the gangster come together in a single crystalline neon image) and bring this signification with them into their western roles. Sinatra and Dino along with the rat-pack switched from gangster rat-pack movies (*OCEANS ELEVEN*) to rat pack westerns (*SERGEANTS 3* and *FOUR FOR TEXAS*) as if there were no separation between the two. Their presence in the two genres was interchangeable, as if their images existed on the same surface, scattered through the genres (including musical and comedy). The Vegas card game took on an overt western "cool", while seeming to exist as part of a gangster series. Dean Martin's role in *RIO BRAVO* makes reference to his Vegas gangster image when he deals the cards, and the songs that he and Ricky Nelson sing reference their singing careers (rockabilly and crooning as cowboy songs). Dean Martin also had made comedy westerns with Jerry Lewis such as *PARDNERS* (1956) in which they shoot "the end" credit, disturbing the distinction between diegetic and non-diegetic. His role as comic also enters *RIO BRAVO* through his "drunk" persona entering the image of the cowboy.

"Punk, you're lucky that you're livin, 'cause I'm the UNFORGIVEN. "

- Ice Cube "Make it Ruff, Make it smooth".

Lethal Injection (Priority Records 1994)

Just as Ice Cube connects the western to the Hip Hop culture, he simultaneously evokes both the western image of Clint Eastwood by referencing *UNFORGIVEN*, and his image as the

rogue cop, through the use of the word "punk" from the famous Dirty Harry series⁹. Clint Eastwood exists as a crystal-image which cuts across generic boundaries, rendering the various genres as part of an ever shifting surface. In the star image of Clint Eastwood the six-gun and .44 magnum coexist on the same surface. Eastwood's situation is the opposite to, and more complex than THE OKLAHOMA KID, in which stars signifying gangsters play westerners. Eastwood made his name playing a westerner, the Man with No Name, in Leone's "Dollars Trilogy"¹⁰. He then made COOGANS BLUFF in which he played a cop from Arizona on mission in New York City. The film consciously plays on the insertion of the signs of the cowboy into the modern day cop. This film acts as a transition for Eastwood's image into DIRTY HARRY where the image of the rogue cop coexists with the westerner in the one image. By the time of UNFORGIVEN we have a situation where the Man with No Name informs the image, as well as Dirty Harry - here the rogue cop as westerner comes back and infects the westerner.

Eastwood dedicates UNFORGIVEN to "Sergio and Don", denoting the importance within the film of the Man with No Name and Dirty Harry. The film he directed after UNFORGIVEN, A PERFECT WORLD, also plays off these two series, as well as referencing his career in an oblique way. The obvious allegory of the film is the end of the perfect world, the end of truth and certainty that came symbolically with the assassination of Kennedy in 1963. In a way this signifies as the end of the modern world and the start of the world of the simulacrum. It also coincides with the start of Eastwood's career as the Man with No Name in A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS in 1964. At this point Eastwood's image is raised to the surface nature of the simulacrum

From 1964 on, Eastwood consciously set out to invert the image of the westerner embodied in John Wayne: "I do all the stuff John Wayne would never do . . ." (Frayling Clint 154). It is interesting that Eastwood spent the first seven years as a cowboy playing Rowdy Yates in the RAWHIDE television series. RAWHIDE was loosely based on RED RIVER, and Eastwood played the side-kick, corresponding to Montgomery Clift's role. Like Clift turning on Wayne in RED RIVER it seems fitting that Eastwood would do a similar manoeuvre to Wayne's western image. Eastwood's collaboration with Leone coincided with what Deleuze calls "the moment of pop art", in their spaghetti westerns starting in 1964. These films, A FISTFUL OF

⁹The Beastie Boys in their song "High Plains Drifter" make a similar point. They bring together the image of a hip hop gangster, stealing cars and holding up 7-11's, being tailed by Dirty Harry. They combine this with Eastwood's image as a westerner, via the Man with No Name of HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER. The chaos of the song posits Eastwood's image on both sides of the law. "High Plains Drifter", Paul's Boutique, Brooklyn Dust Music, Capital Records Inc. 1989.

¹⁰The linking of Eastwood with the image of the westerner is an obvious, widely recognised point. This can be seen in the central joke of BACK TO THE FUTURE III, in which Martie goes back to the "real" west, telling everyone his name is Clint Eastwood, and no one knows who that is.

DOLLARS, FOR A FEW DOLLARS MORE and THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY posit the genre as self-conscious simulacrum.

The Man with No Name is itself a crystal image. The image brings to the surface aspects of the westerner as analysed by Warshow, and consciously inflects and literalises them much as THE LONE RANGER did earlier. Robert Warshow's argument about the western has often been read as an essentialising one, but much of his argument is an implicit exposition of the western as simulacra. What Warshow's article reveals about the role of the code, the image (as surface), the relation of the code to the "real" (realism as a style), and the role of repetition in the western, implicitly supports a theory of the western as repetition and difference, that Eastwood's Man with No Name made explicit. In the western the code becomes a literalisation of what Deleuze terms the organic regime, forcing it to break through the cliché and assert the power of the false. Warshow sees the characters in THE VIRGINIAN as living by a code - not by an organic 'reality', but by the rules of a genre. The film cannot be seen as purely organic if a code is what determines the actions.

To Warshow the western is preoccupied with the extrinsic nature of the image; with the image's surface. The preoccupation with style - as seen in the image of the cowboy, the images of guns, and the experience of violence as a style - to Warshow is directly opposed to the anti-style of modernism. Here we have the western using style as an extrinsic relation to an object, as opposed to modernism's anti-style, in which an intrinsic relation to an "idea" is seen as a true relation. In this respect Warshow's assessment of the western is more radical than Jim Kitses, who favours the intrinsic. The central concern of the westerner is "honour", but here honour is a style, not an intrinsic moral value. Warshow's westerner is concerned about image, where his guns are, how he reacts and moves in moments of calm and of violence, "the clarity of his physical image against his bare landscape" (WW: 139). The westerner does not hide his gun, he is a walking sign whose appearance is his essence. Guns are also treated as surface signs, as is violence. Violence is not "real" but the experience of violence as simulacra: violence is a style. Warshow implied that the western was always in the realm of simulacra, as we can see from his analysis of THE VIRGINIAN. Clint Eastwood's manipulation of the westerners image as the Man with No Name rendered the westerns tendency to become surface explicit.

The crystal-image that the Man with No Name embodied can be compared fruitfully to Wright's list of character actions for the western hero. Just as Wright's list tends to literalise the westerners image, so did Eastwood before him. In the Dollars Trilogy the functions of the classical western hero as described by Will Wright (Wright 48-49) are raised to a level of simulacra, where the signs pertaining to the hero are literalised, inverted and played with. Wright's chronological lists of functions exist in the image of Clint Eastwood, and in the image of Leone's films, all at the one time. They are not progressively drawn out throughout the

narrative. *THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY* starts with a shootout. Generally the shootout, if we follow Wright's list, would take place towards the end of the film, at point 12, but here it is the first scene. The figure of the Man with No Name at every moment plays off a knowledge of these images and actions and his image gains its significance from the implicit (crystal) image of the actions performed by the western hero, such as those described by Wright or Warshow.

