

Sergej Macura*

Faculty of Philology

University of Belgrade

Serbia

DISCURSIVE INTERSECTIONS AND FILM-MAKING CONSTRAINTS: TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT

Abstract

This paper discusses the several stages of the screenplay for Howard Hawks's film *To Have and Have Not* (1944), loosely based on Ernest Hemingway's novel of the same title. It illustrates the changes from the original narrative throughout the screenwriting process to the script of the film release version, focusing on the crucial contextual causes of the alterations, which include: the stricter rules of decency and violence on screen, enforced by the Motion Picture Production Code, the immediate context of World War II and politically sensitive topics that had to be approved by censorship, and finally, William Faulkner's tenure at Warner Brothers, during which time he learned by practice to assist Hawks on very short notice and make on-the-set changes when the crew considered them necessary.

Key words: screenplay, adaptation, melodrama, censorship, *To Have and Have Not*

1. Introduction

An analysis of a full-length feature film which comes from the classical Hollywood A-list is laden with an array of potentially insuperable obstacles – all of them were produced with the assistance of dozens of technicians, stylists, costume designers and the like, so the director's specific will may suffer certain refractions in the final outcome; further on, the screenplay could have gone through several stages of alteration (which was usually the case), thus obscuring the original text if the film was made by way of adaptation; finally, the heads of studios could have steered the ideological ramifications of the plot to such a desired course that the final cut should pose the least threat as a potential political liability in the eyes of audiences both in the US and worldwide. All these factors took part in the production and release of *To Have and Have Not* (1944), one of the best-acclaimed films by Howard Hawks, which earned Warner Brothers the crowds and income on a par with the 1942 hit *Casablanca*, with the same lead actor (Humphry Bogart), no longer in the customary role of a

* Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Studentski trg 3, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia; e-mail: sergej.macura@fil.bg.ac.rs

mobster or gunman, but interpreting a small-time smuggler straddling both sides of the law.

The paper will try to emphasise the crucial points in the novel-to-film adaptation of Hemingway's work *To Have and Have Not* (1937), perhaps not his finest piece of longer fiction, but surely the indispensable source for the 1944 film screenplay, which itself went through four phases, even as the shooting was in progress. It will also shed light on the role of William Faulkner and his distant, but unique relation with another Nobel Prize winner on the same cinematic project in their different capacities; in addition, the analysis will also treat the contribution of Jules Furthman, an accomplished screenwriter with such titles to his name as *Underworld* (1927), *Shanghai Express* (1932), *Blonde Venus* (1932) and *Mutiny on the Bounty* (1935), to mention just a few. The numerous instances of excision, abridgement, character elimination, and the coupled influences of censorship and political recommendations all make up for a highly multifaceted work that the phenomenological school of analysis would label "opalescent", that is, capable of exuding several shades of meaning if seen from a greater number of viewpoints. It is only in unison that these actualised meanings shape the viewer's overall impression, and some of them stay far below the celluloid surface if they are not scrutinised with well-researched sources and testimonies of the persons involved in the film-making process. The main source of this information will be represented by Bruce Kawin's edition of the screenplay for *To Have and Have Not* (first issued in 1980), with an in-depth introduction and the alternate versions of dialogues which were dropped out as the shooting went on. Stefan Solomon's longitudinal study *William Faulkner in Hollywood: Screenwriting for the Studios* (2017) will assist the process of analysis from Faulkner's biographical point of view and enhance the location of this author's interests, disposition and reasons for embarking on this project. The basic guidelines for the complex matter of film adaptation will derive from Thomas Leitch's succinct study *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents* (2007), a book opposing the dismissive premise that cinematic transposition only serves as an ancillary mode to the sovereign domain of literature, being more or less unfaithful to the unmatched original text. In view of a more comprehensive analysis of the effects conveyed by the film release version, it would be in order to offer a brief overview of the plots of both works.

2. The plot of the novel

The novel begins with an episode in a bar in Havana, when Morgan refuses to transport three Cuban terrorists to the US – in a dynamic motivational response to this, they get shot in the streets by an opposing faction. Harry makes his way to his own boat usually chartered for fishing, and meets his friend Eddy, a drunkard who used to be a

good workman once. Their American client, Mr. Johnson, manages to hook two large fish and lose them both, along with Morgan's fishing gear. Instead of paying Morgan the next day, the client boards a plane to Florida. Facing financial constraints and the inability to support his wife Marie and three daughters, Morgan agrees to smuggle a number of Chinese out of Cuba, but his employer, Mr. Sing, obviously expects him to drown the cargo. Eddy performs his plotline role by stowing away on the boat, which makes Morgan vow to kill him as he is now an undesirable witness. However, after loading the Chinese, Morgan strangles Mr. Sing, throws the corpse overboard, puts the cargo ashore and heads home to Key West.

