Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English

Mythical Patterns and Ideology in Stanley Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey* and Francis Ford Coppola's *Apocalypse Now*

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English.

Option: Comparative Literature

Presented by: Takfarinas Abdiouene

Panel of Examiners:

Guendouzi Amar, MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou, Chair,

Afettouche Belaïd, MAA, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou, Examiner,

Boutouchent Fadhila, MCB, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi Ouzou, Supervisor.

June 2014

Acknowledgments

This page is too small to contain all the people that need to be thanked. I am forever indebted to my supervisor, Dr. Fadhila Boutouchent, for accepting to take me under her wing, no matter how outlandish my topic seemed to everybody. Without her patience and her stimulating input, this dissertation would not exist. I would also like to thank the staff of teachers at the Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou who always show a genuine interest in the intellectual growth of their students as well as their own. These two years of Master's degree would have been extremely dull without the presence of my fellow Master students: Nafissa Hocini, Ghiles Idir, Zahia Kebir, Dounia Boutirna, Mahrez Rahim, Omar Bouadma, Rabah Bendou, and a host of others whom I cannot cite for fear of missing to mention one or another. I would also like to thank my friends, former fellow students and teachers from the University of El Tarf who supported and encouraged me in my freshman years.

One person deserves special mention. One of my greatest debts goes to our headmaster, Professor Dalila Arezki, whose encouragements and perpetual guidance will be forever remembered.

Last but not least, a great thank you to our Professor at the department, Mr. Bouteldja Riche, who works relentlessly and makes tremendous efforts for the sake of the University, and without whom the Masters would not have been possible.

Dedication

To my parents, who never failed to support me and encourage me no matter what. To my mother, who always sheds a tear or two whenever I am leaving home, and to my father, who is always patient with me. I also would like to dedicate it to my brother, who never refuses to help whatever other obligations he might have. To my friends, wherever they are, and to anyone who was ever moved by a piece of literature, film, theater or any other art form.

Abstract

This dissertation investigates the mythic dimension of two films, Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey and Francis Ford Coppola's Apocalypse Now. Using Gérard Genette's hypertextuality for a discussion of adaptation, Roland Barthes's notion of 'myth' and Jean-François Lyotard's concept of 'metanarratives' for the ideological contents of cultural production, and Joseph Campbell's Monomyth for the protagonists' 'hero's journey', I will try to show how Stanley Kubrick and Francis Ford Coppola integrated myth to their work in order to promote postmodern ideas about civilization and knowledge, and highlight how they appropriated the texts, as they not only adapted but also expanded the source texts with allusions to myth and literature, and how the polysemiotic nature of film as a distinct art form helped them create works with polysemic content.T.S. Eliot used the term "mythic method" when reviewing James Joyce's Ulysses. Myth is an important element in these two films. If the purpose of the modernist author is to "order" his/her work by use of mythic subtexts or intertexts, I will argue that in the postmodernist variation it is used, possibly, to "disorder" the narrative, and by that I mean that it makes the final work ambiguous to interpret. The following dissertation is divided into three chapters. I want ot find out why the mythical paradigms of ancient myth were used in these two films. These are films that are loosely based on The Sentinel and Heart of Darkness respectively. The aesthetic style of the films can be said to be postmodernist, but could they be using a modernist 'method' when they incorporate myth? There is also the problem of myth as ideology. Once a myth is transmitted from one person to another through one medium or another, it sends with it an ideological message. I will investigate whether the ideological messages of 2001: A Space Odyssey and Apocalypse Now are in accord with the dominant political views of their era, and how do they express their own ideas in relation to that.

Contents

Acknowledgments……..….i

Dedication ……...….. ii

Abstract ……..…….…...…. iii

Introduction ……..…….…….....….. 1

Review of Literature …….…….4

Issue and Working Hypothesis ……..... 6

Methods and Materials…….…. 7

Notes and References ……... 11

Results ……..... 13

Chapter One: Myth as a Narrative and Myth as Ideology in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* …….….... 15

1.1 Theoretical background on Myth…….…….……..... 15

1.2 Paradigms of Myth and Archetypes in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*…….….…... 20

1.3 Lyotard's Grand Narrative and Myth as Ideology …….23

Chapter Two: Genre and Adaptation in 2001 and Apocalypse Now …….…….. 29

2.1. *2001: A Space Odyssey* as Science-Fiction ……..……..……. 29

2.2 The Vietnam War films and *Apocalypse Now* ……..… 30

2.3 Polysemy and the Transformation of Source Texts ……...……32

Chapter Three: The End of Grand Narratives in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*…….……..…... 48

3.1 Insanity and the Effects of Exposure to Violence in *Apocalypse Now* ……....…. 48

3. 2 Science and the Desensitization of Humanity in *2001: A Space Odyssey* ….…….…. 52

Conclusion ……..…….….... 60

Bibliography……...……..……..…..... 63

Introduction

Introduction

Myth, as a form of storytelling, has been an integral component of society since the dawn of civilization. It found its most widely accessible vehicle in religious scripture and ritual. It is generally accepted as a term referring to a symbolic story related to religious belief [1]. It is also mostly associated with archaic people, who had a tendency to explain natural phenomena they could not understand by magical thinking and to create legends about their ancestors' supernatural heroics [2]. This is the type of myth studied by anthropologists (Lévi-Strauss, 1959), folklorists (Frobenius and Fox, 1937), and mythographers (Campbell, 1949; Eliade, 1954). But the creation of heroes is also found in modern culture. Novels, films, comic books, television, and songs still refer to heroes and magic, although people lost credulity about the reality of such magical phenomena. What popular culture does is recycle what is often referred to as 'archetypes' [3].

There are other definitions for 'myth'. The word is sometimes used to mean 'illusion'. We say that such or such idea is a myth to mean that it is a lie fabricated or maintained by the ruling class to keep its hands on power. Here, myth stands for ideology. Myth as ideology is the domain of cultural studies, discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis. Archaic stories could be also discussed as ideology; though those ideologies of the past have become irrelevant in the secularized world we have inherited. But many mythographers study ancient myths as timeless symbols still relevant to the present world. In this way, ancient myth becomes ideology once again. Ideology is the body of doctrine, myth, and beliefs that guides an individual, social movement, institution, class, or any large group [4]. In *Structural Anthropology* (1959), anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss says that myth is "language" functioning on "an especially high level [5]. Myth is linked to language; it is through it that Myths are passed down from generation to generation. By the time the novel form was

invented, myth found its way into literary narratives. Myth never stopped inspiring artists and writers alike in their production, in spite of the rejection it suffered from the realists. But 'Realism' as a literary tendency is as Roland Barthes argued itself a 'myth' in the ideological sense [6].

Apart from writers, politicians tend to mythicize history, to give mythical investiture to historical figures and to amplify historical events. A politician with an influential apparatus of propaganda – the media – shapes ideological myths which in turn influence the attitudes of the population towards its own history. But politics is not the only realm in which history is mythicized. Most major historical events have been exploited as a basis for movie plots. In the United States of America, two major events were mythicized: the Space Race and the Vietnam War.

After World War II, tensions between the Soviet Union and The United States of America escalated. The USSR wanted to spread communist ideology to other countries, and the USA wanted to stop that spread by any means. American interventionism was practiced whenever a 'threat' was perceived. The defeat of the French in Indochina led to its splitting into three countries: Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Vietnam was itself divided into a Communist North Vietnam and an anti-Communist South Vietnam backed by the USA. At first, only 'advisors' were present in Vietnam, but quickly the US sent troops and entered directly in the armed conflict. Eventually, the war escalated, making tremendous losses in lives from both sides and the rise of anti-war protests all over the world, championed by counter-culture events such as the Woodstock Festival in 1969. The American troops retreated in 1974 but they kept supporting the South Vietnamese. The Vietnam War was over in 1975 with the fall of Saigon, after which the country was reunified under a communist regime.

The Space Race was a competition between the USSR and the USA over space exploration. Each of the two blocks feared that the other would gain massive military power

through knowledge acquired from space exploration and research, so the Space Race was partly motivated by military interests. But also, apart from the military, technological and scientific authority over which each wanted to outdo the other, it was also a means for each of the block to marvel its population and convince it of its superiority. So it was in the spirit of Communist superiority that the successes of space explorations were expressed by the Soviets, who were the first to launch a man to outer space. And it was in the spirit of competition and superiority of American values over Communist values that the Americans launched the Apollo program. The NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) was the USA's force behind the success of the Apollo program, which saw them as the first to land on the Moon.

Each one of the two historical events (or periods if one prefers) stood as a symbol of the Cold-War struggle between the USSR and the USA. Some of the films produced in that era were propaganda for the dominant thinking of the period, while others have mostly sought to avoid a black and white worldview by avoiding the subject altogether. Films dealing with outer space are usually science-fiction films happening in a hypothetical future, while the Vietnam War films have stronger ties to history. I chose to contrast science-fiction space travel film *2001: A Space Odyssey* (Stanley Kubrick, 1968) with Vietnam War film *Apocalypse Now* (Francis Ford Coppola, 1979). Sure, the two are from different genres of film, but they share a lot in common. What I will compare is the way their creative teams subverted the ideological undertones of the Space Race and the Vietnam War respectively using as templates for their stories archetypes from ancient Myths. Both are important American films with themes historically peculiar to the United States. The two films are adaptations, so I will analyze the mythical dimension of their source-texts. The reason for which this present study deals with different definitions of the word "myth" is because at least two of them apply to the films *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*. We have Myth

in the old sense – a story of supernatural proportions with a relevance to the community in which it circulates, and we have myth as ideology. Anyone in a discussion of either *2001: A Space Odyssey* or *Apocalypse Now* would point to a mythical dimension, one in the traditional definition of the word, and represented in archetypal characters (heroes, villains etc.) and archetypal stories. But the second definition applies too. Both *Apocalypse Now* and *2001: A Space Odyssey* are stories containing a narrative which have Mythical connotations, and at the same time debunk established ideological myths.

Review of Literature:

In *Myth* (2000), Laurence Coupe discusses, among other topics, the mythical dimension of *Apocalypse Now* as a film and as an adaptation. He makes interesting connections to Conrad's *Heart of Darkness,* the novella on which the film is based; T.S. Eliot's *The Hollow Men,* a poem used in the film, Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, a book we see in a scene from the film and which also inspired the climax; and the shamanistic attitude of Jim Morrison, singer and songwriter for The Doors, whose song *"The End"* was used as intro and outro for the film. Coupe's study is in the broad sense of 'myth' as ancient story with symbolic meaning. This is why he dismisses Roland Barthes' *Mythologies,* a book concerned with 'myth' as ideology, and neglects its potential as a provider of new insights on Myth as ancient symbolic story. He does mention that Barthes' myth is ideology and should not be taken to mean Myth in the traditional sense, but ancient Myth can be categorized as an archaic form of ideology [7]. What ideology does is legitimate ways of thinking and practice for a community. That is what Myth stood for in the past. This is one of the approaches I will be undertaking for the analysis of *Apocalypse Now* and that I find missing in Laurence Coupe's book.

In *Kubrick's Hope: From 2001 to Eyes Wide Shut* (2008), Julian Rice Discusses the 'optimism' of director Stanley Kubrick that pervades the films he co-writes and creates a contrast to a seeming 'pessimism' about human nature in his movies [8]. He attributes that optimism to Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949), a work exploring the theme of the 'hero' in its different incarnations throughout world cultures and which influenced Stanley Kubrick. But that theme is under-analyzed. It is only described as an inspiration for both director Kubrick and screenwriter Arthur C. Clarke (who was given the book by Kubrick) for some motifs in the film. In *Kubrick's 2001: A Triple Allegory* (2000), Leonard F. Wheat analyzes the allegories presented in the film. He mentions three allegories: one related to parallels to the classical mythological text *The Odyssey*, and Wheat demonstrates that with anagrams in the characters' names as well as the journey itself. He also metnions the parallels to the Nietzschean 'overman', a later stage in the development of humanity imagined by German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. The third allegory of Wheat is that connecting the film to the body of work of its co-writer Arthur C. Clarke. Clarke had theories about a future symbiosis between man and machine. But the author makes no efforts to investigate the why of such allegories. It is the work of a passionate who gathered a lot of information but whose purpose was only to show, not explain.