Added to this image of the western hero is the pop existentialism which seems to narrate and critique the other images in the Clint Eastwood crystal. Existentialism has been used by others to inform the western image, such as Monte Hellman's *RIDE THE WHIRLWIND* and *THE SHOOTING*, but in the Man with No Name existentialism is a pop sign, not a philosophy. Comedy infiltrates the western hero in the image of the Man with No Name, showing the impossibility of keeping various series separate and distinct. The bounty hunter, previously a minor part of the western, became, in the dollars trilogy, one of the main signifiers in the image of the Man with No Name. The bounty hunter had featured as a central character in the Anthony Mann westerns *THE NAKED SPUR* and *THE TIN STAR*, in Bud Boetticher's *RIDE LONESOME*, in de Toth's *THE BOUNTY HUNTER* and in the TV series that made Steve McQueen a star, *WANTED: DEAD OR ALIVE*. Eastwood's use of the bounty hunter in *UNFORGIVEN* brings the Man with No Name to the foreground of its image. A notable use of the bounty hunter between the dollars trilogy and *UNFORGIVEN* is *BLADERUNNER*, which was adapted for the screen by David Webb Peoples, who wrote *UNFORGIVEN*.

DIRTY HARRY belongs to a series of police films that themselves have taken images from the gangster film. It is well known that due to the Hays code, elements of the image of the gangster were utilised for the detective in films about U.S. federal agents (*THE G MEN*). Rogue cop films such as *THE ENFORCER* with Bogart, *ON DANGEROUS GROUND*, *ROGUE COP*, and *THE BIG HEAT* had a similar treatment of the gangster and cop as part of the same surface. When Clint Eastwood made *DIRTY HARRY* the rogue cop series was overlaid on the western series, rendering these supposedly distinct genres as part of the one folding surface plane. In *DIRTY HARRY* genres are not seen as separate distinct entities in which a meaning is hidden behind the depth of a surface, but the opposite. The meaning is on the surface. Whereas previously the aggressive gangster became part of the policeman, and in the fifties the gangster himself became cool like the westerner, now the cool westerner, the Man with No Name enters the image of the cop (culminating in the *ROBO COP* films) in a more obvious way than in *DRAGNET* through the star image of Clint Eastwood.

Clint Eastwood's image in *UNFORGIVEN* as the bounty hunter William Munny relies primarily on the image of the Man with No Name and Harry Callahan in *DIRTY HARRY*. In this way, a film which signifies as a western, through the image of its star and prime signifier

denies strict generic boundaries. UNFORGIVEN would not make as much sense if we excluded DIRTY HARRY. Certainly the scene in which Munny kills Little Bill gains some of its power through its relation to the scene in which Harry kills Scorpio. When Munny shoots Little Bill with the line "deserves got nothing to do with it", it is a crystal-image which recalls Harry Callahan saying "This is a .44 Magnum, the most powerful handgun in the world . . . do you feel lucky , punk ?" and "Go ahead, make my day".. William Munny is a folding over of two genre surfaces: the westerner inverted by the Man with No Name and the cop Harry Callahan. The image of William Munny actually takes these images and decentres them further. When Munny (Eastwood) says to Ned (Morgan Freeman) "*remember that drover I shot through the mouth and his teeth came out the back of his head ?*" he evokes an image of recent splatter films or postmodern horror (such as EVIL DEAD 2) as well as Peckinpah's slow motion violence and the reputation the Eastwood/Leone westerns had for exploitation-style violence in the 1960's. When Munny sits in the saloon before being beaten up, he clutches his coat around him and shivers, looking simultaneously like the image of a gangster and a westerner. After Munny is beaten up by Little Bill, he crawls to safety, recalling a similar scene in A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS. Through the multiple contradictory viewpoints and in the framing of the hero in the images, Clint Eastwood has decentred the hero. He is constantly pushed from the centre of the image, which is a contrast to Leone who literalised the hero through centring.

My name is John Ford- I make Westerns: Genre and Auteur

The auteur theory cuts across generic boundaries; it has been used to simultaneously essentialise genre, while at the same time it has been used to undermine genre. Certain auteurs (leaving aside the question of the star as auteur to focus on the role of the director) have come to signify the western through the films they made, the publicity surrounding them and the critical writings on them. The quote "My name is John Ford, I make westerns"(used as a chapter title in Bogdanovich 6) shows Ford's self-consciousness in this respect, making him the prime example; but there are also William S. Hart, Raoul Walsh, Anthony Mann, Bud Boetticher, Sam Peckinpah, Delmer Daves, Clint Eastwood and others. An auteur can come to signify a genre, but will show characteristic ways of doing things that will appear in other non western films by the same auteur. As we have seen John Ford came to signify the centre of the western.

The star is a more visible image of the transgression of strict generic boundaries than is the "auteur". However the auteur is an important way in which genre series coexist with other series. Much writing about the "auteur theory" has been centred around the "intent" of the auteur, finding the true meaning of the work through finding out about its "creator". Here I would like to displace the metaphysics of "intent", to show how the auteur theory works as

"images" to effect the signification of a film or series of films. If we look at a typical "auteurist" book, such as Robin Wood's study of Howard Hawks (or even Gerald Mast's), we see an analysis of a series of images and how they are manipulated over a series of genres. The common characteristics and threads are shown to exist across genre boundaries. Generally the auteur theory was seen as an accompaniment to genre theory, not a theory that deconstructs genre theory, as I am proposing. The manipulation of images and situations by an auteur such as Hawks forms a series that extends into every genre he worked in (comedy, war, gangster, science-fiction horror, film noir, musical, historical epic, the western). This manipulation of images sometimes reaches a popular recognition (as with Hitchcock and Ford) where an auteur series is given its own name ("a John Ford film"), but often works as a more "silent" transgression of genre series (or as a law of impurity).

Jean Luc Godard in his essay on Anthony Mann "Supermann: Man of the West" (Godard 116) plays with the idea of an auteur signing his name with a genre. The play on the word and name "man(n)" in relation to the title of the film and its director Anthony Mann carries through to the first sentence: "A man (Gary Cooper) is in a little local train when it is attacked by bandits." Mann signs this film (as well as *THE MAN FROM LARAMIE*) with the most iterable of signatures. The word "man" transgresses genre boundaries, existing in the western and outside it. The word denotes the individual Anthony Mann (a man), and the relation of Anthony Mann to the western (Mann of the west), but transgresses generic boundaries by its expansive use in other contexts. Mann's titling of his films constitutes a type of time-image.