The second part of the novel locates Morgan in the same aquatory, smuggling liquor from Cuba to Florida, and the time indicates a six-month-long ellipsis, which implies that he has not been able to return to the charter fishing business. Now his companion is an African named Wesley, and both have been shot while smuggling alcohol from Cuba. When they are spotted again, Morgan discards his liquor overboard, probably already accustomed to this contingency plan by now.

The third part is the novel's longest section, again set a few months later, this time in Key West. Morgan no longer has access to his impounded boat, and his arm has been amputated. Lawyer Robert Simmons (Bee-lips according to Morgan) hires him to take four Cuban terrorists to Havana; they have robbed a bank so that they could finance their anti-Machado activities. Morgan hires Albert Tracy, a workman on relief, to serve as his mate on the journey. Not being able to steal his boat back, Morgan manages to get a boat from Freddy, who owns the bar where many of the events take place in the novel. Hemingway then introduces a parallel subplot, which features businessmen and rich writers coming to town to pass the time introducing some excitement into their dull lives. The figure of writer Richard Gordon serves as the counterpoint for Harry Morgan's own fate, as Gordon's marriage founders due to his philandering, and he is even beaten up at the bar. Morgan stashes away a gun on the boat, the bank is robbed, and the terrorists kill the lawyer and Harry's mate, for which reason he directs the boat off course and waits for nightfall. He has completely lost all faith that the men who executed Albert might feel any sympathy for the working man, and he kills all the four during the night, but he also gets mortally wounded. The boat is found by the coast guard the following day, Harry is taken to the hospital, but he succumbs to the wounds, and the narrative ends on a very pessimistic note that one single man stands no chance against the forces either of malevolent fate or of the Depression.

The novel in its fundamental composition poses a generic problem, since it in fact consists of two short stories and a novella somewhat loosely linked: originally entitled "One Trip Across", the first section had been published in *Cosmopolitan* in 1934 as an integral first-person story about Harry Morgan, who metaphorically and literally

tries to stay afloat in times of crisis. The second section is an incorporated version of “The Tradesman’s Return”, published in *Esquire* in 1936, and they both feature the character of Harry Morgan in his dangerous daily struggle, this one narrated in third person. With the exception of a page added in the novel that features Morgan’s wife Marie and a quiet evening spent in their dining room on his return from his working day, both segments of the book may be considered identical to the magazine versions, which are in turn followed by the bulk of the novel where the one-armed Harry takes on the mission of transporting Cuban revolutionaries to their island.

3. Main changes in the film plotline

Not much of Hemingway’s plot remains in the film version, as a disabled lead character would have gone completely against the grain of traditional Hollywood stardom, so Hawks made the character a fully able-bodied man and thus suppressed the numerous Marxist overtones and musings of the bitter economic underdog depicted in the original storyline. Moreover, his wife Marie was replaced by the provocative Lauren Bacall, who provided much incentive for the electrifying on-screen chemistry between the main actors. As Bruce Kawin claims: “The fishing scene with Johnson is hardly changed, and in both stories Morgan’s financial hardship leads to his having to deal with radicals. The Gordons undergo several metamorphoses until Helen [his wife] and Hélène [his mistress] show up as Hélène de Bursac and Gordon is lost in the shuffle. Wesley becomes Horatio, and the *Queen Conch* keeps her name but changes ownership” (Kawin 1997: 15). The most conspicuous spatiotemporal change can be seen in the displacement of the film’s setting to Martinique, a French colony ultimately under control of the Vichy regime in the summer of 1940.

The film itself opens with the same entanglement as the novel, the major difference being in the location and time, but the chronotope still conforms to the Caribbean region constructed in the original text. Harry and Eddie take their American client Johnson fishing, who incurs them a loss of two fish and a rod; he promises to compensate for the loss when the bank opens next morning. Morgan finds himself a bit stranded and considers the offer which comes from a source non-existent in the novel and which reflects a noticeably different ideological mindset: Gérard (Frenchy), the owner of the popular bar, a member of the Free French resistance, asks Morgan to smuggle two of his comrades from another island and bring them to Martinique, which Harry refuses as he does not wish to break his neutrality code. He also gives a brusque treatment to a newly-arrived young lady who asks him for a match to light her cigarette – the question “Anybody got a match?” is answered by his silent locker-room toss of the matchbox, her lighting of the cigarette, and the elegant toss back to the skipper (*To Have and Have Not* 13:32–13:41). We can already notice that Bogart’s character is a more