In a collection of essays dedicated to the study of *2001: A Space Odyssey* – Robert Kolker's (Ed) *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey - New Essays*, Joseph Campbell's name is cited only once [9]. To be frank, the essays do not directly deal with myth, and have subjects as diverse as reception theory [10], artificial intelligence [11], and gender [12]. As an adaptation of a short story (*The Sentinel*, 1949), discussion of adaptation is absent from the book. Adaptation is a subject which will be dealt with in this dissertation because of the importance of the transformation of source materials in their passage from the literary world to the film world. The study of film in relation to literature have been explored in many

scholarly works (Stam and Raengo, 2004; Hutcheon, 2006; Sanders, 2006) and have gained great importance in recent years. Books do not live in a world on their own. A constant circulation of stories, plots and motifs led to the scattering of those same elements in a net of intertextual works of fiction to be found in all storytelling media.

Most works dealing with *2001: A Space Odyssey* or *Apocalypse Now* focus on one theme or another, but very often the importance of the mythic paradigms used in the films is overlooked. My contribution aims at stressing this otherwise slightly touched area.

Issue and Working Hypothesis:

Very often, adaptation theorists use theories from literary studies. For example Robert Stam uses Gérard Genette's hypertextuality, from *Palimpsests* (1982) to elaborate a formula for the transformation of texts in other forms of media [13]. There is an issue of faithfulness in adaptation. Some filmmakers keep the dialogue from their source texts but make works with almost no relation to the essence of the original story. Sometimes the archetype of a character of one story becomes obscured in the transition to the new medium in a deliberate attempt to downplay the themes of the narrative or in a simple misunderstanding of the original work. When done in purpose, the downplaying of a story's themes can be ideological, and when such operation is done to a mythological source, the moderation of the tone of the story negatively affects the original symbolic meaning of the myth. This downplaying of mythological motifs serves the spreading of a form of ideological 'myth' [14].

In *2001: A Space Odyssey*, The mythical structure mirrors an origin story (or genesis) in the first segment of the film. It then uses the 'hero' motif in the rest of the film, which is emphasized at the ending. The whole movie is given a mythical aura in its structure even though its content remains purely secular. The 'myth' or ideology which is ever present in the

movie and which is debunked in its climax is that of science as a liberating force for humanity.

Apocalypse Now has as a basis for its narrative the novella *Heart of Darkness* (1901) by Joseph Conrad. The novella has its own mythical dimension which we find again in *Apocalypse Now*. But the new context of the Vietnam War adds its own myths. The ideology rampant in the film is that of the civilized westerner fighting the savage 'other' [15].

It is in light of all those elements of myth as symbolic story, myth as ideology, and adaptation that I use Jean-François Lyotard's notion of 'metanarratives'. A 'metanarrative' or 'Grand Narrative' is an idea or principle which has been mythicized to become a legitimizer for certain practices. Science has been made into a metanarrative by the Enlightenment: the 'myth' of science as leading humanity to liberation. The metanarrative of science has been carried on during the Space Race. The idea of civilizer westerner pacifying the lands of savages was at the back of the American intervention in Vietnam, although now the 'savage' is more aptly identified as the communist Vietcong. *2001: A Space Odyssey* debunks the first metanarrative by presenting a future humanity devoid of emotions in their constant contact with technology and unable to intellectually cope with the immensity of the universe. *Apocalypse Now* takes an American military officer and turns him into a 'savage' gone insane and fighting war by his own ways. Lyotard claims the irrelevance of 'metanarratives' because they are unfounded. *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* are then two apt candidates to represent what he calls the 'postmodern condition'

.

Methods and Materials:

a - Theory:

My hypothesis is that in these two films, the creative teams of screenwriter and director/co-writer have deliberately used mythical structures in their narratives. The reason for

this inclusion is irony. The mythical form of the films serves the ironical commentary they make on the ideologies of the Space Race and the Vietnam War. Coppola and Kubrick display ideas about how both violence and technology contribute to the desensitization of human beings, and they do so by ironically including mythical motifs which when taken from their original sources are high in emotion. Using Joseph Campbell's *Hero with a Thousand Faces* as a tool for comparison, the hero's journey of the protagonist of each film will be analyzed in relation to Campbell's original meaning. Then, I will see where the two films stand as postmodern works of art debunking 'metanarratives' of knowledge and violence.

I will be using Roland Barthes's notion of 'myth' when referring to myth as ideology, and Claude Lévi-Strauss's myth to refer to the word in its traditional sense. I will be using Myth with an uppercase M for 'traditional Myth' and myth with a lowercase M when it refers to 'myth as ideology'. The two works of fiction I decided to contrast in this dissertation are *2001: A Space Odyssey* by Arthur C. Clarke and Stanley Kubrick, and *Apocalypse Now* by John Milius and Francis Ford Coppola. Chapter One will focus on the mythical paradigms used in each film; I will then introduce Lyotard's idea of 'metanarratives'. Chapter Two puts the two films in the context of their own genre and in relation to their source-texts to see what changed in the adaptations and how that affects the story. In Chapter Three, I will discuss the ideological myths which are debunked in the films and see if they succeed in doing so. To conclude, I will try to link all that was said above to T.S. Eliot idea of a 'mythical method' and see if there is a postmodern variant to it.

b - Plot Summaries of the Films:

2001: A Space Odyssey is a movie divided into five segments. The first segment, *The Dawn of Man*, takes place millions of years in the past, in Africa, where the Australopithecus ancestor of humanity is struggling to survive in a hostile environment. This first part is like a

secular genesis of humanity. The ape-like ancestors discover the use of tools and weapons in this segment after they encounter a black rectangular shape. This first part jumps in a cut-scene into millions of years later in the future, with outer space conquered. This part has no subtitle. A rumor on earth says that an epidemic of unknown origin was spread on the moon station where research is conducted. But this is a cover story for another event; a black shaped monolith was found on the moon. It had sent a radio signal to Jupiter which was intercepted by scientists on earth, and so a secret mission is conducted in the next segment, *18 Months Later*. Dr David Bowman and Dr Frank Poole conduct the mission to Jupiter on board a space ship called *Discovery*. The rest of the crew is formed by three hibernating astronauts and HAL, a super intelligent computer controlling the spaceship. The computer is almost deactivated by the two astronauts when it malfunctions, but it foresees their secret plans and wreaks havoc. The hibernating crew's life functions are unplugged and so they are killed, and Frank Poole is killed with a space pod controlled by HAL while he is repairing an antenna. Bowman, who was outside when the incidents happened, manages to re-enter the sealed ship, deactivate HAL, and carry on the mission. When on Jupiter's orbit, Bowman is absorbed into a monolith floating in space and is swallowed into an unknown zone of the universe. He finds himself later in a room which replicates a hotel suite. In it he is shown to age rapidly in sequences, and then he is transformed in his dying bed into a fetus inside an illuminated sphere. The last scene shows the fetus in colossal proportions facing planet earth.

Apocalypse Now is about a U.S. military officer, Captain Benjamin Willard, who is sent in a secret mission to kill a renegade, Colonel Walter E. Kurtz, at the frontier between Vietnam and Cambodia. He is said to use unsound methods and of being insane, and so, must be eliminated. The film is made up of episodic events which lead the protagonist and a crew of unexperienced soldiers into a strange journey. Willard is first led to an opening to the Nung River y Colonel Kilgore, a megalomaniac who chose the site because it has a good beach for

surfing. After that, Willard and his crew undertake a journey into the absurdity of the Vietnam War. In the way up the river, Willard studies Colonel Kurtz's file, and wonders, given the record of the colonel, how such a man could turn so bad. At each stop, Willard reflects on whether Kurtz is really condemnable after all. Willard is made captive by Colonel Kurtz but is then released. Kurtz asks Willard to preserve his memory for his son in a scene where he almost suggests his own execution. Willard completes his mission at the end by executing the Colonel, but he takes the memoirs of the latter with him.

Production Details:

2001: A Space Odyssey

Crew: Script: Stanley Kubrick and Arthur C. Clarke, based on Clarke's story "*The Sentinel*". Direction: Stanley Kubrick; Cinematographer: Geoffrey Unsworth; Additional Cinematography: John Alcott; Production Design: Tony Masters, Harry Lange, Ernie Archer; Special photographic effects design and direction: Stanley Kubrick; Special photographic effects supervision: Wally Veevers, Douglas Trumbull, Con Pederson, Tom Howard; Editing: Ray Lovejoy**;** Music: Richard Strauss, Johann Strauss, Aram Khatchaturian, György Ligeti; Costumes: Hardy Amies.

Cast: Keir Dullea (*David Bowman*), Gary Lockwood (*Frank Poole*), William Sylvester (*Dr. Heywood Floyd*), Daniel Richter (*Moon-Watcher*), Douglas Rain (*Voice of HAL 9000*), Leonard Rossiter (*Smyslov*), Margaret Tyzack (*Elena*), Robert Beatty (*Halvorsen*), Sean Sullivan (*Michaels*), Frank Miller (*Mission Control*), Penny Brahms (*Stewardess*), Alan Gifford (*Poole's Father*).

Year of Release: 1968.
Produced by Stanley Kubrick for MGM Studios.
Total Running time: 148 minutes.

Apocalypse Now – Redux (or "director's cut")

Crew: Script: Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, based on Joseph Conrad's *Heart Of Darkness.* Additional Narration: Michael Herr; Direction: Francis Ford Coppola; Cinematographer: Geoffrey Unsworth; Additional Cinematography: Caleb Deschanel; Production Design: Dean Tavoularis, George R. Nelson; Special Effects Design and Coordination: A.D. Flowers; Editing: Richard Marks, Walter Murch; Music: Richard Wagner, The Doors, The Rolling Stones; Costumes: Luster Bayless.

Cast: Martin Sheen (*Captain Willard*), Robert Duvall (*Colonel Kilgore*), Marlon Brando (*Colonel Kurtz*), Frederic Forrest (*Chef*), Sam Bottoms (*Lance*), Laurence Fishburne (*Mr. Clean*), Albert Hall (*Chief Phillips*), Dennis Hopper (*Photojournalist*), Harrison Ford (*Colonel Lucas*), G.D. Spradlin (*General Corman*).

Year of Release: 2001. (Original Year of Release for *Apocalypse Now*: 1979).
Produced by Francis Ford Coppola for Zoetrope Studios.
Total Running Time: 195 minutes.

Notes and References:

1. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/400920/myth, accessed on 14/05/2014.

2. Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 6.

3. Carl Jung, R.F.C. Hull (Trans), *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, (London: Routledge), 1955, 4.

4. Definition of 'Ideology': http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/ideology(accessed on 13/07/2014).

5. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepfer (New York: Basic Books, Inc.), 1963, 210.

6. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Anette Lavers (New York: The Noonday Press), 1972, 136.

7. 27. Jean-François Lyotard, G. Bennington (Trans), *The Postmodern Condition* (Manchester University Press), 1984, 19-20.

8. Julian Rice, *Kubrick's Hope – From 2001* to *Eyes Wide Shut* (Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press), 2008, 195.

9. James Gilbert, *"Auteur with a Capital A"*in *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*, ed. Robert Kolker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 33.

10. Ibid, 29.

11. Michael Mateas, "Reading HAL: Representation and Artificial Intelligence" in *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*, ed. Robert Kolker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 105. Barry Keith Grant, "Of Men and Monoliths: Science Fiction, Gender, and 2001: A Space Odyssey" in *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*, ed. Robert Kolker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 69.

12. Ibid, 69.

13. Robert Stam et al, *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics* (New York: Routledge), 2005, xi.

14. Julie Sanders, Adaptation and Appropriation (New York: Routledge), 2006, 19.

15. Ter Ellingson, *The Myth of the Noble Savage*, (Berkley: University of California Press), 2001, xiii.

Production details from:

1. Robert Kolker (Ed), *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

2. Internet Movie Database; Apocalypse Now (1979) Full Cast & Crew, http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0078788/fullcredits, (consulted on 14/07/2014).

3. Jamie Russel, *The Vietnam War Movies*, Harpenden: The Pocket Essential, 2002.

Historical Details From:

1. The Vietnam War (summarized), http://thevietnamwar.info/vietnam-war-summary, accessed on 15/07/2014.

2. The National Cold War Exhibition: Space Race, http://www.nationalcoldwarexhibition.org/schools-colleges/national-curriculum/space-race (accessed on 15/07/2014).