The auteur theory has often been posed as the counter theory to genre theory, as the theory which can explain what genre cannot. This is evident in Kitses' book *Horizons West* which has one chapter on genre and three chapters of auteur studies. Richard Collins, in "Genre: A Reply To Ed Buscombe" (R. Collins 157-163), locates the auteur as the source of intrinsic meaning, not the strictly generic elements such as iconography. He cites the example of Nicholas Ray. Ray's film *THE TRUE STORY OF JESSE JAMES*, he says, has a stronger relation to *REBEL WITHOUT A CAUSE* than to Henry King's *JESSE JAMES* or others in the Jesse James series. The point that, through the auteur (as in the star) the individual work transgresses genre boundaries is important. What Collins does not mention is that King's *JESSE JAMES* is also subject to the transgression of genre through the auteur theory; the auteur theory does not just apply to selected directors. *JESSE JAMES* is more like King's *LLOYD'S OF LONDON* than like Lang's *THE RETURN OF FRANK JAMES*, for example. A counter position to Collins has already been noted, in Bud Boetticher's carrying through of certain western elements into the gangster film in *THE RISE AND FALL OF LEGS DIAMOND*. Here an auteur who is strongly associated with the western has affected another genre by using the western.

Boetticher, like Mann, signs his name with the western, and uses the western as well as his position as auteur to deconstruct genre boundaries.

We can see how the auteur creates another series that intersects, doubles up with and crosses over and coexists with genres-series. Raoul Walsh affirms this when he made the same film (his film) in two different genres: *HIGH SIERRA* and *COLORADO TERRITORY*. Nicholas Ray's films exist as a series, but also in the genre series; *JOHNNY GUITAR* would not make as much sense if looked at only in terms of its auteur series, and its relation to the genre series were excluded. It is *JOHNNY GUITAR*'s relation to the western which makes it such a great deconstructive text.

The work of John Ford has been used to essentialise the western, while the work of 1950's auteurs has been used to show how signs can intersect and cross over genre. Primarily I would like to reverse these two situations, showing Ford to cross over the genre boundaries and the 1950's directors to sign themselves with the western, to show how each is a series that coexist and intersect depending on the point of view taken. For someone who "made westerns", John Ford actually made remarkably few (after 1926) about lone cowboys cleaning up rotten towns, the narrative most people consider "typical" of the genre. He probably made more films about military life than about the west.

Clint Eastwood's role as auteur has become one of star as auteur, in which the two roles mix, one informing the other. His success at directing has inadvertently given power to the status of the star as signifier being responsible for his own signification. Star directing has broken down the hierarchies associated with authorship, leading the way to the possibility of all the possible signifiers (images) in the text, and manipulators of signifiers (from production design to cinematography) becoming auteurs. The blurring of positions caused by Eastwood's directing has decentred the notion of the single auteur: is it the star, the director, the writer, the cameraman or the codes with which they express themselves which are common to everybody. Many stars of westerns have directed films (John Wayne, Kirk Douglas), and produced their films (Randolph Scott) but few have consistently directed themselves. William S. Hart is the notable exception to this. Hart's directing was, like Eastwood's, aimed at ensuring a serious product, as well as affirming the responsibility of the star for his own image. It seems indicative of the Hollywood studio politics, that for most of the period in which westerns were in major production this situation did not happen, only at the *start* and the *end* of the genre.

Eastwood's role of star as auteur causes a reassessment of his role in the Leone westerns. The rift that is alluded to in some biographies, between Leone and Eastwood, seems to have been over the question of authorship. Leone apparently took the auteur theory literally and assumed all authorship for Eastwood's manipulation and creation of the Man with No Name.

In retrospect Eastwood can be seen to be affirming a decentring of the single auteur, by assuming the star's responsibility for his own signification. I find this a more productive position than Paul Smith's, who assumes Leone's responsibility for the radical nature of the Dollars Trilogy, and sees Eastwood's Hollywood westerns as a repudiation of the Leone's. If we assume Eastwood as partly responsible for the Dollars trilogy, then his other work must be seen as part of the same series that explores the paradoxical nature of his image. Asserting the simulacrum through paradox is quite different from trying to "correct" that image, as Smith sees it. Considered as series, Eastwood's films contaminate and complicate each other, just as Leone's do. The intersection of these two series is an interesting moment, impossible to "freeze", in which each series escapes the grasp of the other. Perhaps Eastwood's politics are not as productive as Leone's, which seems to be what concerns Smith. This does not mean that the films are not as "good", which is Paul Smith's assertion.

Eastwood as auteur-star transgresses genre, existing as a series which partakes of all genre series (for example: *PLAY MISTY FOR ME*, *DIRTY HARRY*, *EVERY WHICH WAY BUT LOOSE*, *HONKYTONK MAN*, *BIRD*). In any individual work in a particular series, such as *UNFORGIVEN* in the western series, the insertion of the signification of Eastwood naturally connects all those other series to the western series. Eastwood's work in the western in this way works against ideas of generic purity.

The image of women in *UNFORGIVEN*, central to the film, extends into other genre surfaces, particularly the cop film via *DIRTY HARRY*, *THE GAUNTLET* and *SUDDEN IMPACT*. The credits of *DIRTY HARRY* show a woman in a pool seen through the cross-hairs of a rifle view-finder. The woman, obviously the subject of the camera's voyeuristic gaze, is then shot as the credit comes up. This is the image which accompanies Harry Callahan's search for Scorpio, to avenge the victim whether the law allows it or not. *UNFORGIVEN*, after the introductory image, opens with a similar scene of violence against women. The camera slowly makes its way into a whore house, into the bedroom and then into the point of view of a young prostitute being cut up by a fat cowboy. This time the audience is put in the position of the victim, not the killer.

The First and Last Western

Derrida points out that each time we try to trace back an origin we find an event that at first seems to be an origin. But for that event to exist there must have been a prior context for it to exist within. We go back to the context and find that it needs a prior event. We find only "nonoriginary origins" (Culler 96) This is similar to Deleuze's observation that bodies have

within them the principle of reproduction: they are born into existing contexts, in which exists possibilities of the future (LS: 271).

The project of maintaining a pure genre with boundaries denoting inside and outside requires the myth of an origin. The western has many. Bazin begins his essay with these words: "The western is the only genre whose origins are almost identical with those of the cinema"(BW: 140). This is both true and false. As a myth of origin it is a good one, helping to sustain the myth that the western is the essence of the cinema. The "first western film" THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY was made within ten years of the first commercial screening of a film. The film is comprised of many of the images that would become integral elements of the western: cowboys, guns, horses, trains, violence. The cowboy shooting at the screen, already a self reflexive element through its relation to Lumiere, became important as an element of the duel, and also as a framing device for the credit sequences of some later westerns.

THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY serves as a "myth of origin" for the western. Bazin implied that the western is the essence of the cinema due to it being the most succinct expression of movement in the cinema (BW: 141), the movement of cowboys on horses across screen presumably doubling the movement of the film through the camera and then through the projector. But we can see that movement predates the western in the cinema, as earlier "western scenes" in other films, predate THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY. The film itself is a deceptive origin (as are all origins). As a first western it has no definitive version that we can call the *original*. Due to distribution policies of the time the film was released as a loose structure. The segment where the cowboy shoots at the audience was offered to distributors as a possible *start* or *end* of the film, or as both, depending on the wishes of the owner of the cinema. So even in the first western we have a particularly interesting principle of difference, a decentred origin. Not one of the three possible variations is the true origin. To further decentre the "origin" of the western, the Edison company re-filmed the film (as was common practice at the time due to deteriorating negatives) and distributed it as the same film. The film was also re-filmed by the Lubin company, hoping to profit from the films success. So the first western is not only a decentred origin, but also has its own "copies".