typical shady loner, who resides in a hotel, without so much as a mention of a family. Paradoxically, this cast of his character fits in more easily with the standard Hemingway macho type, so well-known and established by the mid-1940s. Harry lingers with the narratively essential acceptance of the smuggling job because the sultry young lady (Marie) manages to steal Johnson's wallet with enough money for his compensation, all until the French police open fire at resistance fighters from Harry's room and kill Johnson in the fray – when all the money is confiscated, Morgan takes on this mission and arranges for Marie to leave the island by plane soon. Like the episode in the novel, Harry's mate sneaks on board the boat as a stowaway, and they pick up the two freedom fighters, the couple Paul and Hélène de Bursac; although Paul is shot in the shoulder by a patrol boat, they arrive back in Martinique. Marie, who deliberately missed the plane, helps dress his wound. The two women engage in a short-lasting rivalry over Harry, where Marie wins out by her strict dominance over Harry's physical proximity to Hélène. In a tense melodramatic scene in his room, she professes her sympathy in an ironic repetition of the other woman's words: "I don't think I'll ever be angry again at anything you say" (*To Have and Have Not* 1:14:04–1:14:08), and even makes a circle around him at his request, after which they kiss as a sign of the future union. In the finale, much more similar to *Casablanca* than to Hemingway's novel, Captain Renard tries to extort the information on the revolutionaries from Eddie, but Harry takes a gun from his desk drawer and coerces Renard and his henchmen into letting the De Bursacs, Marie, Eddie and himself leave the island for good.

4. The film's prehistory and production context

The origins of the film have so far become the stuff of legend, even by Hollywood standards: the two close friends, Hemingway and Hawks, went on a ten-day fishing trip in 1939, when the director put forth a proposal to the writer. According to Peter Bogdanovich's interviews with Hawks, the conversation went as follows:

I told Hemingway I could make a picture out of his worst book and he said, rather grumpily, "What's my worst book?" I said, "That bunch of junk called *To Have and Have Not*." He said, "Well, I needed money." I said, "Oh, I don't care about that part." He said, "You can't make a picture out of that." "Yes, I can." So for about ten days we sat around, while we were fishing, and talked about how these characters met one another, what kind of people they were, and how they ended up. When I came back, I went over and bought the story and started in on the premise that Hemingway and I had evolved. (Quoted in Brody 2012: par. 2)

The Hughes Tool Company purchased the TV, film and radio rights directly from Hemingway in 1939, and Hawks bought them in 1943, followed by an immediate resale to Warner Brothers, which granted him a quarter of the film's profits. Hawks probably had a melodramatic addition planned out even before the fishing trip, because Kawin reports another part of their conversation: "'You can't make anything out of that,' said Hemingway, and Hawks said, 'Yes, I can. You've got the character of Harry Morgan; I think I can give you the wife. All you have to do is make a story about how they met'" (Kawin 1997: 16). Not managing to get Hemingway to assist him with the script, Hawks played the card of the writer's vanity: "Okay, I'll get Faulkner to do it; he can write better than you can anyway" (Kawin 1997: 16). Nevertheless, knowing Hawks's propensity to produce unreliable testimonies, especially decades after the real events had taken place, any viewer of the film should take this declaration with a lot of reserve, as he was notorious for telling mesmerising stories without solid footing in the situation at hand. When we put things into historical perspective, it is understandable why Hemingway did not take part in the screenwriting process for *To Have and Have Not* – the novelist had moved to Cuba in late 1939, and spent the longest sustained period of residence in his life on the island, even organising volunteer boat patrols that gathered intelligence on the Nazi submarines and their collaborators throughout the Caribbean. He was definitely unavailable for this work while the script was under way and the filming done on set, approximately from October 1943 to May 1944.

It is precisely these winds of war that caused the tectonic changes in the ideological point of view within the film when compared to the novel, since the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs objected to Warner's plans to film a novel that "might embarrass the Batista regime in Cuba" (Kawin 1997: 31), although the novel concerns the Machado regime, in power from 1925 to 1933. The Cuban authorities could have recognised the striking similarities between the two parties in power, and the Office of Censorship, an emergency wartime regulator of information from and into the US, would not have given the film an export licence to be shown overseas, which would have entailed earning much less than was predicted as profitable. Since much money had already been invested in the film, Hawks asked the Inter-American Affairs Office what other location they could suggest, to which they replied that Martinique was outside their sphere of concern (Kawin 1997: 31). The changes posed considerable problems for the logistical organisation behind the film, so Hawks needed assistance from another Hollywood "contractor".