Results

My aim is to find a relationship between Francis Ford Coppola's and Stanley Kubrick's integration of myth into their films *Apocalypse Now* and *2001: A Space Odyssey* respectively, and more precisely to find what unites the two stories in relation to myth. The fact that these two filmmakers used references to traditional myth in films that had contemporary subjects – the Vietnam War; the Space invasion – is not a coincidence and cannot be a playful gimmick by the screenwriters and directors.

By comparing mythical motifs used in both films, and others peculiar to each one on its own, I will try to see whether the goal of integrating myth in their films was to create what T.S. Eliot calls '*order*'. A first reading (or interpretation if one prefers) of the two films cited above is that they share a common structure known as the 'monomyth' which inspired the screenwriters for the journey of each protagonist. The 'monomyth' is a term appropriated by Joseph Campbell from James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (1939) and used as a template for the interpretation of mythology in Campbell's book *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949). But that use of the hero motif an the journey he goes through was not fortuitous. Kubrick and Coppola used Myth in films which in a deep level question our place in the universe, question our sense of what is evil and what is good, of what is power and what role has violence played in our civilization. There is a paradox between the use of a subtext which glorifies one's culture and heroes and a text that questions those values in our contemporary world. Myth is then used in those films to debunk ideological myths of culture and of political powers such as the United States over the validity of their assumptions.

Chapter One

Chapter One: Myth as a Narrative and Myth as Ideology in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*

1.1 Theoretical Background on Myth

In the climax of *Apocalypse Now*, the 1979 film based on *Heart of Darkness*, director Francis Ford Coppola has Captain Benjamin Willard kill the renegade Colonel Walter E. Kurtz, as described in the screenplay:

> Willard steps behind Kurtz, raising the machete. Kurtz turns. Willard brings the knife down and starts hacking away at Kurtz, hitting him first on the shoulder, then all over. [1]

Willard's execution of Colonel Kurtz is accompanied by the ritual killing of a water buffalo by a Cambodian tribe [2].In this, Kurtz's execution is ritualized. James Frazer, in his book *The Golden Bough*, talked about an ancient ritual practiced in ancient times at a temple by the lake Nemi:

> […] In this sacred grove there grew a certain tree round which at any time of the day, and probably far into the night, a grim figure might be seen to prowl. In his hand he carried a drawn sword, and he kept peering warily about him as if at every instant he expected to be set upon by an enemy. He was a priest and a murderer; and the man for whom he looked was sooner or later to murder him and hold the priesthood in his stead. Such was the rule of the sanctuary. [3]

This ritual of succession for priesthood was a direct inspiration for Francis Ford Coppola to the ending of *Apocalypse Now* [4]. In similar fashion, *2001: A Space Odyssey* displays some parallels to ancient mythology to be found, inter alia, in Homer's *Odyssey*. *2001: A Space Odyssey* is a 1968 film written by Stanley Kubrick and Arthur C. Clarke, directed by Kubrick and based on a short story by Clarke. The "Odyssey" in the title, which is reminiscent of *The Odyssey*, the famed epic poem sang by Homer in ancient Greece, is there to tell the audience that the film is going to be about adventure, though not on board a ship sailing the Mediterranean, but on board a spaceship travelling to Jupiter. In *2001: A Space Odyssey*, the

link to earlier texts and to myths is subtler. But as will be shown there are hints to *The Odyssey* all over the movie's plot which will make the "Odyssey" of "A Space Odyssey" more relevant as an intertextual reminder [5].

It would not be hard to trace back the Mythical aspects of each of *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*; it would prove more difficult to say why they are there. Why use allegory, metaphor, and allusion to past texts and legends such as *The Odyssey* in a science-fiction film? And why use the symbolism of the dying priest from *The Golden Bough* for the ending of *Apocalypse Now*, a film set during the Vietnam War?

Before analyzing the mythical images found in *Apocalypse Now* and in *2001: A Space Odyssey*, I will start by giving a general definition of Myth. And then I will move to other conceptions of the word *"myth"* as well as the implications of those conceptions for the present study.

Myth is a word which has a lot of different connotations. It is defined in the online *Encyclopædia Britannica* as "a symbolic narrative, usually of unknown origin and at least partly traditional, that ostensibly relates actual events and that is especially associated with religious belief."[6] It is then a traditional story which has been told and retold from generation to generation and which has a particular significance for the community in which it is repeated. Laurence Coupe quotes Don Cupitt who provides us with a similar, yet more elaborate definition. The latter says that "myth is typically a traditional sacred story of anonymous authorship and archetypal or universal significance which is recounted in a certain community and is often linked with a ritual" [7]. These stories are often set "outside historical time in primal or eschatological [i.e. last, ultimate] time" [8]. Archaic people have always had the tendency to create supernatural stories about their origins, the origins of the universe, natural phenomena they could not understand, and legends about their ancestors' heroic deeds. Cupitt adds that humans have a natural predisposition for myth-making: "We can add

that myth-making is evidently a primal and universal function of the human mind as it seeks a more or less unified vision of the cosmic order, the social order, and the meaning of the individual's life..." [9] Myth is then part of the fabric of societies and of individuals' psyche. That 'primal function' mentioned by Cupitt has been passed down to the modern era. In his 1923 review of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, T.S. Eliot writes about a 'mythical method', referring to Joyce's use of parallels to *The Odyssey*.

> In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him […] It is simply a way of controlling, of *ordering*, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history […] Instead of narrative method, we may now use the *mythical method*. [10]

What Joyce did in *Ulysses* is tell a story happening in twentieth century Ireland with rich allusions to Homer's *Odyssey*. To Eliot, the most important thing about *Ulysses* is that use of classical motifs in a new way; in fact, he saw classical heritage as an important quality to be found in art and in literature more particularly. In an earlier essay, *Tradition and the Individual Talent* (1919), T.S. Eliot claims that new art has to be valued in relation to its predecessors. "No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists." [11]. What Eliot means by 'mythical method' is, then, the creation of an orderly work of art through reference to canonical works (such as *The Odyssey*) which would aesthetically position the modern artist in a continuum of diachronic works of art and literature. "The existing monuments form an ideal *order* among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them." [12].

In *Myth* (2000), Laurence Coupe identifies four dominant paradigms of Myth to be found in symbolic traditional stories: cosmology Myth, telling about the origins or the

creation of the universe, fertility Myth, often including a sacrifice and linked to the rites of fertilization and cultivation of the land, hero Myth, telling a story about the deeds of a particularly courageous individual whereas a fourth paradigm, deliverance Myth, tells of an oppressed community freed from some calamity by the intervention of a superhuman character, hero or god [13]. The characters we encounter in those stories are incarnations of what is referred to as 'archetypes'. An archetype is a recurring thematic symbol, a figure which has its origin in ancient times [14]. In popular culture, the archetypes derived from Myth become recurring tropes (or figures) recognizable by creator and audience alike, without either being formally trained or educated in Mythic knowledge. Instead of referring to Mythical texts by way of a 'mythic method', popular fiction writers often unconsciously borrow themes whose origin lie in Myth to shape their narratives and characterization.

There is another definition for the word 'myth'. It could refer to rumor, deception, and illusion. Roland Barthes has at the end of *Mythologies* (1957) an essay titled *Myth Today* (*Le mythe, aujourd'hui*) in which he makes the following statement: *myth is a type of speech* ("le mythe est une parole") [15]. For Barthes, Myth is an ideological construct; it cannot solely be constituted of ancient narratives to be found in the ancestral traditions, but is a mode of signification concerning all cultural objects of contemporary life;

> […] what must be firmly established at the start is that myth is a system of communication, that it is a message. This allows one to perceive that myth cannot possibly be an object, a concept, or an idea; it is a mode of signification, a form. [16]

Barthes's myth is not the same as the one referred to by Laurence Coupe when he discusses the paradigms of myth in archaic tales. Barthes' notion of myth is a malleable mode of signification rising from culture, from art, or from politics; in other words, it is ideology. Indeed, in the same essay, Barthes claims that myth is a message, but not any type of

message; it is the form of that message that makes it a myth. He then goes on to say that myth can consist of any message in any medium of representation such as writing, photography, cinema and journalism. "[a message] can consist of modes of writing or of representations; not only written discourse, but also photography, cinema, reporting, sport, shows, publicity, all these can serve as a support to mythical speech. Myth can be defined neither by its object nor by its material, for any material can arbitrarily be endowed with meaning: the arrow which is brought in order to signify a challenge is also a kind of speech." [17] For Barthes, anything can be 'myth', an ideological construct, when communicated in a certain way. The form we give to speech is what makes it 'myth', not its content. Even Myth taken in its original definition can carry ideology from the archaic past [18].

In *Structural Anthropology* (1959), anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss says that myth is language, one which has its specificity in the story it tells, not its form;

> [Myth's] substance does not lie in its style, its original music, or its syntax, but in the story which it tells. Myth is language, functioning on an especially high level where meaning succeeds practically at "taking off" from the linguistic ground on which it keeps on rolling. [19]

As an anthropologist, Lévi-Strauss's notion of myth is more akin to that mentioned at the beginning of this paper. To Barthes, myth's essence is in the form of the message, which is dependent on its rhetorical intention. To Lévi-Strauss, Myth's essence is in the message itself. With an example closer to Barthes's myth-as-ideology, Lévi-Strauss talks of the ideological subtext of the French Revolution for the politician in contrast to its meaning to the historian;

> When the historian refers to the French Revolution, it is always as a sequence of past happenings […] But to the French politician, as well as to his followers, the French Revolution is both a sequence belonging to the past— as to the historian — and a timeless pattern which can be detected in the contemporary French social structure […] [20]

With the same material exploited by historians – 'history' – politicians give birth to ideology. Historical events like the French Revolution become, like fables, timeless. So, after all, Lévi-Strauss does not really contradict Barthes, as it is the way in which politicians talk about historical events which mythicizes them.

Two major political events were mythicized in American history: the Space Race and the Vietnam War. The first was the race for supremacy in the domain of space exploration and the second was a failed attempt to eradicate communism from North-Vietnam. The two events were symbols of the Cold-War. Usually, the films that deal with outer space are science-fiction films, while in the Vietnam War films have a greater duty to rely on history. I chose to contrast science-fiction space travel film *2001: A Space Odyssey* with Vietnam War film *Apocalypse Now*. These two films have also a structure and motifs resembling ancient Myth.

1.2 Paradigms of Myth in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*

Kubrick and Clarke framed their story on the hero myth as theorized by Joseph Campbell [21]. After the 'call to adventure' has been accepted (both Willard and Bowman are on a mission), the hero crosses the *first threshold*, a frontier separating the quiet world of the hero from the "unknown";

> With the personifications of his destiny to guide and aid him, the hero goes forward in his adventure until he comes to the "threshold guardian" at the entrance to the zone of magnified power. Such custodians bound the world in the four directions — also up and down—standing for the limits *c* the hero's present sphere, or life horizon. Beyond them is dark less, the unknown, and danger; just as beyond the parental watch is danger to the infant and beyond the protection of his society danger to the member of the tribe. [22]

The hero crosses the imaginary boundary separating his ordinary world from a world of dangers, and after he crosses the *threshold*, is led to experience an initiation into darkness represented by the *"Belly of the Whale"*, an expression taken from the biblical story of Jonas.

It is illustrated in Willard's journey up the Nung River, and in Bowman's voyage to the far stretches of outer space. Each gets swallowed into a world which transforms them. Each one of them crosses a dangerous *threshold*. That is part of the hero paradigm expressed in each film. Besides the cosmology Myth in *2001: A Space Odyssey* represented by the genesis of humanity, and depicted in the *Dawn of Man* segment, and a fertility Myth in *Apocalypse Now*, with the ritualized execution of Colonel Kurtz, we have those hero motifs shared by the two films. The Belly of the Whale experience is even more pronounced in the ending of *2001: A Space Odyssey*, in which David Bowman experiences a death and rebirth motif explored in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*;

> The idea that the passage of the magical threshold is a transit into a sphere of rebirth is symbolized in the worldwide womb image of the belly of the whale. The hero, instead of conquering or conciliating the power of the threshold, is swallowed into the unknown, and would appear to have died. [23]

Figure 1.1. David Bowm reborn as a fetus at the finale of the film. The death and rebirth of Bowman as a fetus can be read as the death and rebirth of the hero. *© MGM Studios, 1968.*

David Bowman is swallowed through a "star gate" [24], his own *threshold*, after following the third monolith of the film and finds himself in an alien room, decorated to resemble a human hotel suite, where he sees himself age, die in bed and then be reborn as a fetus. That is an example of hero Myth pushed to the limits. But in contrast to *Apocalypse Now*, *2001: A Space*

Odyssey has no central protagonist, just as there is no central antagonist. Identification with one character or another is almost impossible. We are glad for example that Bowman disconnects HAL, the computer-gone-mad, but the character hardly displays any emotion. So there is a paradox between a film presumably influenced by hero Myth and a character with whom we cannot identify. So maybe Kubrick and Clarke are trying to subvert the *monomyth* or to parody it while still giving us a universal hero.