One of the most important images in THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY is the image of movement. Movement is expressed in a number of important varieties. Each type of movement in the film can be found in previous (non "western") films, making the origin of movement in the cinema a dispersed one. The first type is the *across-screen* movement first seen in the back projection of a train passing across the background, from inside the train station. There were many other films which displayed this across screen movement via boats and trains before Porter's film. The second type is movement *into the screen*, typified by the shot from above the train of the robbery in progress. This time the movement is not across screen, but the camera

(and viewer) is moving forward, as the abstract plane of the landscape recedes behind the screen (this happens only once in the film). This type of movement was exploited in Hale's Tours in which spectators were seated in fake railway carriages and other vehicles. The third type is movement out of the screen (towards the viewer), which we see in the movement of the cowboys and the horses. This type of movement can be found previously in Lumiere's films, such as the train arriving at the station, and the workers leaving the factory. The fourth type of "movement" is the close-up, "the affection-image" (C1 87). The close-up in THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY comes a year after the "first" close-up which appeared in GRANDMA'S READING GLASS. As discussed earlier, we can detect in THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY a self conscious relationship to Lumiere's earlier film of the train entering the station, by Porter's use of the image of a train, and then transforming the shock of Lumiere's train coming towards the screen to the shock of a cowboy shooting at the screen. None of these elements are exclusive to the western, nor do they originate with the western.

History as an origin of the western has been cited by many films and theorists alike. Particularly, the theorists, Bazin, Lovell and Kitses, all reinforce (often at the same time as denying) the myth that the western is a *copy of reality*. A view of the western as simulacra alters the westerns subservient relationship to *reality*. It is impossible to separate a reality (history) from the western. The western is a repetition that partakes in the reality, as the reality partakes of the western. One is not inside the other, and they cannot be separated. This relationship is explored in Fritz Lang's THE RETURN OF FRANK JAMES. Here Lang contrasts myth with reality (the distinction is assumed to exist) as Henry Fonda inhabits a fiction of a reality in which he lives through multiple versions of his own life. This is a fiction about a west in which reality and fiction are mixed, possibly to the point of the impossibility of separating them out. If we analyse the *real West*, we have a very similar experience. Even when the real West was happening its exponents lived it through fiction, changing their actions according to the wild west shows, plays and dime novels. The presence of the representations changed the reality, the reality changed the representation.¹¹ The early westerns of Ford and other directors were made with real cowboy extras. Billy The Kid (William Bonney), Jesse James and the Dalton's all were aware of the writings published about their careers, and spread their own myth accordingly, changing facts to suit fiction. We come to the point which Derrida makes in "Signature Event Context", that everyday speech cannot be

¹¹Christopher Frayling recounts the close links that cowboys and lawmakers of the real west have had with their construction in myth/fiction. Wild Bill Hickok and Buffalo Bill Cody both acted as themselves in the play SCOUTS OF THE PRAIRIE, just before Wild Bill was shot in 1876. Buffalo Bill played himself in a number of films before he died in 1917. as did Wyatt Earp. Wyatt Earp's pallbearers at his funeral in 1929 were Tom Mix and William S. Hart (this is mentioned in Robert Mitchum's narration in TOMBSTONE). Frayling cites the influence the book The Authentic Life of Billy The Kid had on Bonney's subsequent actions, the influence of Jacobean tragedy on Jesse James, and the book Emmett Dalton wrote in 1937, entitled When The Daltons Rode, in which he fabricated his own heroic death forty five years earlier. (Frayling Spaghetti 192-3.)

separated from the representation of that speech in fiction (DS: 17-18). This is because, as Derrida points out, everyday speech is a form of acting out. People live manipulating signs in the same way that fiction does, everyday life cannot be separated from representation.

We have looked at the idea of the decentred origin of the western in the first film, and the idea that reality as an origin is impossible as the western cannot be separated from reality. Now it remains to analyse the literary origins that conflict with the notion of the western as copy of reality. Warshow's analysis of the western's relation to realism is exemplary. In analysing *THE GUNFIGHTER* he puts forward the idea that realist westerns are not concerned with representing the real, but the sign of the real, a generic reality that can only be described as simulacra. The location of the real historical West is itself a code essential to greater generic repetition and enjoyment of the false. In *THE RETURN OF FRANK JAMES* the character played by Gene Tierney is writing a book on Jesse and Frank James. The relationship between the dime novel and Billy the Kid is commented on by the depiction of the novelist in *THE LEFT HANDED GUN*, and the dime novels and writers in *YOUNG GUNS 2* and *UNFORGIVEN* repeat this. These films expose the process of separating reality from fiction, the myth-making process, but also, implicitly the idea of the western as simulacrum, as opposed to the copy.¹² When analysing the role of literature as an origin of the cinematic western we encounter Derrida's "non originary origins". This happens when we look to the dime novels of writers such as Ned Buntline, for a precedent to the cinematic western. Not only do we find that these writers and their fiction formed part of the reality of the West, through their connections with Wyatt Earp and other figures, but we also find prior literary contexts which made their literature possible. John Cawelti credits Fenimore Cooper with originating the western as we know it. If this is the case we have the interesting case of the western novel existing before the west proper existed. From Fenimore Cooper we are lead back to Rousseau. From the dime novelist in general we are lead back to Jacobean tragedy, chivalric courtly romances (as Bazin points out), the epic (of Nordic sagas), and Greek tragedy (in Anthony Mann's westerns). So the context for the western existed before the historical facts took place¹³. The context expands every time we study a particular area, robbing the western of any single pure origin.

The mythic images in Anthony Mann's westerns make a virtue of the impression of origin; the myth of a nonexistent, pure origin. Mann's mythic western images make a virtue of their impurity. They signify as pure western image, but at the same time evoke multiple origins (tragedy, epic, thriller, melodrama, the fight between good and evil).The most obvious

¹²Through the use of the codes and devices such as the "wanted" poster, all westerns in some way deal with this point.

¹³Interestingly *UNFORGIVEN* was released about the same time as Michael Mann's version of *THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS*, marking a reflection on the process of generic origin.

example here is *THE FURIES*, but what is obvious in this film's relation to tragedy is present in all the Mann-Stewart collaborations (*WINCHESTER 73*, *BEND OF THE RIVER*, *THE NAKED SPUR*, *THE FAR COUNTRY* and *THE MAN FROM LARAMIE*). The point is that Mann made this impurity, the multiple origin, a virtue.

Ford's *THE MAN WHO SHOT LIBERTY VALENCE* is one of the most explicit examples of the film within a film, and the film about the technique of filmmaking, in the western. As such it deconstructs the notion of the western's origin being history or reality. Not only is the flashback sequence (unusual to the western) a film within a film, but the scenes in flashback are filmed on sound stages which give them the effect of a certain "fakeness", which renders them as an early western film, opposed to the scenes shot in the present (also in the past), where the "real" sets look like a different era of the western film. So here we have past and present (also in the past) rendered as two different types of westerns, both reading as different levels of "fakeness". The emphasis on the difference between hyper-realities produces a western as simulacrum, where even the origin and truth are seen as film within films. This is the western without an origin in reality.