5. Faulkner's role and situation

By the time work on this film adaptation began, William Faulkner had already gained more than a decade's worth of experience in the bustling industry

of screenwriting in the global cinematic hub: in the 1932–33 period he worked on a contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, and from 1935 to 1937 he was hired by 20th Century Fox, and in 1942 he signed for Warner Brothers, a stint which was to last for another three years, with a number of intermittent commitments for other studios, like Universal and RKO, ending with the work on *Land of the Pharaohs* in 1954. All in all, Faulkner was very active in the making of several of Hawks's motion pictures, and it was his adaptation of his own short story "Turnabout" into the 1933 film *Today We Live* that made him Hawks's favourite screenwriter, especially for work on short notice. In sum, Faulkner accepted the lowbrow market economy of Hollywood since he needed money for his Mississippi estate, and the starting weekly salary of \$500 was quite sufficient to motivate him in this different mode of writing. Additionally, when he was asked by Hawks to adapt *To Have and Have Not*, he was personally interested in helping his friend out of a jam (Kawin 1997: 33). For several years before this contract was made, Warner Brothers had been turning out films which addressed the threat of Nazism when even the Senate considered them jingoistic. The studio president only stated that they produced films that reflected current affairs, and after the Pearl Harbor infamy, conditions became more suitable to the production of war films, with Warner at the cutting edge of the trend (Solomon 2017: 123–124). Among other titles, Warner seems to have presciently released the war-related narratives *Underground*, *International Squadron*, *Sergeant York* and *Dive Bomber*, all in 1941, before the war was brought to America's doorstep.

Thomas Leitch expands the hitherto existent divisions of film adaptations formulated by Geoffrey Wagner, Andrew Dudley and Kamilla Elliott with a ten-tier spectrum of renditions, ranging from the most obvious (celebration) to the least noticeable (allusion). The most common approach to adaptation, according to this author, is the second type, named *adjustment*: "A promising earlier text is rendered more suitable for filming by one or more of a wide variety of strategies" (Leitch 2007: 98). This type finds its analogy in Elliott's genetic concept, which postulates an underlying deep narrative structure between the two versions of a given story. There are changes during the process that Leitch recognises as inevitable: the compression of a lengthy novel, and the expansion of a short story or novella (Leitch 2007: 99) due to the quantitative differences between the fictional originals and the more or less standard 90- or 120-minute film runs. Apart from these visible features of duration, the plot may sometimes undergo changes that we could term confections (two characters merge into one, several plot details are replaced by just one), excisions (some of the original storyline is elided from the screenplay), and rearrangements (the events may assume a different order and form a divergent opinion in the viewers' minds when compared with the original). Having in mind the variety of changes that occur on

the long path from Hemingway's not very unified novel to the release version of the film, and the director's instructions sometimes given on the spur of the moment, it was only natural to expect a decidedly different atmosphere, pace of events, character development and the narrative finale in the cinematic version of *To Have and Have Not*.

The novel demonstrates several features that do not fit in well with Hemingway's opus in general, let alone with the relatively narrow constraints of the Motion Picture Production Code, in effect at the time of shooting and still valid deep into the 1960s: John Cobbs lists three segments of superfluous material in the novel, such as the degenerate veterans fighting in boorish bars of the Florida keys, the Richard Gordon subplot, and the roll call of the yachts that closes off the novel's plot (Cobbs 1979: 1). Apart from these, any screenwriter operating under the adopted rules of decorum would have had to dispense with these details from the original: frequent mentions of alcoholism, for example, in the episodes with Eddy (Hemingway 1955: 24), racist references to the Chinese as "yellow stuff" (Hemingway 1955: 35), the cruel murder of Mr. Sing (Hemingway 1955: 59), smuggling alcohol from Cuba (Hemingway 1955: 80), very poignant social commentary – "after the poor people are starved out and gone somewhere else to starve some more they are going to come in and make it into a beauty spot for tourists" (Hemingway 1955: 98), Harry's theft of his impounded boat (Hemingway 1955: 110), and his premeditated murder of the four Cuban radicals he is carrying to their island (Hemingway 1955: 155–163). Just a handful of examples from the Code will illustrate what no screenwriter was allowed to incorporate for public viewing, as the document made it very clear what representations infringed the legal or social norms. Under the heading "Crimes against the Law", Article 1b stipulates: "Brutal killings are not to be presented in detail", and Article 4 states: "The use of liquor in American life, when not required by the plot or for proper characterization, will not be shown". The heading "Sex" in Article 2 regulates that: "Scenes of passion should not be introduced when not essential to the plot", which rules out the love-making scene of Harry and Marie (Hemingway 1955: 114), in which they also bring up the subject of miscegenation, expressly forbidden by Article 6 of the same section.