Coppola used *The Golden Bough* to conclude his movie, which is a fertility Myth practiced in ancient times. But in that Myth, the killer becomes the priest, so if Coppola wanted to reproduce the Myth of the ritual killing and succession of the priest, Willard would replace Colonel Kurtz as the new leader of the Cambodian tribe, but he leaves the temple; in other words, he completes the mission he was sent to accomplish, even though he comments that he was the army anymore [25]. Willard's story can also be interpreted as a *"Belly of the Whale"* experience. Campbell explored all ancient hero myths known to him and found out that almost all of them use a similar pattern of 'call', 'initation', and return. Campbell reproduces in his account the mystic aura surrounding such stories.

In addition to subtle or overt allusion to other texts, religious or secular, *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* are penetrated by other sources, primarily by the texts they were based on, short story *The Sentinel* by Arthur C. Clarke and novella *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad respectively.

2001: A Space Odyssey is, on the surface, about humanity's origins and its destiny in the future. It is a mythical text not only because it borrows from *The Odyssey* [26], but mostly because of its narrative content which seeks to give a mythical structure to a hypothetical past in which primitive humanity struggles to survive.

But as will be seen in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*, this is not the intention of postmodernist artists. Although postmodernists have a debt to modernists like

Eliot, Joyce and Conrad in incorporating Myth in art of the twentieth century, the postmodernists do not believe anymore in what Jean-François Lyotard calls the "metanarrative" of human knowledge [27], among which I will posit modern interpretations of Myth as influenced by modernist literature.

1.3 Lyotard's *Grand Narrative* and Myth as Ideology

Lyotard writes in his influential book *"The Postmodern Condition"* that the Enlightenment created a myth (in the sense of ideology) in which knowledge can be a matter of consensus.

> […] the rule of consensus between the sender and addressee of a statement with truth-value is deemed acceptable if it is cast in terms of a possible unanimity between rational minds: this is the Enlightenment narrative, in which the hero of knowledge works toward a good ethico-political end – universal peace. As can be seen from this example, if a metanarrative implying a philosophy of history is used to legitimate knowledge, questions are raised concerning the validity of the institutions governing the social bond: these must be legitimated as well […] [28]

Here the Enlightenment is blamed for what is elsewhere in the book labeled the "metanarrative" which is the hypothesis of a unified knowledge of the universe, sported by science, creating a consensus about truth which would bring peace to the world. Lyotard's account of the metanarrative (or grand narrative) is a myth in the Barthesian sense, and could very well make another essay from *Mythologies*. Further Lyotard discusses 'popular stories', his version of Myth:

> The popular stories themselves recount what could be called positive or negative apprenticeships (*Bildungen*): in other words, the successes or failures greeting the hero's undertakings. These successes or failures either bestow legitimacy upon social institutions (the function of myths), or represent positive or negative models (the successful or unsuccessful hero) of integration into established institutions (legends and tales). Thu the narratives

> allow the society in which they are told, on the one hand, to define its criteria of competence and, on the other, to evaluate according to those criteria what is performed or can be performed with in it. [29]

Lyotard claims that Mythical imagination originates ideological myths in societies. These ideologies define their values and structure their life. But judging from the mid-century enthusiasm for Myth, there is a desire to bring together all mythological thinking under a unified theory, just as the Enlightenment urged scientists to find unifying theories for their subjects of study. In *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Joseph Campbell tried to find a unifying template he called the *monomyth* shared by all cultures all over the world and from which all mythological thinking derived.

> Campbell's case is particularly revealing of the connection between the modernist resuscitation of romantic myth and its popularizing by midcentury theorists. His work on *Finnegans Wake* led directly to *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949) and his subsequent career as the promoter of a "monomyth" according to which the universal pattern of myth is indeed that "allegory of the fall and resurrection of mankind" that he projected upon Joyce. [30]

Campbell co-authored a study of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, *"A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake"*, and published in the subsequent years his famed *Hero with a Thousand Faces* based on the theory of universal myth that he deduced from Joyce's book. This book will be influential among filmmakers such as Stanley Kubrick, director of *2001: A Space Odyssey*.

Lyotard debunks the idea of unified knowledge, what he calls 'metanarratives' are also myths in the ideological sense inherited from humanity's predisposition at creating mythologies. His ideas can be applied to narrative structures which tend to give a unified, universal truth about humanity, whether that narrative is about ancestral heroes or about a promising future.

Notes and References

1. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 191.

2. Ibid.

3. James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, (PDF: The Floating Press), 2009, 13.

4. "*I decided that the ending could be the classic myth of the murderer who goes up the river, kills the king and then himself becomes the king (…) [In] reading some of The Golden Bough and then From Ritual to Romance I found a lot concerning that theme.*" Coppola interviewed in Peter Cowie, *Coppola* (London: Faber & Faber), 1990, quoted from Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 24.

5. Clarke has quoted Kubrick as saying: "What I want is a theme of mythic grandeur." from Irving Singer, *Cinematic Mythmaking: Philosophy in Film* (London: The MIT Press), 2008, 208 – 209.

6. 'Myth': http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/400920/myth , (accessed on 14/05/2014). The authors of the definition use the word *narrative*. I will not be using *narrative* interchangeably with *story* as explained further in the dissertation.

7. Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 6.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

10. T.S. Eliot, *Ulysses, Order, and Myth*: http://people.virginia.edu/~jdk3t/eliotulysses.html,(accessed on 12/05/2014).

11. T.S. Eliot, *Selected Essays*, (London: Faber And Faber Limited) 1999, 15.

12. Ibid.

13. Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 3.

14. Carl Jung, R.F.C. Hull (Trans), *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, (London: Routledge), 1955, 4.

15. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, (Paris: Seuil, 1970), 181.

16. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, Anette Lavers (Trans) (New York: The Noonday Press), 1972, 107.

17. Ibid, 108.

18. Just to avoid the confusion, notice that I am using Myth with an uppercase **M** whenever I want to refer to the traditional definition of the word and myth with a lowercase **M** when talking about myth as ideology, just as the H is used for the French "Histoire" and "histoire".

19. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepfer (New York: Basic Books, Inc.), 1963, 210.

20. Ibid, 209.

21. Julian Rice, *Kubrick's Hope – From 2001* to *Eyes Wide Shut* (Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press), 2008, 2.

22. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Novato, CA: New World Library), 2008, 74.

23. Ibid, 84.

24. Arthur C. Clarke, *2001: A Space Odyssey* in *The Odyssey Collection* (PDF), 41.

25. Francis Ford Coppola (director), John Milius (screenwriter), *Apocalypse Now – Redux* (Zoetrope Studios), 2001, DVD.

26. James Gilbert, "Auteur with a Capital A" in *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*, ed. Robert Kolker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 32.

27. Jean-François Lyotard, G. Bennington (Trans), *The Postmodern Condition* (Manchester University Press), 1984, xxiv.

28. Ibid, xxiii – xxiv.

29. Ibid, 19 – 20.

30. Andrew Von Hendy, *The Modern Construction of Myth* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 2001, 151.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two: Genre and Adaptation in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*

2.1 *2001: A Space Odyssey* as Science-Fiction

In an attempt to define science-fiction, Adam Roberts cites some of the conventions usually found in popular science-fiction texts: "Spaceships, interplanetary or interstellar travel; aliens and the encounter with aliens; mechanical robots, genetic engineering, biological robots; computers, advanced technology, virtual reality; time travel; alternative history; futuristic utopias and dystopias." [1]

Roberts does not limit his definition to those conventions, but these are nonetheless sufficient tropes which stand as indicators for a work of science-fiction. On brief scrutiny, it is clear that *2001: A Space Odyssey* fits the definition of space travel science-fiction film, and many of the conventions cited above are present in it. It is after all the story of a crew of engineers and scientists travelling on a mission to Jupiter on board a spaceship, *The Discovery*, in the future (or what seemed to be futuristic enough as the year 2001 back in 1968). The spaceship is controlled by a super computer, HAL9000, capable of reproducing human thought and language. Aliens are lurking all along the film although we never see them. But apart from those tropes, the story is far from being a typical science-fiction adventure movie. In 1968, no films had achieved the technical prowess found in *2001: A Space Odyssey*. Other serious science-fiction films did exist, but the limited technology for special effects and the often limited budgets made them look unreal. The visual quality of*2001: A Space Odyssey* has set it apart from former science-fiction films. Actual satellite images of outer space were used, and director Stanley Kubrick had solicited a NASA consultant on the film's set to assess the plausibility of the technology of the film.

What made the movie's success as a narrative achievement was due in major part to Arthur C. Clarke. A renowned science-fiction writer, Clarke pinched the screenplay from a

short story of his own, *The Sentinel*, in which an astronaut doing routine work on the moon discovers a mysterious crystal block. The following scene comes after the astronaut sees a flashing object and decides to go find out what it might be:

> I was standing on a plateau perhaps a hundred feet across. It had once been smooth-too smooth to be natural-but falling meteors had pitted and scored its surface through immeasurable eons. It had been leveled to support a glittering, roughly pyramidal structure, twice as high as a man, that was set in the rock like a gigantic, many-faceted jewel. [2]

As a short story, *The Sentinel* was not dense enough to be converted into a screenplay. Many new ideas were added by a team-work between Clarke and Kubrick. *The Dawn of Man* segment, were the first to discover a "monolith" left outside their cave by unknown forces [3]. Even the original screenplay has been altered by Kubrick. Narration by Clarke was totally removed and replaced by musical cues. Clarke wrote a novelization of the film concurrently with the production of the film.

2.2 The Vietnam War films and *Apocalypse Now*

Just as *2001: A Space Odyssey* was not a typical science-fiction film for its time, so was *Apocalypse Now* in the realm of the Vietnam War film. Two noticeable movies about the Vietnam War preceded Apocalypse Now: John Wayne's *The Green Berets* (1968) and Michael Cimino's *The Deer Hunter* (1978).

Unlike *The Deer Hunter* and *Apocalypse Now*, *The Green Berets*(1968) was made and released during the Vietnam War, and was controversial for its pro-war rhetoric. As discussed by Leslie Abramson, the propagandist intention of the film was blatant,

> John Wayne mobilized his iconic status to rescue right-wing ideology in *The Green Berets*. Deploying his emblematic screen image as a frontier and war hero, Wayne (who co-directed and starred in the film) rearticulated the conflict in nostalgic terms, staunchly defending U.S. military policy via the conventions of the World War II combat film and the western. Yet, in its status as rhetoric, commercial enterprise, and generic text, the film proved

> immensely problematic, a work whose flaws foreground fissures in both domestic prowar doctrine and, as *New York Times* critic Renata Adler recognized, the status of Hollywood's classical strategies of *fantasization*. [4] (italics mine)

John Wayne's America had to mythicize its own history in order to keep its status as the world's sheriff. Examples like and *The Green Berets* are very suitable illustration for myth as ideology. The myth is a series of clichés of good westerners versus bad communist Vietcong, played in a cowboy versus Indians type of story. In similar fashion, many films in the industry were Cold War propaganda, a side-effect of the Red Scare.

On a different tone, *The Deer Hunter* (1978) tells the story of three Russian American friends' military service which takes them to Vietnam. They are made prisoners by north-Vietnamese soldiers. For entertainment, the sadistic guards force them to play Russian roulette and gamble on the outcome [5]. The three friends end up by escaping but the experience leaves them deeply traumatized. There is a certain amount of maturity that was beginning to appear in American cinema in the 1970's. *Apocalypse Now* (1979), released a year later, was based on Joseph Conrad's novella *Heart of Darkness*. Instead of post-war trauma, Coppola opts for a theme of alienation.