When we see the flashback within the flashback, in which we discover the "truth" about who shot Liberty Valence, (that it was John Wayne, not as myth has it, Jimmy Stewart) we are seeing another film, a film literalised by the flashback. This is not the truth. The truth is only a succession of different films. The truth is rendered as one of many films, as well as a different camera set-up, a different flashback : if we had one more camera set-up, one more point of view we would see Ford directing the film. Truth, like in Deleuze's powers of the false, is just another point of view, which contradicts the next. We cannot do anything else except "print the legend".

The myth that the true western is American is one of the strongest essentialising forces in the genre and forms another myth concerning the origin of the western. Importantly Leone, not the first to make a western outside America, is the first to flaunt it and make a career out of it. Leone's intervention into the western is merely the clearest example of the relation that the western has with America, Americans and American history. "America" is not the meaning of the western, nor is it the signified for the western signifier. "America" exists as a simulacral sign for the western, which belongs to no one and everyone. The link between the "America" of the westerns and the geographical place is tenuous and cannot be taken for granted. The "myth" of the west, as simulacrum, has been recurring long before the western, much as Nietzsche's "eternal return" theorised: the western is another repetition, which keeps recurring with no exact basis in location. Many directors have pushed to the limit the location of the west: Mann in *THE FAR COUNTRY* pushes it to Alaska, Aldrich in *VERA CRUZ* pushes it to Mexico, and Watt in *THE OVERLANDERS* pushes it across to Australia. Junya Sato made the Japanese

western KOYA NO TOSEININ (THE DRIFTING AVENGER) starring Ken Takakura in the Australian desert. With the spaghetti western the landscape of Spain has become a paradoxical part of the American west. The western cannot be contained, and in Paul Verhoeven's TOTAL RECALL, it leaves the planet, and Mars becomes the west.

The relation of the Australian cinema to the western illustrates the complex relation of international series which deny an origin in any one country. Australia had the series of "bushranger" films as early as 1906 with THE STORY OF THE KELLY GANG. This series had a quite separate line of development, in no way originating in THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY. Yet this series, which parallels the series of bandit westerns such as those centred on Jesse James, shared many of the same signs and images and often intersected with those films. The bushranger series included CAPTAIN MOONLIGHT, CAPTAIN MIDNIGHT THE BUSH KING, CAPTAIN STARLIGHT OR GENTLEMAN OF THE ROAD, THE KELLY GANG and NED KELLY with Mick Jagger and MAD DOG MORGAN with Dennis Hopper. Australia has another series which is more consciously part of the western. Americans made westerns in Australia, as well as Australians: RANGLE RIVER written by Zane Gray; THE KANGAROO KID, and KANGAROO. There are Australian westerns too, films like RAW DEAL and MAN FROM SNOWY RIVER. The relationship of these films to the western is paradoxical: they are westerns and they are not westerns.

The western and the "America" as simulacral images deny the possibility of finding a true meaning or signified of the western. Unlike Wright's attempt to pin down the meaning, or the common attempt to make the geographical America the true signified, or meaning, the western is a fluctuating series of recurring differences, that have no centre, and belong to no one. It is the Italian westerns directed by Sergio Leone and starring Clint Eastwood that make the position of the western as mass-media simulacra, belonging to no one culture, explicit. These films remove the western from the essentialising grip of American ownership, and assert that the western has no fixed intrinsic meaning, or transcendental idea.

Much has been made of the post colonial critique that these films, and others by more political Italian directors, have been interpreted to contain (Smith 1-17). Even Leone's mise en scene is supposed to be a conscious reversal and manipulation of the codes favoured by Hollywood westerns. But all Leone does is treat these codes as simulacra, as signs of signs with no essence or origin, which is particularly evident in the famous close-ups. Leone uses the close-up, an image belonging to all the cinema (it crosses genres) and to all countries (no intrinsic relation to any one culture) to render the western as simulacrum. Leone's close-up of Eastwood's eyes makes the close-up the shape of the cinemascope screen (aspect ratio: 1:2.4), literalising the importance of the medium. The signifier "America" is in Leone's work a sign disconnected from the geographical location of America. The dubbing of the voices in the Dollars Trilogy,

done with a conscious feel of dislocation, is an outward sign of this disjuncture. But Leone was not the first to use the close-up to deconstruct the western. Samuel Fuller did it in *I SHOT JESSE JAMES*, his first film, and in the shootout in *FORTY GUNS*. In *FORTY GUNS* the extreme close-up deconstructs the spatial coherence of the shootout in a baroque distortion of space.

Clint Eastwood's image as a star, and particularly in *UNFORGIVEN*, relies and plays off the important roles that he played for Leone. The image of William Munny in *UNFORGIVEN* manipulates paradoxical images, American (the American western actor: Wayne, Stewart, Cooper) and non-American (Dostoyesky's existential hero via Kurosawa, Toshiro Mifune, his own Man with No Name). The role of the Italian and Japanese cinema is part of the Clint Eastwood crystal and is integral to *UNFORGIVEN*, which as an American western flaunts its impurity.

UNFORGIVEN comments on the role of myth and representation in everyday "reality", by showing how an injustice becomes a news event, is "falsified" as myth and spreads to cause further tragedy. Here myth is an integral part of reality, an event equal to any other, that propels the events along a trajectory. The myth in the western is equated with the media in the modern world; both are integral to the "reality" of a situation. In *UNFORGIVEN* the failure of the justice system results in the spreading of the crime into myth, causing tragic results for many. The myth (or representation) is here part of everyday "reality"; but it is not the myth that is at fault, rather the lack of justice for a minority. This comments upon the lack of justice in the Rodney King beating, and the role the media has in taking part in the events, both good and bad, by spreading news of the injustice, but then turning it into further tragedy as happened in the L.A. riots.. The myth in *UNFORGIVEN* is good because it attempts to bring about justice, bad because it brings tragedy with justice. (Justice itself is shown to be subjective and fluctuating, with no centre of truth.) This reading -confirmed by public statements by Eastwood- (Wilson 12) is in the film further related to the Rodney King beating by the almost symbolic murder in police custody of Ned Logan, the black cowboy played by Morgan Freeman. The image of Ned being whipped to death simultaneously evokes the Rodney King incident and the era of slavery. As a genre film about "reality TV" coverage, *UNFORGIVEN* suggests that the genre film and "reality TV" (*COPS*, *TOP COPS*, *HARD COPY*) have similar relationships to "reality", that is they are both part of "reality", not separate, commentators on it or lesser representations of it.