Apart from these legislative limitations, there were issues that came from the quotidian context of cultural politics related to the immediate political reactions to powerful cinematic propaganda: in 1942 Faulkner had conceived of a pro-Free France screenplay with the allegorical figures of two brothers ideologically divided, *The De Gaulle Story*, but the General's representatives in the US did not like the relative absence of liberation activities and the gradual slipping of De Gaulle's character into the background. Due to the modifications imposed externally, he began to lose faith in the verisimilitude of the script, considering that such guidance would either please

only the French liberation movement or nobody at all (Phillips 2001: 36). One of the most compelling reasons for cancelling the project could also be found in the fact that Roosevelt changed his mind about his French ally, as De Gaulle had previously confronted Churchill, so the President's enthusiasm died out, and the movie glorifying the troublesome commander never came to fruition (Phillips 2001: 37). These politically charged influences inevitably seeped into the plot structure, matters of geographical setting, and mostly into motivational dynamics which was to spur the noble actions of perhaps hitherto inactive characters like Morgan and also demonstrate an acceptable level of grounding in real life so as to offer the audience a slice of artistic fullness, not shallow single-use propaganda advertisements.

6. The stages of the screenplay

The first version of the screenplay (Temporary Screenplay) was written by Jules Furthman, and we can term it a transposition of Hemingway's text in a stricter sense than is offered by Leitch's term *adjustment*: Johnson owes Morgan money for the damage, the singer in the harbour bar named Corinne (later Marie) steals his wallet, which Morgan duly notices. She plants the wallet into Harry's own coat, and three Cuban students want Harry to take them to Cuba, where they should rob a bank. Since he refuses, one of them guns down Johnson mistakenly, and Harry gets into a gunfight with the Cubans, who take Corinne hostage and release her when they are defeated in the conflict. The following day Mr. Kato (Mr. Sing in the novel) hires Morgan to smuggle contraband to Florida, in which action he and his mate are wounded – Corinne bandages the wound and Kato is caught with incriminating evidence. A mysterious lady arrives from the US, named Sylvia, who had soured Harry on all women a long time ago (she would morph into Hélène de Bursac); now the Cubans kidnap Corinne again, and Harry agrees to yield to their pressure, so they sail to Cuba and commit a successful and bloody robbery. Sylvia's husband (taken prisoner) assists Harry in liquidating the radicals on the boat, they return to Cuba to receive exoneration from the police, and Harry prepares for a happy life with Corinne.

This script includes a major difference from the novel in that it presents reversible losses for Morgan, and in Hemingway the defeats accumulate until they inexorably destroy the hero; in this script Harry goes through the same basic sequence of situations (Johnson, smuggling, revolutionaries) and ends up with a wife, a healed arm, and the money that Johnson owed him (Kawin 1997: 25–26). Apart from this, Hawks did not like the type of the loser in his narratives, so Morgan discovers that he has to team up with a haphazard partner in order to survive, unlike the bitter loner from the original novel.