In *Heart of Darkness*, the story revolves around Charles Marlow, an experienced sailor taking a job as captain on a steamboat for a Belgian ivory trading company operating in Congo. His adventurous journey leads him on the river to meet the infamous Mr. Kurtz, a man said to use "unsound methods" [6] for gathering company owned ivory that he takes as his own. The Marlow of *Apocalypse Now* is Captain Benjamin Willard; a former CIA agent sent on a mission up the Nung River, to cross to Cambodia and "terminate with extreme prejudice" [7] the command of the infamous Colonel Walter E. Kurtz, whose methods are "unsound" [8] and who operates without any supervision. His superiors believe him to have gone insane.

Heart of Darkness has an unnamed narrator giving an account of an evening spent aboard the yawl Nellie. While he and other passengers are waiting for the turn of the tide that would carry their boat down the river, a character named Charles Marlow tells them a story. The largest portion of *Heart of Darkness* is the retelling of Marlow's narrative from the unnamed narrator. We almost forget about the latter if it was not for the repeated use of quotation marks. As a narrative parallel to Heart of Darkness, the screenplay of Apocalypse Now is largely made of voice-over narration analogous to Marlow's narration of his journey in the Congo.

2.3 Polysemy and the Transformation of Source Texts

Before we move to the ambiguity of interpretation present in *2001* and in *Apocalypse Now*, I will review the elements which stem from the source-texts and those which were added to the hypertexts. Following Gérard Genette's theory of hypertextuality, one can look at *Heart of Darkness* and as a hypotext, while *Apocalypse Now* is a hypertext:

> I mean [by hypertextuality] all relation uniting a text B (what I shall call a hypertext) to a prior text A (which I would call, of course, a hypotext) on whom it comes to graft in a way which is not that of the commentary" [9]. (translation mine).

Using this concept, film theorist coined a text-to-film hypertextuality in the study of adaptation. The source text A (hypotext) becomes the novel, novella or other format of literature while the resulting adaptation to film or television is the hypertext (text B). As viewed by Robert Stam:

> One way to look at adaptation is to see it as a matter of a source-novel hypotext's being transformed by a complex series of operations: selection, amplification, concretization, actualization, critique, extrapolation, popularization, transculturalization. The source novel, in this sense, can be seen as a situated utterance, produced in one medium and in one historical

> context, transformed into another, equally situated utterance, produced in a different context and in a different medium. [10]

Robert Stam borrows from Gérard Genette who, in his *Palimpsests*, identified the various types in which texts are indebted or are the result of the transformations of prior texts. *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* are both representatives of a *text B* related to a former *text A* which it doesn't comment but rather transforms. This can now be understood under the intertextuality umbrella term, and for more practical reasons, the transformation of hypotexts into hypertexts.

In the process of transformation of texts and in their passage from novel to screenplay, and from screenplay to screen, some changes take place. *Heart of Darkness*, in becoming *Apocalypse Now* is re-contextualized into a contemporary war, and the characters are substituted for members of the military hierarchy. In *2001*, the story of *The Sentinel* becomes an episode of the film's two hours and a half. The most important aspect which "grafts" on the hypertext is its polysemiotic nature. Film, unlike books, is made up of moving images, sound, and music. We do not experience books and films in the same way. The pacing of a novel can be controlled by the speed of reading. Film does not give you a choice: you have to watch it in the same amount of time as everyone else. Another aspect which distinguishes some films with a certain amount of symbolism is polysemy.

Polysemy means the multiplicity of possible meanings for an utterance. A polysemous message is a message whose meaning is ambiguous, and can be interpreted in different ways depending on the filter through which we receive the message. The icon of a camera can stand for cinema; it could also stand for journalism, surveillance, and so on. Again, I turn to Roland Barthes for further illustration:

> All images are polysemous; they imply, underlying their signifiers, a 'floating chain' of signifieds, the reader able to choose some and ignore others. Polysemy poses a question of meaning and this question always comes through as a dysfunction, even if this dysfunction is recuperated by society as a tragic (silent, God provides no possibility of choosing between signs) or a poetic (the panic 'shudder of meaning' of the Ancient Greeks) game; in the cinema itself, traumatic images are bound up with an uncertainty (an anxiety) concerning the meaning of objects or attitudes. [11]

The images in *Apocalypse Now* and *2001* are 'polysemous', partly, because of the 'polysemiotic' nature of film as a medium. The images and symbols used in the movies can be interpreted differently depending on the filter we choose. Music, too, is another device that may have an important role in the interpretation of the film. A famous piece of music played 'diegetically' - that it is part of the ongoing scene - or non-diegetically - part of the soundtrack only the viewer hears - changes radically the interpretation of the choice of the music. In *Apocalypse Now*, to scare some villagers and the Vietcong soldiers who control the area, Colonel Kilgore plays *Ride of the Valkyries* by Richard Wagner on a cassette player with amplifiers from all helicopters relaying the sound through radio. The script of the film introduces it as follow:

> **"KILGORE**
> **(to Lance)**
> We'll come in low out of the rising sun, and about a mile out, we'll put on the music.
> **LANCE**
> Music?
> **KILGORE**
> Yeah, I use *Wagner*. Scares the hell out of the slopes. My boys love it." [12]

Wagner was inspired, for the opera from which the above mentioned piece is taken, by the Valkyries of Norse mythology. The Valkyries are minor goddesses who appeared during battle and decided who should die [13]. Valkyries are often depicted in art as riding winged horses above the battlefields, although they actually ride on the back of wolves in the actual

Mythic text. The metaphor used by Coppola here is that Kilgore's air cavalry is Valkyries in the sense that they ride above the battlefields (inside helicopters) and choose who dies with their bombs and machine-guns.

Figure 2.1. Vietcong village/base bombed and raided by Kilgore's "Valkyries". *© Zoetrope Studios, 2001.*

The symbolism air cavalry/Valkyries is one interpretation of the scene. Another is about how the dramatic tone of a music which is foreign (German) is used to scare the Vietnamese. Some American soldiers in the Second Gulf War are said to have used loud music as psychological torture to scare Iraqi prisoners. That is the meaning we get from Kilgore himself, he wants to torture those "natives" with loud foreign music which sounds scary. Because of the recuperation of Wagner's music by Nazi propaganda, used along other German artists and thinkers as symbols of Aryan race supremacy, Wagner can be interpreted as a symbol of fascism. Fascism is a system which emphasizes aggressive nationalism and often racism [14]. Fascism can be exemplified by officers like Colonel Kilgore and their overkill attacks. Kilgore uses heavy artillery in order to attack a small village with very few Vietcong combatants, just because it is reputed a good beach for surfing. Kilgore's aggressive behavior is at least partly fueled by racism.The presence of Wagner's music can also be linked to Conrad – who knew Wagner's operas – as it is even speculated that Wagner

influenced his writing [15]. But in spite of the difference between the two mediums – novella and film – the theme is not altered. *Apocalypse Now*, like *Heart of Darkness*, is still about the adventure of a man up a river discovering the horrors of imperialism.

Gérard Genette distinguishes between the story, which in semiotic terms he labels as the 'signifier' and the narrative, which is the 'signified'. He states:

> I propose, without insisting on the obvious reasons for my choice of terms, to use the word *story* for the signified or narrative content (even if this content turns out, in a given case, to be low in dramatic intensity or fullness of incident), to use the word *narrative* for the signifier, statement, discourse or narrative text itself, and to use the word *narrating* for the producing narrative action and, by extension, the whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place. [16]

A narrative, i.e. the signified can be told in many different stories, so no matter how much the source text is expanded and transformed in the process of adaptation, if the core signified, or narrative, can remain the same then the essence of the story doesn't change.

Genette discusses mainly literature. But his definition of narrative can also apply to a variety of narrative media. Let us contrast Genette's statement to Barthes' *narrative*. In his essay "*Introduction to The Structural Analysis of Narrative*" [17], he gives narrative capacity to all human modes of communication:

> Narrative is first and foremost a prodigious variety of genres, themselves distributed amongst different substances - as though any material were fit to receive man's stories. Able to be carried by articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures, and the ordered mixture of all these substances; narrative is present in myth, legend, fable, tale, novella, epic, history, tragedy, drama, comedy, mime, painting (…) stained glass windows, cinema, comics, news item, conversation. [18]

This means that *narrative* is a term that applies to a variety of forms of expression, including films. Any medium of human communication can carry 'narrative'. For that narrative to be

Mythical or to be myth, or to carry both, it has to bear some special features, which can be represented in allegorical images, metaphor, allusion to Mythical texts, and nostalgia; it can be present in the mode of signification (egg: a story spanning millennia like in *2001: A Space Odyssey,* Enlightenment dreams about a bright scientific future) or in the content quoting Mythical sources directly, like *The Golden Bough* in *Apocalypse Now*. The 'signified' of a text can be present on many levels. While watching *Apocalypse Now,* or reading its screenplay, we know the story to be based on *Heart of Darkness* as soon as Captain Willard says the name of Kurtz in his narration. But, a second level of reading is needed if we want to find the other 'hypertextual' sources. When watching *Apocalypse Now* or *2001,* one expects them to fit into one genre or the other, the war film or the science-fiction, and the viewer would not be mistaken about his/her categorization. But they might also be surprised by elements in the narratives which do not fit the conventional definition of the genres to which those two films belong.

In *2001: A Space Odyssey*, the story is still about a mysterious geometrically symmetrical block discovered by humanity, like the source text *The Sentinel*. One of the interpretations of *2001* is that it can be seen as a "grand narrative" of the origins and destiny of humanity, a cosmology Myth, with the genesis in *The Dawn of Man*, followed by a hero narrative as well in the *18 Months Later* and *Intermission* segments [19]. The film was influenced partly by German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. Although the film doesn't begin with the creation of the universe, it starts with a segment titled "*The Dawn of Man*". In this first part of the movie, we are given the spectacle of apes trying to survive in a semi-desert land. The actors playing the apes have studied the habits and gestures of actual gorillas in a zoo before the shooting of the film started. So, at the beginning, they are only playing apes. Wild animals and rival tribes threaten the survival of the clan of "Moonwatcher" [20]. One morning, a strange rectangular monolith with perfect proportions is found outside their

cave. They all come closer to it, scared but curious. After the object is touched by the whole group where the Moonwatcher takes the lead and the spectator is invited to witness the use of the first tool. While toying with the bones of the skeleton of another animal, Moon-watcher discovers that he can crush some bones with a thicker one, and then decides to make a weapon of it. The ape has acquired new knowledge that helps him evolve from passive gatherer to hunter-gatherer capable of defending its territory with violence. This evolutionary acquisition of knowledge is reminiscent of, as described by George Stack:

> Knowing, for Nietzsche, is a transformational process and an evolutionary one. Truths are contextual and the context in which they are viable is a perspectival one: that of an individual (the "truths" of individual life-experience), a culture, a historical period, a discipline, a species, or, more mystically, life itself. [21]

So, the cosmology here is that of the origin of man's technology. But man learns after his contact with the strange monolith, a revelation from God or from aliens. In this particular scene of the discovery of the first tool, the choice of music is very revelatory. Richard Strauss' "*Also Sprach Zarathustra*" is played three times during the film, and in this particular scene, the parallel to Friedrich Nietzsche's "*Thus Spoke Zarathustra*" is overt [22].

Figure 2.2. The ape labeled "Moonwatchter" in the original script and in Arthur C. Clarke's novelization, pondering about the possibility of the first tool (and weapon) of humanity. *© MGM Studios, 1968.*

In this novel, Zarathustra, a caricature of prophets and fortunetellers, teaches people about the *Übermensch* [23], which is a type of being who transcends humanity, an "overman", the next step in human evolution. This is a central concept in Nietzsche's thought. In his reasoning, man is a link between the ancestral ape-man and the Übermensch, or overman:

> [...] I teach you the overman. Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him?
> "All beings so far have created something beyond themselves; and do you want to be the ebb of this great flood and even go back to the beasts rather than overcome man? What is the ape to man? A laughingstock or a painful embarrassment. And man shall be just that for the overman: a laughingstock or a painful embarrassment. You have made your way from worm to man, and much in you is still worm. Once you were apes, and even now, too, man is more ape than any ape. [24]

To the question *"What have you done to overcome him?"* Kubrick and Clarke could answer with their space travel tale. Man has gone outside of his world to reach for the stars. Even though it is highly improbable that space travel in the real world would reach the level depicted in *2001: A Space Odyssey*, America's Apollo program, which led to the first moon landing in 1969, is considered one of the highest achievement of the United States, and one of the highest achievements of humanity.