In *UNFORGIVEN* the novelist, W.W. Beauchamp, who stands for the process of myth-making (and film making), takes part in reality, and his presence affects the psyche of those who propel the action. The central scene in which the character of Beauchamp is used to deconstruct the reality/fiction dichotomy, is the three way "duel" in the jail between Beauchamp, Little Bill and the bounty hunter English Bob (Richard Harris). Eastwood takes

Leone's three way duel from *THE GOOD THE BAD AND THE UGLY*, itself a baroque rendering of the two way duel on the main street of the classical western, into new territory. In this metafictional duel, Little Bill encourages the writer to take the gun and shoot him. When Beauchamp points the gun at Little Bill he is unable to touch the trigger, and so the writer in turn offers the gun to English Bob in the jail cell, who eventually declines to take the gun, thus declining to enter into a shootout with Little Bill. This plays off the codes of the western duel, as well as positing this duel on a no-mans-land where reality and fiction cannot be separate entities. On one level the influence of "fiction" interfering in "reality" is shown by the writers insertion into the middle of the "real" western duel, holding the gun out to English Bob and pointing it at Little Bill. But the writer is also a long accepted element of the western as well as the "real" west, and as such is also part of the "reality". On another level the western duel is shown to be all fiction, with the "reality" of the writer entering the (his) fiction of the duel. All three figures are simultaneously reality and fiction.

In Eastwood's public statements, in statements by the press and in the images in the film, *UNFORGIVEN* has been coded as a type of *final western*: "I don't know if it will actually be my last one, but it seemed to be the perfect subject to do as a kind of final western. It really sums up what I feel about the genre." (Wilson 12) To set up a view of genre in which *THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY* is the start and *UNFORGIVEN* is the end, is to see genre as static and finite. However Eastwood is not endorsing generic myths by setting up an opposite to the myth of origin (the myth of the end), but is instead using genre as another crystal-image. Eastwood has always played with the distortion and inversion of generic rules, now he treats the myth of genre (as self contained and finite) as a crystal-image of itself, using the genre as an image of its own apocalypse. If Eastwood played an avenging angel in *HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER*, in *UNFORGIVEN* the genre itself is given the coding of biblical destruction. When he later hallucinates: "*I see the angel of death*" he evokes his role as avenging angel in *HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER* which he later acts out in his final vengeance on the town. When in the last scene he becomes an avenging angel, he rides past Ned's body in the coffin, threatens the town "I'll come back and kill every one of you sons of bitches", and the vengeance theme of the western has intersected with horror. Eastwood's whole career has been one of killing the western, just as his name inadvertently signifies the opposite to Ford's *westward* journey to the promised land. The signification of the *final western* carries through to the possibility that it could be Eastwood's last western, or the last film in which he both directs and stars in, or the end of the Man with No Name. The various significations of the end, here become mixed and infect each other.

"Deserves Got Nothing To Do With It"

Shane after his gunfight in the saloon rides off into myth, because the "real world" no longer has room for the western hero. The boy calls out to him to come back, that mommy loves him. In UNFORGIVEN *Munny* rides off into the side of the screen, the decentred hero, already a myth and anti-myth, the intertextual cowboy. No one runs after him. No one wants him back. No one loves him. For Munny the relation between myth and "reality" is not one of simple opposition, one folds into the other. When the image turns back to the sign of myth which the film started with, of Eastwood's silhouette visiting his wife's grave (recalling similar scenes in SHE WORE A YELLOW RIBBON and YOUNG MR. LINCOLN) and the written commentary announces that Munny moved to San Francisco, the crystal-image is complete: Munny moves to the birthplace of Clint Eastwood and the home of Harry Callahan. *Then* the words appear on the screen "Dedicated to Sergio and Don" and the film ends.

Filmography Films Cited in text

* Denotes films viewed.

Film	Director , Date
ABBOTT AND COSTELLO MEET FRANKENSTEIN	Charles Barton 1948.*
ALONG THE GREAT DIVIDE	Raoul Walsh 1949.*
APACHE	Robert Aldrich 1954.*
BACK TO THE FUTURE III	Robert Zemeckis 1990.*
BADMANS TERRITORY	Tim Weelan 1946.*
BEND OF THE RIVER	Anthony Mann 1952.*
THE BIG HEAT	Fritz Lang 1953.*
THE BIG SKY	Howard Hawks 1952.*
BILLY THE KID	King Vidor 1930.
BILLY THE KID VS. DRACULA	William Beaudine 1966.*
BIRD	Clint Eastwood 1988.*
BLADERUNNER	Ridley Scott 1982.*
BLAZING SADDLES	Mel Brooks 1974.*
BLOODY MAMA	Roger Corman 1970*
BONNIE AND CLYDE	Arthur Penn 1967*
THE BOUNTY HUNTER	Andre de Toth 1954
THE BOWERY BOYS MEET THE MONSTER	Edward Bernds 1954.
BUCHANAN RIDES ALONE	Bud Boetticher 1958.*
THE BULLFIGHTER AND THE LADY	Bud Boetticher 1951.*
CAPTAIN MOONLIGHT	John Gavin 1910.
CAPTAIN MIDNIGHT, THE BUSH KING	Alfred Rolfe 1911.
CAPTAIN STARLIGHT	Alfred Rolfe 1911.
COOGANS BLUFF	Don Siegel 1968.*
COLORADO TERRITORY	Raoul Walsh 1949.*
COMANCHE STATION	Bud Boetticher 1960.*
COME BACK LITTLE SHEBA	Daniel Mann 1952.
CORONER CREEK	Ray Enright 1948.*
CURSE OF THE UNDEAD	Edward Dein 1959.
DIRTY HARRY	Don Siegel 1971.*

DISTANT DRUMS	Raoul Walsh 1951.*
DUEL IN THE SUN	King Vidor 1946.*
DRUMS ALONG THE MOHAWK	John Ford 1939.
EL DORADO	Howard Hawks 1967.*
THE ENFORCER	Bretaigne Windust 1951.*
EVERY WHICH WAY BUT LOOSE	James Fargo 1978.*
EVIL DEAD II	Sam Raimi 1987.*
THE FAR COUNTRY	Anthony Mann 1954.*
FLAMING STAR	Don Siegel 1960.*
A FISTFUL OF DOLLARS	Sergio Leone 1964.*
FOR A FEW DOLLARS MORE	Sergio Leone 1965.*
FOUR FOR TEXAS	Robert Aldrich 1963.*
FORTY GUNS	Samuel Fuller 1957.*
THE G MEN	William Keighley 1935.*
GOODFELLAS	Martin Scorsese 1990.*
THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY	Sergio Leone 1966.*
THE GREAT TRAIN ROBBERY	E. S. Porter 1903.*
GRANDMA'S READING GLASS	Brighton school 1902.
GUN CRAZY	Joseph H. Lewis 1948.*
THE GUNFIGHTER	Henry King 1950.*
GUNFIGHT AT THE O.K. CORRAL	John Sturges 1957.*
TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT	Howard Hawks 1944.*
HIGH PLAINS DRIFTER	Clint Eastwood 1973.*
HIGH NOON	Fred Zinnemann 1952.*
HIGH SIERRA	Raoul Walsh 1941.*
HONKYTONK MAN	Clint Eastwood 1982.*
I SHOT JESSE JAMES	Samuel Fuller 1949.*
JESSE JAMES	Henry King 1939.*
JESSE JAMES MEETS FRANKENSTEIN'S DAUGHTER	Beaudine 1966.
JESSE JAMES VS. THE DALTONS	William Castle 1954.*