The next version (Revised Temporary Screenplay) was left unfinished in early January 1944, in case Bacall should not be able to handle the starring role. In this script Corinne's functions are split between Marie and Amelia, Morgan's American girlfriend. Sylvia bears the name Helen Gordon and has no husband; Johnson is killed accidentally in the street (two revolutionary factions clashed), and the police inspector is now in charge of the secret police. Morgan appears in two smuggling scenes, very similar to those in the novel: he sets the Japanese immigrants ashore, and he receives an arm wound while transporting liquor (Kawin 1997: 27). Furthman composed the Final Screenplay in January and early February 1944, and it is probably the source used by Faulkner in his own contribution to the film; the main reason Hawks discarded the script may lie in politics rather than in art – the script girl on the movie Meta Carpenter Wilde claimed that a film that showed an American smuggling rum and revolutionaries between Key West and Havana, with a Cuban flag raised, would deeply embarrass the government. The government help to the studios in a time of war entailed a necessary avoidance of trouble in sensitive political matters, often at a high artistic cost of the film production, so this time Hawks needed Faulkner to reshape the whole script. It was Faulkner who thought of switching the location to Martinique, who condensed the figure of "Slim" into one woman, and who was most interested in the anti-Vichy sentiments of the story (Blotner 2005: 455). After Faulkner was hired for this specific job, Furthman did not participate in the writing process, meaning that he remained on the payroll and shared the credit (Kawin 1997: 28), but the work henceforth was not done in four hands. The penultimate version of the script begins with a dock scene rather than catching the marlin, Marie steals Johnson's wallet, but does not frame him like in an earlier stage; the student revolutionaries are not so hostile towards Harry, but only one survives the street shootout. The money from Johnson remains inaccessible to Morgan, so Marie has to steal a bottle of alcohol in what became the most famous scene of the film: "You know how to whistle, don't you, Steve?" (*To Have and Have Not* 43:20–43:30). Harry accepts the job of transporting Japanese immigrants, but kills Kato and takes the fee with which he buys a load of liquor, causing a patrol boat to fire and wound him and his mate. Marie and a revolutionary arrange for a physician to treat him, and Harry now has to carry Pancho to Cienfuegos, where they want to rob a bank. Again, the mate is ruthlessly killed by the Cubans, so Harry takes his revenge and confiscates the money, giving it to police inspector Caesar. Finally, Harry decides to stay on the island and marry Marie. What binds these script versions together thematically is still fairly visible in the story of how Morgan and Marie met, the alien smuggling operation, Morgan's arm wound, the bank robbery and commentary on the revolution, but the film version deletes the Asians' participation, the robbery and ideological discussions. Instead of the Cubans, the aliens with revolutionary missions

are now French, the repressive regime is represented by Vichy Captain Renard and his subordinates, and Harry now has only one smuggling job to pull off, without getting wounded himself.

7. Departures from the script in the film

When the Cuban setting was eliminated for good, Hawks asked Faulkner for help, who suggested that the main political interest should lie in the conflict between Free France and Vichy, which he began devising in the screenplay in late February 1944. Now the crew had to steer carefully through the numerous imposed rules of political and social decorum, answering directly to the recommendations from the Production Code Administration, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information, so Faulkner had on average three days before his written scenes were actually shot on set – this quickened tempo lasted from early March to early May 1944, when that part of the production was completed. It is impossible to say with certainty which of the persons involved contributed which replica to the dialogue on screen, since Faulkner, Hawks and Bogart were inventing new scenes, dialogue and gags as they went along; most of these last-minute changes made the characters less “literary” in feel (Kawin 1997: 33), closer to genuine effects of a war melodrama than a seasoned writer of fiction like Faulkner could have shaped them.

One of the crucial development lines in the screenplay concerns the handling of the female protagonists, Corinne and Sylvia, who manage to divide Harry’s affections; Sylvia becomes Mrs. Laughton, then Helen Gordon (in Furthman’s stages), to be finally moulded into Hélène de Bursac in Faulkner’s version. If Bacall had not been able to handle the demanding role, Hélène would have been Morgan’s main love interest. Furthermore, the classical Hawksian love triangle in which one of the women gradually fades away into the background also well suited the demands of Joseph Breen, the strict head of the Production Code Administration, that Morgan should not engage in a relationship with a married woman (Solomon 2017: 153).

When we take stock of all the material in the final screenplay, it amounts to slightly over 110 pages of half letter size, and Kawin supplies all the changes made to that version while the film was being produced on set, which in turn amounts to about 50 pages of somewhat new and somewhat old text, with more or less conspicuous rearrangements. We will also discuss the most relevant alterations of the script through the prism of topics already covered, like decency, wartime ideology, Code stipulations, and the romantic dynamics between the two protagonists.

The very opening scene features a military hut, with a dozing French navy quartermaster and two black urchins who see a relatively torn-up poster of Marshal