Nietzsche tells the story of how he got inspired to write *Zarathustra*:

> I now wish to relate the history of Zarathustra. The fundamental idea of the work, the Eternal Recurrence, the highest formula of a life affirmation that can ever be attained was first conceived in the month of August 1881. I made a note of the idea on a sheet of paper with the postscript: "6,000 feet beyond man and time". That day I happened to be wandering through the woods beside the Lake of Silvaplana and 1 halted not far from Surlei beside a *huge pyramidal block of stone*. It was then that the thought struck me. Looking back now I find that exactly two months before this inspiration I had an omen

> of its coming in the form of a sudden and decisive change in my tastes—more particularly in music. The whole of Zarathustra might perhaps be regarded as music. [25]

Nietzsche's encounter of a *huge pyramidal block of stone* echoes Clarke's short story *The Sentinel*, in which the narrator encounters a *pyramidal block*, and echoes even more with the apes of the film who are totally transformed since their contact with the black monolith.

Apart from *Heart of Darkness*, Apocalypse Now is influenced by the work of the monologist of the film, Michael Herr who narrates his experience as a war reporter in Vietnam in his semi-fictional work, *Dispatches* (1977). When he was asked to correct the text for script, Herr removed all the narration previously written by the screenwriter John Milius for Willard and replaced it by his own narration. *Dispatches* is usually described as blurring the line between fiction and non-fiction writing. Its style is a direct influence on *Apocalypse Now*. It can be viewed as a textual bridge between Marlow's account of Belgian imperialism in Congo from *Heart of Darkness* and Willard's experience in the Vietnam War. Scripting the voice-over narration of Willard, Herr tapped from his own writing and from his own experience as a reporter in the war. The style of *Dispatches* is itself influenced by *Heart of Darkness*. Herr introduces his memoir by talking about a map hanging on his Saigon apartment which, by the time of the American intervention, has become obsolete:

> There was a map of Vietnam on the wall of my apartment in Saigon and some nights, coming back late to the city, I'd lie out on my bed and look at it, too tired to do anything more than just get my boots off. That map was a marvel, especially now that it wasn't real anymore […] That's old, I'd tell visitors, that's a really old map. [26]

Told in the first person, the style of *Dispatches* was easy to reproduce for a voice-over narration. 'Maps' is an important element in Conrad's novella. It introduces themes of exoticism, imperialism, and the desire for colonialism from the very beginning of the

narrative. Marlow refers to his "passion" for maps and later refers to Africa as a mass of uncharted territories, reflecting a colonialist desire to conquer the 'unknown' places to the Western colonizer. Marlow recalls:

> 'Now when I was a little chap I had a passion for maps. I would look for hours at South America, or Africa, or Australia, and lose myself in all the glories of exploration. At that time there were many blank spaces on the earth […] [27]

The temptation of the snake, an image from the bible, is described in looking at a map of colonized Congo; Marlow is enchanted by it,

> […] there was [in the map] one river especially, a mighty big river, that you could see on the map, resembling an immense *snake* uncoiled, with its head in the sea, its body at rest curving afar over a vast country, and its tail lost in the depths of the land. [28]

The "snake" as a symbol of evil is an image which is repeated *in Apocalypse Now* when Willard narrates the part in which he is about to take his mission:

> **WILLARD (V.O.)**
> I was going to the worst place in the world, and I didn't even know it yet. Weeks away and hundreds of miles up river that *snaked* through the war like a circuit cable...plugged straight into Kurtz. [29]

In the movie, Colonel Kurtz has a bookshelf with the following books: *The Golden Bough* by Frazer, *From Ritual to Romance* by Jessie Weston, Goethe's *Faust*, and the *Holy Bible.* The choice of these books is not accidental. *The Golden Bough* is a symbol for the fertility myth mentioned earlier. *From Ritual to Romance* is an essay in which the author traces the origins of the Grail romances in the Arthurian legend to pagan myths of Quest [30]. The 'quest' in *Apocalypse Now* is that of Willard's travel on the Nung to find Kurtz, kill him and eventually get promoted. In the play *Faust*, Goethe reimagines a popular tale which was used before him in theater. Doctor Faust is a scientist bored with the limits of human knowledge and who

wants to know other-worldly phenomena, and for that he makes a deal with the devil Mephistoles who would drag his soul to hell when he dies. At the end of Goethe's play, Faust's soul is rescued at his death by angels.

What can be noticed when tracing back those sources is the fact that an image or a sequence can mean many things at the same time. These images or sequences send us back to other texts referred to in the new work intentionally or intentionally. But unlike the 'order' T.S. Eliot urges artists and writers to bring forth by exploring Myths and canonical works of literature, Coppola and Kubrick only confuse the audience with the multiple possible interpretations.

Because of the polysemiotic nature of films like *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*, one can find himself indulging in infinite theories, never ending interpretations which are supplanted by other interpretations. Ambiguity of a work of art is referred to as polysemy. A reader or viewer can choose how to interpret the work of art, be it a work of literature, a film or a painting. But this ambiguity is emphasized in a polysemiotic medium. Images, sounds (music), language (dialogues/monologues), camera angles, the viewer of a film can be directed into one interpretation or another.

As an example of a polysemous interpretation, there is an interesting analysis of *2001: A Space Odyssey* is to be found in a book titled *Kubrick's 2001: A Triple Allegory* (2000) by Leonard F. Wheat. Just as the author indicates in the title, his essay is about three allegories in this movie. The first is that of *The Odyssey*. Bowman can be identified to Odysseus (or Ulysses); his journey through space is the adventure of Odysseus in the Mediterranean, the hibernating crew is the crew of Odysseus, killed by the Cyclops Polyphemus (the computer controlling the *Discovery* ship, HAL9000) [31]. He also metnions the parallels to the Nietzschean 'overman': Bowman becomes the overman when at the end of the film he transcends 'man' [32]. Wheat identifies three stages for Nietzschean evolution: the worm –

the origins of life in primitive cells, the ape – man's ancestor in Darwinian science, 'man' – the contemporary *homo sapiens*, and 'overman' – a later stage in the development of humanity imagined by Nietzsche.

The third allegory of Wheat is that connecting the film to the body of work of its co-writer Arthur C. Clarke. Clarke said that in the future, machines and man would merge into a *homo machinus* type of symbiosis. Wheat concludes that Kubrick took the idea but turned it on its head as the symbiosis between HAL9000 and the *Discovery* ship, which he says is an 'allegory' of the human body. The symbiosis fails because it threatens the lives of humans [33].

Wheats' analysis is very informative, but at other times it indulges in arbitrary interpretations. My problem with Wheat is his overuse of anagrams to explain the link between characters and plot to the story of *The Odyssey*. He indulges in an openness of meaning to be found in the name of characters; the weakness of the triple allegory theory is that it overemphasized the *Odyssey* allegory. Wheat sees anagrams in the names of some characters where there are none and says that it is the authors of the film who created them as a parallel to Greek mythology. Wheat also forgets to mention another allegory which is important, that is the *conception allegory*. Many images of the film in the entrance of Bowman's pod into the "star gate" in the *"To Jupiter and Beyond"* segment are, in a sequence, an allegory of penetration, impregnation, of evolution of the egg, up to the gestation and formation of the fetus inside a womb until he actually materializes as a fetus in the alien room.

Interpretation of a film can be tricky, especially if the creative team has played with the allegories and Mythical allusions, but Jean-François Lyotard can help us know a thing or two about where the narratives of *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* wanted to go with their allusions to myth.

Notes and References:

1. Adam Roberts, *Science Fiction*, (New York: Routledge), 2006, 12.

2. Arthur C. Clarke, *The Sentinel*, (New York: Avon Periodicals, Inc.), 1951 (Scan), 6.

3. Stanley Kubrick and Arthur C. Clarke, *2001: A Space Odyssey* (MGM Studios Publishing), 1968, 12.

4. Leslie H. Abramson, 1968 – Movies and The Failure of Nostalgia in Barry K. Grant (Ed), American Cinema of the 1960's (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2008, 193.

5. The Deer Hunter; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Deer_Hunter (consulted on 10/06/2014).

6. Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (2004: Planet PDF), 129.

7. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 17.

8. Ibid, 14.

9. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes*, (Paris: Seuil), 1982, 13.

10. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo, A Companion to Literature and Film (Malden: Blackwell), 2004, 114.

11. Roland Barthes, *Image-Text-Music* (London: Fontana Press), 1977, 38 – 39.

12. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 37.

13. J.A. Coleman, *The Dictionary of Mythology* (London: Arcturus Publishing Limited), 2007, 1070.

14. Definition of 'Fascism': http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fascism?s=t(accessed: 14/07/2014)

15. John Louis DiGaetani, *Richard Wagner and the Modern British Novel*, (New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc.), 1978, 25.

16. Gérard Genette, Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method (New York: Cornell University Press), 1980, 27.

17. Roland Barthes, *Image-Text-Music* (London: Fontana Press), 1977, 79.

18. Ibid.

19. Stanley Kubrick (director), Arthur C. Clarke (screenwriter), *2001: A Space Odyssey* (MGM Studios, 1968), 2007, DVD.

20. Arthur C. Clarke, *2001: A Space Odyssey* in *The Odyssey Collection* (PDF), 15.

21. George J. Stack, *Nietzsche's Anthropic Circle: Man, Science, and Myth*, (Rochester: University of Rochester Press), 2005, 9.

22. Richard Strauss, composer of *"Also Sprach Zarathustra*" is quoted as saying: "I mean to convey in music an idea of the evolution of the human race from its origin, through the various phases of development, religious as well as scientific, up to Nietzsche's idea of the *Übermensch...*" Gene D. Phillips, *The Encyclopedia of Stanley Kubrick* (New York: Fact On File, Inc.), 2002, 12.

23. Most English versions have "overman" as a translation for the German "übermensch" but some recent translations keep the German original.

24. Walter Kaufmann (Trans/Ed), *The Portable Nietzsche* (Middlesex: Penguin Books), 1982, 124.

25. Friedrich Nietzsche, Judith Norman (Trans), *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2005, 123.

26. Michael Herr, *Dispatches*, (New York: Vintage International) 1991, 3.

27. Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (2004: Planet PDF), 11.

28. Ibid, 12.

29. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 6.

30. Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 21.

31. Leonard F. Wheat, Kubrick's 2001: A Triple Allegory, (Plymout: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.), 2000, 14.

32. Ibid, 75.

33. Ibid, 7.

Chapter Three

Chapter Three: The End of Grand Narratives in *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now*

I had talked about the search for consensus about knowledge as criticized by Lyotard. I also had mentioned Joseph Campbell's preoccupation with a 'monomyth' which in his words explains the seeming similitudes in the Mythic imagination of various groups from different parts of the world. Some motifs from the 'monomyth' do appear in the two films. Neither Kubrick nor Coppola, or their screenwriting partners for that matter, try to push a unified idea about heroism or the evolution of humanity, nor do they try to direct the interpretation of their films. This does not prevent us from examining some important themes in the films. The first theme that I will discuss is the theme of insanity born in the face of extreme violence, explored in *Apocalypse Now* and epitomized in Colonel Kurtz's character. The second theme concerns *2001: A Space Odyssey* and it is about the desensitization experienced by humanity when neglecting their human urges for artificial comfort.

3.1 Insanity and the Effects of Exposure to Violence in *Apocalypse Now*

When Willard receives his 'call to adventure' he seems to be hesitant. But he was actually "waiting for a mission" [1] He wanted adventure, though he didn't know into what he was going to embark. The General explains to Willard about Colonel Kurtz's "unsound methods". To the army, Kurtz is a genius gone mad, a "good man" who surrendered to the "dark side" [2] and then must be eliminated,

> **GENERAL**
> Well, you see, Willard, in this war, things get confused out there.
> Power, ideals, the old morality, and practical military necessity. But out there with these natives, it must be a temptation to be God. […] Sometimes, the dark side overcomes what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Every man has got a breaking point. You have and I have them. Walter Kurtz has reached his. And, very obviously, he has gone insane." [3]

The ‘temptation’ and ‘insanity’ mentioned by the General are recurring themes in the film. When Willard’s crew meets Colonel Kilgore, they do witness “unsound methods”, but unlike Kilgore, Colonel Kurtz made reports about the war and his hierarchy “didn’t dig what he had to tell them” [4]. When contrasted, Kilgore’s methods are no less unsound that Colonel Kurtz’s. Willard ponders about Kilgore’s way of fighting in the war, and if that was tolerated, then he wondered what they had against a man like Kurtz.