JOHNNY CONCHO	Don McGuire 1956.*
JOHNNY GUITAR	Nicholas Ray 1954.*
KANGAROO	Lewis Milestone 1952*.
THE KANGAROO KID	Lesley Selander 1950.
THE KELLY GANG	Harry Southwell 1920.
KOYA NO TOSEININ (THE DRIFTING AVENGER)	Junya Sato 1968.
KUNG FU	Jerry Thorpe 1971.*
THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS	Maurice Tourneur 1920.*
THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS	George B. Seitz 1936.
THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS	Michael Mann 1992.*
THE LAST SUNSET	Robert Aldrich 1961.*
THE LAW VS. BILLY THE KID	William Castle 1954.*
THE LEFT HANDED GUN	Arthur Penn 1958.*
LLOYDS OF LONDON	Henry King 1936.
THE LUSTY MEN	Nicholas Ray 1952*
MAD DOG MORGAN	Philippe Mora 1976.*
MAD MAX 2 (ROAD WARRIOR)	George Miller 1982.*
THE MAGNIFICENT SEVEN	John Sturges 1960.*
MAN OF THE WEST	Anthony Mann 1958.*
THE MAN WHO SHOT LIBERTY VALENCE	John Ford 1962.*
A MAN WITHOUT A STAR	King Vidor 1955.*
THE MAN FROM LARAMIE	Anthony Mann 1955.*
MY DARLING CLEMENTINE	John Ford 1946.*
THE MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY	Frank Lloyd 1935.
THE NAKED SPUR	Anthony Mann 1953.*
NEAR DARK	Kathryn Bigelow 1988.*
NED KELLY	Tony Richardson 1970.*
OBJECTIVE, BURMA!	Raoul Walsh 1945.*
OCEANS ELEVEN	Lewis Milestone 1960.*
THE OKLAHOMA KID	Lloyd Bacon 1939.
ONCE UPON A TIME IN THE WEST	Sergio Leone 1968.*

ON DANGEROUS GROUND	Nicholas Ray 1951.*
ONE EYED JACKS	Marlon Brando 1961.*
THE OUTLAW	Howard Hughes 1943.*
THE OUTRAGE	Martin Ritt 1964.
THE OVERLANDERS	Harry Watt 1946.
THE PALEFACE	Norman Z. McLeod 1948.*
PARDNERS	Norman Taurog 1956.*
A PERFECT WORLD	Clint Eastwood 1993.*
PLAY MISTY FOR ME	Clint Eastwood 1971.*
PURSUED	Raoul Walsh 1947.*
RAMROD	Andre de Toth 1947.
RANGLE RIVER	Clarence Badger 1936.
RASHOMON	Akira Kurosawa 1950.*
RED RIVER	Howard Hawks 1948.*
REBEL WITHOUT A CAUSE	Nicholas Ray 1955.*
THE RETURN OF FRANK JAMES	Fritz Lang 1940.*
RIDE LONESOME	Bud Boetticher 1959.*
RIDE THE WIRLWIND	Monte Hellman 1967.*
RIO BRAVO	Howard Hawks 1959.*
RIO LOBO	Howard Hawks 1970.*
THE RISE AND FALL OF LEGS DIAMOND	Bud Boetticher 1960.*
ROBOCOP	Paul Verhoeven 1987.*
ROGUE COP	Roy Rowlands 1954.*
RUN FOR COVER	Nicholas Ray 1955.*
SANJURO	Akira Kurosawa 1962.*
SERGEANTS 3	John Sturges 1962.
SEVEN SAMURAI	Akira Kurosawa 1954.*
SHANE	George Stevens 1953.*
SHE WORE A YELLOW RIBBON	John Ford 1949.*
THE SHOOTING	Monte Hellman 1967.*
STAGECOACH	John Ford 1939.*
THE STORY OF THE KELLY GANG	Charles Tait 1906.

THE TALL T	Bud Boetticher 1957.*
THE TIN STAR	Anthony Mann 1957.
TOMBSTONE	George Cosmatos 1993.*
TOTAL RECALL	Paul Verhoeven 1990.*
A TRAIN ENTERING A STATION	Louis Lumiere 1896.*
THE TRUE STORY OF JESSE JAMES	Nicholas Ray 1957.
ULZANA'S RAID	Robert Aldrich 1972.*
UNDERWORLD	Joseph Von Sternberg 1927.
UNFORGIVEN	Clint Eastwood 1992.*
VERA CRUZ	Robert Aldrich 1954.*
VIRGINIA CITY	Michael Curtiz 1940.
THE VIRGINIAN	Victor Flemming 1929.
WAGONMASTER	John Ford 1950.*
THE WESTERNER	William Wyler 1940.*
WESTWORLD	Michael Crichton 1973.*
WHITE HEAT	Raoul Walsh 1949*
THE WILD BUNCH	Sam Peckinpah 1969*
WINCHESTER 73	Anthony Mann 1950.*
YOJIMBO	Akira Kurosawa 1961.*
YOUNG GUNS	Chris Columbus 1988.
YOUNG GUNS II	Murphy 1991.*
YOUNG MR. LINCOLN	John Ford 1939.*
3:10 TO YUMA	Delmer Daves 1957.*
Television series:	
COPS	1980-90s Reality TV series*
DRAGNET	1951-70.*
HARD COPY	1980-90s Reality TV series*
THE LONE RANGER	1949-57, APEX.*
TOP COPS	1990's Reality TV series.*
RAWHIDE	1959-66, CBS-TV.*

WANTED: DEAD OR ALIVE

1958-61, CBS-TV.

Miscellaneous:

HALE'S TOURS

Film series 1905-10

MARLBORO

Television commercials, 1960's onwards*

BIBLIOGRAPHY: WORKS CITED

Alloway, Lawrence. Violent America. The Movies 1946-1964. New York: Museum of Modern Art Press. 1971.

Bazin, Andre. "The Western: Or The American Film Par Excellence". What Is Cinema ? vol 2. Translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1971, pp. 140-148.

_____. "The Evolution of the Western". What Is Cinema ? vol 2. Translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1971, pp. 149-157.

Bogdanovich, Peter. John Ford. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

"Billy The Kid". The BFI Companion to the Western. Edited by Edward Buscombe. London: British Film Institute Publishing, 1993.

Calabrese, Omar. Neo-Baroque: A Sign of the Times. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Cawelti, John. The Six Gun Mystique. Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1971.

Collins, Jim. "Genericity in the Nineties: Eclectic Irony and the New Sincerity". Film Theory Goes To the Movies. Edited by Jim Collins, Hilary Radner and Ava Preacher Collins. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Collins, Richard. "Genre: A Reply to Ed Buscombe". Movies and Methods vol. 1. Edited by Bill Nichols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 157-163.

Conley, Tom. "Translator's Forward: A Plea for Leibniz". In Gilles Deleuze, The Fold - Leibniz and the Baroque. Forward and translation by Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993, pp. v-xx.

Combs, Richard. "Shadowing the Hero". Sight And Sound. volume: 6, October 1992, pp. 12-16.

Culler, Jonathan. On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Deleuze, Gilles. Cinema 1: The Movement-image. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

_____. Cinema 2: The Time-image. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

_____. "Plato and the Simulacrum." The Logic of Sense. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. pp. 253-279.

Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context". Limited Inc. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1988, pp. 1-24.