Pétain, and the quartermaster promptly replaces the damaged poster with a framed one. In all probability, this scene would have seemed like blatantly open anti-Vichy propaganda rather than a well-developed movie about a rogue turned patriot, so it was excised. The first spoken dialogue centres around the quartermaster and Morgan, who even raises his right hand and salutes Marshal Pétain in the Nazi manner, with the ironic exclamation: “Vive l’empereur!” (Faulkner 1997: 71). When Harry, Eddy and Johnson return to port, the screenplay does not include a major motif in the release version of the film, i.e. Johnson’s debt of \$825 altogether for boat rental and the lost gear at sea. Without this exchange, the viewer would be at a loss to know what driving force propels Harry up until Johnson suddenly dies in the shootout. The same evening, Harry is having dinner with Gérard, but the film has him sit alone, and Marie is singing a sad romantic song “Am I Blue” by the piano, which should give a clear signal of their future attraction: “There was a time / I was his only one, / So lonely, / Was I gay? / ‘Til today— / Now she’s gone and we’re through, baby oh—” (*To Have and Have Not* 15:50–16:20). When the De Gaullists rejected by Harry are getting out of the restaurant, they are gunned down by the French police, not by any revolutionaries or bank robbers, and Johnson is killed by a stray bullet, which complicates financial matters for Harry and sharpens the audience’s anti-Vichy feeling even more.

When Renard questions Marie and Harry in the police station, the script has Harry warn him: “You won’t do it by slapping Americans. That’s bad luck.” The officer responds: “An American who interferes with the police of a foreign government is already in bad luck” (Faulkner 1997: 108–109). That exchange may have seemed too ideologically or nationally explicit, so the on-the-set change approaches the Hemingway masculine standard in Morgan’s new replica: “Well, you’ll never do it by slapping people around. That’s bad luck” (*To Have and Have Not* 31:30–31:35). As soon as the two exit the station, she expresses the wish to have a drink, which does not suit the characterisation prescribed by the Code, and the scene is replaced with one that includes a longer conversation on the patriotic cause (among the first manifestations of Harry’s positive attitude towards the Free French idea):

Morgan: The boys we just left joined with Vichy. You know what that is?

Marie: Vaguely.

Morgan (laughing): Well, they got the Navy behind them. I think you saw that carrier in the harbor.

Marie: Yeah.

Morgan: Well, the other fellas, the ones they were shootin’ at, they’re the Free French. You know what they are?

Marie: It’s not getting any clearer.

Morgan: (laughing) Well, anyway, most of the people on the island, the natives, are patriots. They're for De Gaulle, but so far they haven't been able to do much about it. (*To Have and Have Not* 32:32–32:55)

The references to Free France help viewers decide who they should opt for and thus side with Harry in his future endeavours, although the designation of patriotism still has to be justified by the freedom fighters' deeds, not only through clear-cut ideology. The dialogue obliquely mentions a historical fact that originated after the fall of France to Germany in June 1940: the aircraft carrier *Béarn* was docked in the port, where it remained for the next four years, and Admiral Henri Robert sided with the Vichy regime so as to protect the strategic and material interests of France. Moreover, the British were not on good military terms with France, and the US could avail itself of a huge opportunity to oust the French from the entire Western hemisphere and take over its colonial possessions virtually overnight (Baptiste 1978: 3–4). Up to 1940, France (and by extension, its overseas territories) had also been known as a welcoming country for the exiles, granting them safe passage in and out of its borders. Naturally, all the people who “collectively escaped” were allowed to do so when the government officials turned a blind eye to these forced migrations (Jennings 2002: 294).

The script intended to show Marie's room with several snapshots from her past as a beauty pageant contestant in Miami, Rio, Palm Beach, Trinidad and the like (Faulkner 1997: 114), but this stage design does not occur in the film, as it would imply questionable morality on the character's behalf. The dialogue that ends with the famous advice on whistling contained more self-deprecating overtones by Marie, and the film changes it to Marie's gratitude to Harry for accepting the risky patriot-smuggling mission; at the end, he does whistle, unlike in the script. When Eddy stows away on board Harry's boat, the script does not develop much gun-wielding rhetoric, but the film dialogue does: “Of course I know how to handle one! Everybody knows how to handle a gun. All you do is work the lever and pull the trigger” (*To Have and Have Not* 52:21–52:28). In this version we get a more plastic relief of Harry's sidekick, and ironically, an underdog more similar to Hemingway's type than in Faulkner's carefully reworked version of the novel.