> When near the buildings I met a white man, in such an unexpected elegance of getup that in the first moment I took him for a sort of vision. I saw a high starched collar, white cuffs, a light alpaca jacket, snowy trousers, a clean necktie, and varnished boots. No hat. Hair parted, brushed, oiled, under a green-lined parasol held in a big white hand. He was amazing, and had a penholder behind his ear. ‘I shook hands with this miracle, and I learned he was the Company’s chief accountant…” [5]

Marlow dubs the chief accountant a “miracle” because of the latter’s appearance. In contrast, Kilgore assumes an air of confidence and of unshaken self-control just as impressive and as bizarre as the chief accountant’s physical attire.

> […] A tall, strong-looking man jumps out of the helicopter. This is COLONEL WILLIAM KILGORE. He puts on his Air-Cav[alry] hat, then stands to his full immense height and with his hands on his hips, surveys the field of battle. [6]

Story-wise, *Apocalypse Now* is a bit different from *Heart of Darkness*. On the surface, these are works talking about different events, happening at different times, at different locations, on different circumstances and political contexts. But on another level, the narrative told in *Apocalypse Now* is still similar to the one told in *Heart of Darkness.*

Other episodes are reprised from *Heart of Darkness*. The “the natives” throw “little sticks” [7] at Marlow’s steamboat. Colonel Kurtz’s troops do the same to Willard and his crew. They are attacked with arrows. In both novella and film, the black navigator is killed. Both Marlow and Willard are changed by their adventure, culminating in the altering confrontation with the

mysterious Kurtz. Additionally to the plot structure, *Heart of Darkness* has many references to physical light and darkness. Conrad paints an image in the head of the reader depicting the sky at sunset or the darkness of the jungle.

> Black shapes crouched, lay, sat between the trees leaning against the trunks, clinging to the earth, half coming out, half effaced within the dim light, in all the attitudes of pain, abandonment, and despair. [8]

Figure 3.1. Colonel Kurtz in his first confrontation with Captain Willard. Coppola plays with the lighting to convey a dark atmosphere all along the film, and does even more so in the scenes where Kurtz appears. *© Zoetrope Studios, 2001.*

Conrad describes the natives of Africa as half part of the landscape, half part of the dim light of the jungle. We do not see much of the natives in *Apocalypse Now*, which makes it questionable as a Vietnam War movie. It seems as if it could be done about any other part of the world or historical event provided there would be a jungle, a river, natives, and an organization of some sorts (military or commercial). In postmodernist style, Coppola subverts the 'metanarrative' of American interventionism. The goal of the war was vague. Soldiers were returning traumatized or handicapped by injury. The merit of Michael Herr's narration is that he did see the War, just like the fictional characters of the film – Willard and Colonel Kurtz – who had experienced it directly, although he had a different position as a reporter rather than a military officer. Colonel Kurtz turned against the "filthy lies" of his commanders

and started to fight his own private war commanding troops that followed him to the jungle, even crossing to a non-official conflict zone in Cambodia.

In many instances, Willard's own sanity is put into question. His past as a CIA agent and in the Special Forces presupposes that he is a professional assassin. Contrary to the inexperienced members of his crew, he has seen death and was no more affected by the horror of killing. He is also indifferent to the idea of holding a gun. 'Chief' Phillips stops the boat to examine the transportation of a Vietnamese canoe. Mr. Clean, the young black soldier in Willard's crew, gets completely insane and starts firing at the unarmed villagers, probably for the thrill of it; he is then followed by Lance, a former surfer doing his military service. Everyone is killed, but a woman is still alive. Willard kills the Vietnamese woman who was wounded by his companions, just because he doesn't want to waste time;

> Before anybody can react, Willard aims and SHOOTS THE GIRL DEAD with his .45. She falls dead in Chef's arms.
>
> **CHEF**
> Fuck you. Fuck them.
>
> Willard turns and looks at the Chief.
>
> **WILLARD**
> I told you not to stop. Now let's go. [9]

The audience does not know early on whether to identify Willard as a hero or as a villain. He displays a narrative parallel to hero archetypes, but he then acts like he does not care about the lives of others. Willard is actually the incarnation of another archetype: the anti-hero. Unlike Marlow, he is an assassin. The U.S. army was solicited by Coppola in order to supply with equipment to be used in the film, but they objected to the script, and so declined to help [10]. The objection to the script shows the discomfort of the U.S. army in the depiction of insane military characters, because such depiction of army officials affects the mythicized power of

the sound Americans as leaders of the ‘free world’. The mythical investiture given to the U.S. army since its victories in World War II crumbles in *Apocalypse Now* because it shows the foundations of American military leadership to be shaky. Coppola’s connection to the hero journey and fertility myth is ironical because of the very absurdity of the American intervention in Vietnam. The protagonist is no hero. Willard is at the end only an assassin, and war has no rejuvenating quality. “The Vietnam War is the antithesis of fertility” [11], it is, as exemplified by Michael Herr in *Dispatches*, the opportunity for young soldiers to express their fantasies about annihilation,

> Some people just wanted to blow it all to hell, animal vegetable and mineral. They wanted a Vietnam they could fit into their car ashtrays; the joke went, "What you do is, you load all the Friendlies onto ships and take them out to the South China Sea. Then you bomb the country flat. Then you sink the ships." A lot of people knew that the country could never be won, only destroyed … [12]

For Coppola there is no ‘metanarrative’ of heroism, of war heroism in particular, to be rescued and recycled in the plot of his movie. And there is no fertility Myth of regeneration in a war like that. In constant contact with absurd violence, characters like Colonel Kilgore, Colonel Kurtz, and Captain Willard each have their sanity troubled.

3.2 Science and the Desensitization of Humanity in *2001: A Space Odyssey*

Stanley Kubrick’s film is about humanity struggling to survive and being helped by an alien form of intelligence. That intelligence influenced the primitive ancestral ape. *2001: A Space Odyssey* has also ideological content linked to the historical context in which it was produced and released. In the 1960s, the space race was at its upmost with the Apollo program prepared to launch the first expedition on the moon. The narrative of *2001* seems to be optimistic about humanity’s future, both for its technical and scientific achievements, but

Kubrick and Clarke remain skeptical about the effects of such a progress, which might lead to desensitization and arrogance. As Barton Palmer remarked:

> The film mercilessly debunks the then-current myth of the triumphant technocrat, whose claim to advance the frontiers of knowledge had found its most publicly celebrated reflex in the American victory over the Russians in the space race, ratified the year after the film's release by the first lunar landing. Kubrick's film offered a quite different view. In *2001*, arrogant scientists fail to understand and master the monolith that seems to announce the presence of a superior and powerful intelligence of some kind, giving an ironic twist to the vaunted concept of "mission control. [13]

Humanity is shown in *2001: A Space Odyssey* as primitively knowledgeable about the monolith in the future as they were in their remote origins. In fact, Kubrick roots the beginnings of man's civilization in weapons and violence, his subsequent evolution only a result of his ability to dominate the environment through the use of the weapons he makes. Informed by Richard Ardrey's theories about the role violence played in the evolution of the primitive ancestors of humanity, The ape-like Australopithecus, which he discussed intensively in a book he titled "*African Genesis"*, (not to be confused with eponymous study of African folklore by Leo Frobenius et al), Kubrick creates a whole segment titled "*The Dawn of Man*" and puts it at the beginning of the film as a kind of genesis story.

> It was also Kubrick's belief that evolution had worked in a particular fashion: that the human discovery of tools was embedded in the development of warfare. In other words, man's progress was as much determined by destruction as by advance; the race was truly descended from Cain and Abel. This attitude certainly expressed his ambiguity about technology, whatever his enthusiasms for cryonics and space travel. [14]

After Moonwatchter defeats an opponent from another tribe, fighting him over a pool of water, then kills him, joined by other apes; the audience is shown the hypothetical first crime in history. We jump from a frame in which the bone of the ape-man is thrown in the sky (as a

sign of victory upon a rival) to millions of years later in outer space, the bone replaced by a satellite orbiting the Earth. This is montage, a work of pastiche, a seemingly random sequence but which has its significance. We are introduced to one of the recurrent musical motifs of the film, *The Blue Danube Waltz*, with satellites of different shapes (and different nationalities) dancing in orbits. These satellites are actually weapons of mass-destruction [15].

Kubrick also shows us humanity desensitized, though this time it is by its continual contact with technology; it has lost its wit. We never see humanity as we know it in the film because it only shows the remote past and a remote future (Although 2001 as a year is not very remote from 1968). When Frank Poole dies, Bowman retrieves his body like it was an object, and once he knows of HAL's glitch, in order to be able to manoeuver his re-entry into the Discovery ship he lets go of the body very easily, showing no emotion at all. This desensitization is a common trope in postmodern film. HAL is a creation of man. In its sophistication, it is the most significant technological achievement of humanity, as it imitates its language and mental capacities for logical reasoning. But HAL refuses to be manipulated by men. After knowing of Bowman's and Poole's plans of disconnecting him (he reads on their lips as they only sonically isolate themselves) he plans a revenge, tricks the astronauts about the malfunction of a radar, and uses one of the space pods to kill Poole by disconnecting his oxygen supply. HAL becomes a murderer. Prior to that, only humans were known to have an urge to kill. HAL is finally disconnected by the only survivor of the crew. HAL, as a creation of man, an allegory to man as creation of God, is faulty. Because of his flaws, he must be stopped. The creation allegory is another way to interpret the HAL9000 computer. As Stanley Kubrick was quoted saying: "I will say that the God concept is at the heart of *2001*—but not any traditional, anthropomorphic image of God." [16] Kubrick wanted to depict a 'God' who would be realistic in scientific terms, and generally speaking, *2001: A Space Odyssey* has a seemingly realistic story. There is great attention to detail throughout

that appears to suggest the plausibility of such a world and technology as presented in the film to be the real world in which we live or will live in the future. The monolith which appears at different times in the film, which can be taken as the symbol for alien intervention in the history of humanity, effectively creates suspension of disbelief. The story looks real until the seeming death and rebirth of the astronaut David Bowman and his transformation into a 'Star Child' [16]. The film moves from a documentary style of realism to a surreal fantasy movie. This creates more ambiguity for the viewer. The surface story of *2001: A Space Odyssey* contained in its space travel segments reveals its philosophical connection to the concept of 'overman' imagined by Nietzsche. At the beginning, we see Moonwatcher and his tribe of apes transformed into the beginning of humanity, learning to kill animals for food and rival apes for territory. At the end, we then see man transformed into the 'Star Child'. After the ending scene, the documentary style of the film appears to be only an artifact; a work of pastiche consisting of montage that emphasizes man's pretentiousness about the mastery of space, while in reality, humanity is far from understanding the universe. The supernatural element of the film, embodied in the metamorphosis of Bowman, destroys the idea that outer space will bring us more answers and advances the idea that outer space will only bring more questions. The monolith is outside human awareness, it is unknowable. The music of Ligeti adds an anxious atmosphere to scenes full of mystery. Man does not progress, but he regresses, as his emotional side is flattened by his continual contact with technology. Apart from the 'out-of-copyright' music used in *2001: A Space Odyssey*, other notable pieces of music Kubrick chose were compositions by Italian postmodern composer Ligeti. The atonality of the music can strike some viewers with fear, mystery, suspense; Ligeti's music is contrasted to Johann Strauss' harmonious and soothing *Blue Danube Waltz* used when showing satellites, space ships and space stations dancing in space. The waltz brings an air of comfort and tranquility. Ligeti's *Atmospheres* and *Requiem* bring discomfort and anxiety [18].

The former is played in black screen transitions between different segments of the film; the latter is played at each of the appearances of the alien monolith. This is to express the anxiety and possibly the undesirability of the experience of evolution from ape to man, from man to Star Child. There is also another layer of incomprehension and incapacity of representation. We never see the aliens because Kubrick assumes we cannot depict the unknowable. Unlike other films which use generic anthropomorphized aliens with oversized heads and eye lobes, Kubrick's aliens are supposedly so much removed from our world, so metaphysically different that we cannot even conceive of them physically or otherwise.