_____. "The Law of Genre". Critical Inquiry. Autumn 1980, pp. 55-81.

Fell, John. "Vladimir Propp In Hollywood". Film Quarterly. Spring 1977, pp. 19-28.

Focillon, Henri. The Life of Forms in Art. New York: Zone Books, 1990.

Frayling, Christopher. Spaghetti Westerns: Cowboys and Europeans From Karl May to Sergio Leone. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

_____. Clint Eastwood. London: Virgin Publishing, 1992.

Godard, Jean Luc. "Supermann: Man of the West". Godard On Godard. New York: Da Capo Press, 1972, pp. 116-120.

Kitses, Jim. "Authorship and Genre: Notes on the Western". Horizons West. London: Thames and Hudson, 1969, pp. 7-27.

Lovell, Alan, "The Western". Movies and Methods vol. 1. Edited by Nichols, Bill. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 64-175.

Mast, Gerald. "The Genre Epic: Red River". Howard Hawks - Storyteller. London: Oxford University Press, 1982, pp.297-347.

Hawks, Howard. "A Discussion With the Audience of the 1970 Chicago Film Festival". Focus On Howard Hawks . Edited by Jim McBride. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1972, pp. 15-16.

Schatz, Thomas. Hollywood Genres. New York: Random House Press, 1981.

Smith, Paul. Clint Eastwood - A Cultural Production. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Warshow, Robert. "The Gangster as Tragic Hero" and "Movie Chronicle: The Westerner". The Immediate Experience. New York: Anchor Books, 1962, pp. 83-88, 89-106.

Wilson, Michael Henry. "The Perfect Subject For The Final Western - Clint Eastwood's Unforgiven. An interview by Michael Henry Wilson". Cinema Papers. 91, (January, 1993), pp. 8-14.

Wollen, Peter. "The Auteur Theory". Signs and Meaning in the Cinema. London: British Film Institute, 1969, pp. 74-115.

Wood, Robin. Howard Hawks. London: British Film Institute Publishing, 1968.

Wright, Will. Six Guns and Society: a Structural Study of the Western. University of California Press, 1975.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: WORKS CONSULTED

Barthes, Roland. "Power and Cool". The Eiffel Tower and Other Mythologies. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983, pp. 43-45.

_____. "The Death of the Author". Theories Of Authorship. Edited by John Caughie. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981, pp. 208-213.

Benequist, Lawrence. "The Semiotic Mode: Anchor and Relay as Sign Function in Red River". Cine-Tracts. Edited by Ron Burnett, 3: 2, (Spring 1980), pp. 72-82.

Brophy, Philip. "Rewritten Westerns: Rewired Westerns, Lawyers in Cars and Monsters with Guitars". Stuffing. 1, (1990), pp. 18-41.

Brunette, Peter and David Wills. Screen/Play: Derrida and Film Theory. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Caughie, John (ed). Theories of Authorship. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Cawelti, John. "Myths of Violence in American Popular Culture". Critical Inquiry. 1: 3, (March 1975), pp. 521-541.

_____. "The Question of Popular Genres". Journal of Popular Film and Television. 13: 2, (Summer 1985), pp. 55-61.

Collins, Jim. "New Genre Theory: Six Guns and Homogeneity". Uncommon Cultures: Popular Culture and Post-Modernism. New York: Routledge, 1989. pp. 96-100.

Derrida, Jacques. The Truth In Painting. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987, pp. 37-82.

Dowell, Pat. "Unforgiven." Cineaste. 19: 2-3, (1992), pp. 72-73.

Fete, Margaret. "Woman as an Element of Narrative in Red River". Cine-Tracts. 3: 2, (Spring 1980). pp. 68-71.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author ?". Theories of Authorship. Edited by John Caughie. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981, pp.282-291.

Grant, Barry Keith (ed). Film Genre Reader. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.

Jameson, Richard. "Deserve's Got Nothin' To Do With It". Film Comment. (September-October 1992), pp. 12-14.

Jenkins, Stephen (ed). Fritz Lang: The Image and the Look. London: British Film Institute Publishing, 1981.

Kaplan, E. Ann (ed). Women in Film Noir. London: British Film Insitute, 1978.

Lecerclé, Jean-Jacques. "Berkeley: Bishop, or Busby ? Deleuze on Cinema". Thinking Art: Beyond Traditional Aesthetics. Edited by A. Benjamin and P. Osborne. London: ICA, 1991, pp. 183-206.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. "The Structural Study of Myth". Theories Of Authorship. Edited by John Caughie. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981, pp. 131-135.

Levitin, Jacqueline. "The Western: Any Good Roles for Feminists ?". Film Reader. 5, 1982, pp. 95-108.

Mauduy, Jacques and Gerad Henriët. Geographies du Western. Paris: Nathan University Press, 1989.

McArthur, Colin. Underworld U.S.A.. London: British Film Institute, 1972.

Mulvey, Laura. "Afterthoughts on *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* inspired by *Duel in The Sun*". Psychoanalysis and Cinema. Edited by E. Ann Kaplan. New York: Routledge, 1990, pp. 24-35.

Nachbar, Jack (ed). Focus on the Western. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.

Neale, Stephen. Genre. London: British Film Institute, 1980.

Ross, T. J. "Fantasy and Form in the Western: From Hart to Peckinpah". December. 12: 1/2, pp. 159-169.

Roth, Lane. "Methodology of Syntagmatic Analysis". Film Semiotics, Metz and Leone's Trilogy. New York and London, 1983, pp. 34-63.

Reeder, Roberta. "Red River : Modes Of Analysis. An Introduction.", "Red River: The Literary version and the film", "The Mythic Mode: Archetypal criticism and Red River". Cine-Tracts. 3: 2, (Spring 1980), pp. 54-67.

Sheehan, Henry. "Scraps of Hope - Clint Eastwood and the Western". Film Comment. (September-October 1992), pp. 17-27.

Sklar, Robert. "Empire to the West: Red River". American History / American Film: Interpreting the Hollywood Image. Edited by J. O'Conner and M. Jackson. New York: Ungar Film Library, 1979, pp. 167-181..

Silverman, Michael. "The Drives and Cultural Production in Red River". Cine-Tracts. 3: 2, (Spring 1980), pp. 83-87.

Sontag, Susan. "Against Interpretation". Against Interpretation. New York: Dell, 1967, pp. 13-23.

_____. "On Style". Against Interpretation. New York: Dell, 1967, pp. 24-45.

Thompson, Richard and Tim Hunter. "Clint Eastwood, Auteur". Film Comment. (January/February 1978), pp. 24-32.

_____. "Meep Meep". Movies and Methods vol.1. Edited by Bill Nichols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 126-135.

Thomson, David. "All Along the River". Sight and Sound. (winter 1976-7), pp. 9-13.

Tosches, Nick. Dino: Living High and the Dirty Business of Dreams. New York: Dell, 1992.

Will, David. "3 Gangster Films: An Introduction". Roger Corman - The Millennic Vision. Edited by D. Will and P. Willeman. Edinburgh: Cinema magazine Publishing, 1970, pp. 68-80.

Willis, Donald. The Films of Howard Hawks. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1975.