The relationship with Hélène appears to be of a greater interest in Faulkner's script than in the final cinematic version, since the two women were first envisaged as rivals; when he successfully carries the De Bursacs ashore, Harry “raises the hand with which he had helped Hélène into the boat, sniffs at it, smells the faint scent which she had left, dips his hand in the water to wash it off” (Faulkner 1997: 142). While Paul de Bursac is being operated on, his wife behaves more apprehensively in the

script (“I’m an American citizen”), to which Harry cynically responds: “Why don’t you sing ‘The Star-Spangled Banner’?” (Faulkner 1997: 148). This jab and some other details of possible chemistry between Harry and H       do not appear in the film, where Marie overshadows the figure of the other woman with so much graceful poise. After surgery, the script brings up the matter of money to be paid to Harry, but the film shows his more humane side as a helper to the patriots in trouble, ready to assume the role of a makeshift surgeon. One of H      ’s last appearances takes place at the end of the film, when she tries to explain to Harry that she would not have her husband any other way, no matter how much braver Harry is; they kiss before the scene closes, and nothing of the sort happens in the film – H       gives him her mother’s jewels as “a part payment for all you’ve done for us” (*To Have and Have Not* 1:31:32–1:31:36). By then, Bacall had proved her exquisite ability to bear the burden of a lead role, and H      ’s influence in the film’s storyline had considerably dwindled.

During Paul’s acute illness, the script allowed G       to tell Morgan a patriotic line, after he thoughtlessly exposed Harry to the police: “If that man dies, our only hope of saving Martinique is gone” (Faulkner 1997: 144). Except this hurried replica, nothing else is changed in the film version, which may lead us to the conclusion that the desire for liberation would not have been so strongly embraced by the lead character, who after all, is a smuggler in grave danger. In addition, when the police are questioning Harry about his night voyage, he lies about following the tackle that Johnson had lost, and expresses no special sympathies about the sides at war; in the film, he walks on a razor’s edge in Eddy’s company, who is so drunk that he can mention the passengers any moment, so Harry assumes the role of a brazen macho who bluntly talks back to the interrogators, knowing that they have no proof against him. In a word, we can see a Hemingway hero bluffing in the face of serious peril.

Paul describes the plan to get an important resistance fighter from Devil’s Island in such a way that we can understand a Vichy official is assisting the fighters, but the film presents this scheme in a clearer redemptive light: “He’s a man whom people who are persecuted and oppressed will believe in and follow” (*To Have and Have Not* 1:25:00–1:25:05). Paul also admits having very little courage when compared with Harry, adding that he is always frightened when a risk-taking decision comes up. Another enhancement of Harry’s positive feeling towards the revolutionaries appears at the very ending of the film, when the police officers are tied up and gagged and the patriots are preparing to leave Martinique; Harry is even willing to help them get Villemars from Devil’s Island, and when asked by G       why he is doing that, he replies with the highest degree of friendliness such a hero can muster up: “Well, I don’t know. Maybe because I like you and maybe because I don’t like them” (*To Have and Have Not* 1:37:20–1:37: 25). The last scene underwent a noticeable reduction in length

and a drastic change in tone: the script shows Harry hinting to Gérard that the seized Vichy officers should be eliminated while the orchestra is playing full blast (Faulkner 1997: 183), and the film finishes without a loss of life, in a true melodramatic happy ending, while Marie shimmies up to Morgan accompanied by the musicians' lively notes suitable for a peaceful denouement, so the couple exit with a hopping Eddy following behind (*To Have and Have Not* 1:39:30–1:39:46).

References

- Baptiste, F.-A. (1978). Le Régime de Vichy à la Martinique. *Revue d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale*, 28, 111, 1–24.
- Blotner, J. (2005). *Faulkner: A Biography*. Jackson, MS: The University Press of Mississippi.
- Brody, R. (2012). What to See This Weekend: Being Earnest with Hemingway. *The New Yorker*, 21 July 2012. (17 October 2019) <<https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/what-to-see-this-weekend-being-earnest-with-hemingway>>.
- Cobbs, J. (1979). Hemingway's "To Have and Have Not": A Casualty of Didactic Revision. *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 44, 4, 1–10.
- Faulkner, W. (1997). *To Have and Have Not* (screenplay). In: B. Kawin (ed.), *To Have and Have Not*, Wisconsin/Warner Bros. Screenplay Series, Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 67–183.
- Hemingway, E. (1955). *To Have and Have Not*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Jennings, E. (2002). Last Exit from Vichy France: The Martinique Escape Route and the Ambiguities of Emigration. *The Journal of Modern History*, 74, 2, 289–324.
- Kawin, B. (ed.) (1997). *To Have and Have Not*. Wisconsin/Warner Bros. Screenplay Series. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Leitch, Th. (2007). *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Phillips, G. (2001). *Fiction, Film and Faulkner: The Art of Adaptation*. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Solomon, S. (2017). *William Faulkner in Hollywood: Screenwriting for the Studios*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- To Have and Have Not* (1944). Dir. Howard Hawks. Perfs. Humphry Bogart, Lauren Bacall, Walter Brennan. Warner Brothers.