Figure 3.2. Dr Heywood Floyd reaching for the monolith on the moon. His amazement not so much different from that of the apes in the *Dawn of Man* segment. *© MGM Studios, 1968.*

This suggests that *2001: A Space Odyssey* destroys any notion of a 'grand narrative' or metanarrative of human 'intelligence' as it confronts it to a mystery that remains unsolved from the beginning of humanity up to its supposed progress in the future, and *Apocalypse Now* mirrors its source-text in its denunciation of empire while at the same time it uses mythical motifs to question the values of American interventionism.

When Dr. Heywood Floyd arrives at the space station, there are no pictures on the walls. It is a 'Hilton Space Station', supposedly a space hotel, but there is nothing to remind

people of earth, everything is artificially symmetrical. We do not see plants. Humanity transcended its limitations and defied gravity but this was to the cost of their emotional character.

Notes and References:

1. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 3.

2. Ibid, 10.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid, 14.

5. Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (2004: Planet PDF), 33.

6. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 23.

7. Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (2004: Planet PDF), 91.

8. Ibid, 31.

9. Francis Ford Coppola and John Milius, *Apocalypse Now Redux – The Screenplay* (New York: Hyperion), 2000, 96.

10. James M. Welsh et al, *The Francis Ford Coppola Encyclopedia*, (Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.), 2010, 6.

11. Laurence Coupe, *Myth*, (London: Routledge) 2009, 24.

12. Michael Herr, *Dispatches*, (New York: Vintage International) 1991, 59.

13. R. Barton Palmer, "*2001: The Critical Reception and the Generation Gap*" in *Kubrick's 2001 – New Essays*, ed. R. Kolker, 15.

14. Ibid, 33.

15. Rob Ager, "Kubrick: and beyond the cinema frame – An in-depth analysis of 2001: A SPACE ODYSSEY", 2008. http://www.collativelearning.com/2001%20chapter%208.html, (accessed on 28/05/2014).

16. James Gilbert, "Auteur with a Capital A" in *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey – New Essays*, ed. Robert Kolker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 33.

17. Arthur C. Clarke, *2001: A Space Odyssey* in *The Odyssey Collection* (PDF), 47.

18. Gene D. Phillips, *The Encyclopedia of Stanley Kubrick* (New York: Fact On File, Inc.), 2002, 207.

Conclusion

Conclusion

Lyotard's concept of the end of 'metanarratives' of 'knowledge by consensus' applies to the ideologies debunked by *Apocalypse Now* and *2001: A Space Odyssey*. Myth and mythological references are used ironically to mean the opposite of what we are shown. In *2001: A Space Odyssey*, we do not witness the 'hero' – Dave Bowman – returning to earth with "the power to bestow boons on his fellow man" [1]. We don't know what David Bowman was changed into. Stanley Kubrick closes the film with a total mystery reflecting the whole film's theme of uncertainty. At the end of *Apocalypse Now*, what I would label the *anti-hero's journey*, Willard does not kill Colonel Kurtz because of the mission, but because he had new insights into life. He kills Walter Kurtz to free him from his suffering. He refuses the role of new leader of the native tribe. We cannot know his plans after he leaves, Coppola gives no clue. In both films, we are left with the mystery of knowing what the 'hero' will do with their newly acquired knowledge. The mythical motifs were explored but their symbolism was not completed. If we go back to T.S. Eliot's 'mythical method', and re-examine the films, we see that Kubrick's and Coppola's choice for Myth paradigms was not undertaken with the intention of ordering their work, only to give it a depth that it would lack in conventional film storytelling. This technique is postmodern in contrast to the modernist trend and could be termed a 'postmodernist mythical method', to use Eliot's expression. Coppola and Kubrick, with their respective creative teams, subverted established ideological myths of the Cold War about the necessity of American interventionism and about the liberating benefits of space exploration and technological advancement by referring to ancient myths in form and in allegory, and by using the archetypes of anti-hero, hero, and 'Übermensch'. Bowman becomes an Übermensch, a super-powered entity for which we have no perspective from a scientific point of view and whose intentions in the film are unknown. Willard is an anti-hero following the route of the archetypal hero. When analyzed through Lyotard's concept of the

end of “Grand Narratives” of human knowledge, we can see that Kubrick and Coppola broke away from the conventions of their respective genres by integrating Myth. They seem to mirror T.S. Eliot’s idea about a mythical method which gives ‘order’ to a chaotic world, but what they actually do is subvert such assumptions of order by making incomplete connections to Myth. Willard does not replace Kurtz, and Bowman’s fate after his transformation is ambiguous. Kubrick’s and Coppola’s use of Myth to debunk ideological consensus about the need for violence to affirm power, and the supremacy of man’s science in explaining the universe is then a new method of intersecting Myths of ancient tales and modern ideological myths.

Compared to literature, film can generate more ambiguity of interpretation because of its polysemiotic nature. Sometimes that characteristic is used to create polysemy on purpose, as the more there is speculation about the meaning of a film, the more entertaining it becomes. It acquires a new interactive quality that more conventional films do not possess. Part of that interactive quality is the mythical mode of the films. There is no order created by the integration of myth. Without preaching for one point of view or another, the creative teams of *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Apocalypse Now* have managed to answer the ideological metanarratives of science and of violence which dominated the Cold-War by reverting to themes from ancient Myth.

While Francis Ford Coppola chose to adapt a canonical work, *Heart of Darkness,* as a basis for his film [2], Stanley Kubrick chose a pop culture short fiction instead to make the “proverbial good science-fiction movie” [3]. In the end, the similarities in integrating ancient Myths and debunking ideologies get blurred by the difference in genres. While the theme of a journey to the unknown is shared by both films, the scale of that journey’s impact is personal in *Apocalypse Now* while it is seemingly universal in the case of *2001: A Space Odyssey.* My efforts at doing an interdisciplinary study of mythical motifs in two films from different

genres remain imperfect. Such an initiative necessitates better background on narratology and film studies, two subjects on which I have but limited knowledge. Nevertheless, I tried to cover all important aspects related to the subject at hand in order to get the most satisfying results. Further research is necessary for the understanding of ideological debunking in film using mythological motifs.

Notes and References:

1. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Novato, CA: New World Library), 2008, 28.

2. James M. Welsh et al, *The Francis Ford Coppola Encyclopedia*, (Plymouth: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.), 2010, 6.

3. Gene D. Phillips, *The Encyclopedia of Stanley Kubrick* (New York: Fact On File, Inc.), 2002, 47.

Bibliography

• ABRAMS, J.J. (Ed), *The Philosophy of Stanley Kubrick*, The University Press of Kentucky, Kentucky, 2007.

• ALLEN, G., *Intertextuality*, Routledge, London, 2006.

• BARTHES, R., LAVERS, A. (Trans), *Mythologies*, The Noonday Press, New York, 1972.

• BARTHES, R., HEALTH, S. (Trans), *Image-Text-Music*, Fontana Press, London, 1977.

• CAMPBELL, J., *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, New World Library, Novato, 2008.

• CLARKE, A.C., *The Sentinel*, Avon Periodicals, Inc., New York, 1951 (Scan).

• CONNOR, S.(Ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodernism*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2004.

• COPPOLA, F.F., MILIUS, J., HERR, M., *Apocalypse Now – Redux* (Zoetrope Studios), 2001, DVD.

• COUPE, L., *Myth*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

• DUNCAN, P., *Stanley Kubrick*, Vermont: The Pocket Essentials, 2002.

• ELIOT, T.S., *Collected Poems: 1909 - 1962*, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., New York, 1963.

• ELIOT, T.S., *Selected Essays*, Faber And Faber Limited, London, 1999.

• FRAZER, J.G., *The Golden Bough*, The Floating Press, 2009 (PDF).

• GENETTE, G., LEWIN, J. E., *Narrative Discourse*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1980.

• GOETHE, J.W.V, TAYLOR, B. (Trans), *Faust*, The Pennsylvania State University Electronic Classics Series, 2014 (PDF).

• GRANT, B.K. (Ed), *American Cinema of the 1960's*, Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 2008.

• HERR, M., *Dispatches*, Vintage International, New York, 1991.

• KAUFMANN, W. (Trans/Ed), *The Portable Nietzsche*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1982.

• KOLKER, R., *Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey - New Essays*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

• KUBRICK, S., Clarke, A.C., *2001: A Space Odyssey (Screenplay)*, MGM Studios, 1968, 2007 DVD.

• LEVI-STRAUSS, C., JACOBSON, C. et al (Trans), *Structural Anthropology*, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1963.

• LYOTARD, J.-F., BENNINGTON, G. et al (Trans), *The Postmodern Condition*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1984.

• MCHALE, B., *Postmodernist Fiction*, Routledge, New York, 2004.

• PHILLIPS, G.D. et al, *The Encyclopedia of Stanley Kubrick*, Facts On File, Inc., New York, 2002.

• RICE, J., *Kubrick's Hope: Discovering Optimism from 2001 to Eyes Wide Shut*, The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Plymouth, 2008.

• ROBERTS, A., *Science Fiction*, Routledge, New York, 2006.

• STACK, G.J., *Nietzsche's Anthropic Circle: Man, Science, and Myth*, University of Rochester Press, Rochester, 2005.

• SANDERS, J., *Adaptation and Appropriation*, Routledge, Abingdon , 2006.

• SEGAL., R.A., *Myth - A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.

• SINGER, I., *Cinematic Mythmaking: Philosophy in Film*, The MIT Press, London, 2008.

• SNAEVARR, S., *Metaphors, Narratives, Emotions: Their Interplay and Impact*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

• STAM, R. et al, *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics*, Routledge, New York, 2005.

• VON HENDY, A., *The Modern Construction of Myth*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2001.

• WELSH, J.M. et al, *The Francis Ford Coppola Encyclopedia*, The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Plymouth, 2010.

• WESTON, J.L., *From Ritual to Romance*, pdfbooks.co.za (PDF).

• WHEAT, L.F., Kubrick's 2001: A Triple Allegory, The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Plymouth, 2000.

Secondary Sources

• BARTA, T. (Ed), *Screening the Past: Film and the Representation of History*, Praeger, Westport, 1998.

• BRADSHAW, D. et al (Eds), *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, 2006.

• BROWN, R.S., *Overtones and Undertones: Reading Film Music*, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1994.

• BUTLER, c., *Postmodernism - A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.

• CAMPBELL, J., *The Inner Reaches of Outer Space*, New World Library, Novato, 2002.

• DELEUZE, G., TOMLINSON, H. et al (Trans), *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, The Athlone Press, London, 2000.

• DIGAETANI, J.L., *Richard Wagner and the Modern British Novel*, Associated University Presses, Inc., New Jersey, 1978.

• ELIADE, M., TRASK, W.R. (Trans), *Cosmos and History - The Myth of the Eternal Return*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1959.

• FALSETTO, M., *Stanley Kubrick - A Narrative and Stylistic Analysis*, Praeger, London, 2001.

• FRYE, N., *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton Univerity Press, New Jersey, 1990.

• HEINEN, S. et al (Eds), *Narratology in the Age of Cross-Disciplinary Narrative Research*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2009.

• HUTCHEON, L., *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*, Routledge, London, 2003.

• HUTCHEON, L., *A Theory of Adaptation*, Routledge, New York, 2006.

• JAMESON, F., *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998*, Verso, London, 1998.

• JAMESON, F., *The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*, Verso, London, 2005.

• JAMESON, F., *The Political Unconscious*, Routledge, London, 2002.

• JUNG, C.G., HULL, R.F.C (Trans), *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Routledge, London, 1955.

• LYDEN, J.C., *Film as Religion: Myths, Morals, and Rituals*, New York University Press, New York, 2003.

• MILLER, T. et al (Eds), *A Companion to Film Theory*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2004.

• PERSSON, P., *Understanding Cinema: A Psychological Theory of Moving Imagery*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2003.

• PISTERS, P., *The Matrix of Visual Culture*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2003.

• RUSSEL, J., *The Vietnam War Movies*, The Pocket Essential, Harpenden, 2002.

• STAM, R., *Film Theory - An Introduction*, Blackwell Publishers, Massachusetts, 2000.

• STAPE, J.H. (Ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

• VILLAREJO, A., *Film Studies: The Basics*, Routledge, Abingdon, 2007.