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Abstract

Overall, this Capstone paper is about director Elia Kazan, "On the Waterfront," and HUAC. "On the Waterfront" is one of my favorite films. A big reason is because the film is so layered with political connections. Kazan's film fooled me on my first viewing, which inspired me to do a rhetorical analysis on the iconic piece of cinema. In general, Elia Kazan used "On the Waterfront" to improve him and HUAC's image through metaphors and analogies.
Introduction to Literature Review

Many audience members go to the theater to be entertained. Most times, it is a world that allows them to get away from real life and its constant stress. While film is certainly an escapist art of the world, it can often have deeper meaning. Film has the ability to inspire, inform, and educate the audience. In this case, "On the Waterfront" and its political undercurrents are going to be examined. In other words, many films have an interesting story that has a political meaning behind it. The McCarthy and Vietnam eras of the Cold War are rich with films that express political ideas and undercurrents. Some films get political messages into popular culture through the use of metaphor and analogy in cinematic narrative. Metaphors are composed of vehicles and tenors, analogies are composed by a resemblance of relationships. Narratives are composed of tensions between characters, setting, plot, and theme. At times, film can function as political propaganda. Propaganda is information used to promote or publicize a particular political cause or point of view. Sometimes, the government funds these products, but that is not always the case. However, artists and creators do engage in propaganda like aspects. Castrillo and Echart (2015) note, "The Hollywood political thriller is a film genre of unique relevance in the United States, often acting as a reflection of the fears and anxieties of its historical times" (pg. 109). In this literature review, "On the Waterfront" will be looked at through political research and contexts, while also emphasizing the political ideological shift that sets the context of the film.

1930's-1950's Ideological Shift

It is important to look at the shift that happened from the 1930's to the 1950's. Stephen Underhill (2017) proclaims "Truman had trapped himself with his prior commitment to an idealistic world and the rhetorical reticence entailed by that vision, and so he entered the debate on communism, subversion, and loyalty too late and found himself a prisoner of historical events
(p. 455). It should be noted that idealist’s emphasis on harmony and ethics "lent a helpful political value to racial, economic, and religious minorities interested in social equality" (Underhill, 2017, p. 459). FBI Director Edgar J. Hoover was heavily into the realism that shaped the Cold War era. Underhill (2017) notes, "The style (of political realism) helped to shape how the Truman Doctrine speech was drafted and how audiences interpreted its meanings in more local domestic politics" (p. 457). Underhill (2017) goes on to state, "Combined, Hoover and his allies in Congress and elsewhere used rhetorical realism to communicate a deterministic philosophy about human nature through a diffuse mythic narrative, coordinated between Congress, Hollywood, the press, and more official FBI discourse" (p. 457). Overall, political realism "conceptualizes the nation-state as the primary unit of action in world politics and the commander in chief as the state’s centralized authority" (Underhill, 2017, p. 458). Thus, this realist philosophy suggests that nation-states exist through chaos and as a result, the countries are forced to clarify their foreign policy missions (Underhill, 2017, p. 458). Underhill (2017) notes that the foreign policy missions are defined "in terms of a more singular national interest that can be achieved by diplomatic and military power" (p. 458). Underhill proclaims, "Such singularity benefits the dominant groups that control the nation’s strategic resources, as the dominant group’s needs are viewed as the needs of the nation" (p. 458).

The old ways of political idealism were being criticized and the criticisms made political realism seem even more legitimate and justified. Underhill (2017) states, "Realists naturalized their perspective in response to the rhetorical patterns of political idealism. Planners frequently dismissed idealistic discourse with claims that it was naïvely sentimental, moralistic, utopian, legalistic, rhetorical, or partisan. These missives contrasted idealism with more realistic discourse, which implied that the latter was grounded outside of language or was extratextual"
(p. 458). According to Underhill (2017), supporters of political realism argued that "because idealism was unreal and existed only on paper, argued realists, the mistakes it caused could be contained by limiting the spread of its symbolism" (p. 458). Eventually, political realism found its way into Kazan’s life, as he had to contribute to an ideology that had a darker worldview.

**Kazan’s Situation**

In the Cold War era, Kazan’s life was extremely hectic, and the context of these confusing times must be understood. Film critic Richard Schickel (2005) notes, “Between the completion of *Streetcar* and the start of production on *Viva Zapata!* The following spring, politics began decisively to intrude on Kazan” (p. 217). On February 9, 1950, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy made his notorious speech in Wheeling, West Virginia, where he uttered his fictitious charge that 205 Communists were heavily involved in state departments (Schickel, 2005). Of course, it was said that these Communists were trying to shape policies (Schickel, 2005). With the Communist controversy growing, Kazan knew that he would not be able to evade official inquiry into his former Communist Party associations (Schickel, 2005). Kazan’s assumptions were correct, because in the early 1950’s he was called to testify in front of HUAC. Richard Schickel (2005) notes, “On January 14th, 1952, Elia Kazan appeared at an executive session of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and testified about his membership in the Communist Party fifteen to seventeen years previously. He spoke fully about his own membership in, and disillusionment with, the party, but refused, as “a matter of conscience,” to name the others in his unit” (p. 251). Of course, Kazan’s decision to not give specific names did not satisfy HUAC, considering the fact that he would eventually be called in to testify once more. During this period, Kazan knew that he would have to evolve. Schickel (2005) notes, “Sooner or later he (Kazan) would either have to give up names, take the Fifth
Amendment or flatly refuse to name names. He understood that if he took either of the last two courses his career as a movie director would be finished for the foreseeable future, although he might be able to continue directing in the theater” (p. 251). In this case, Kazan was at risk of losing his occupation and passion: directing motion pictures. Kazan’s years of work within the art community could have been completely disregarded. Kazan would be a marked man if he did not further cooperate with HUAC. It should be noted that Kazan’s political problems worried studios, who urged him to sign a letter that confirmed his Communist ties and granted the studio the right to drop his contract if his testimonies failed to make HUAC happy (Schickel, 2005). HUAC had given information about Kazan’s first testimony to the Hollywood Reporter, who was a huge source that supported anti-Communism (Schickel, 2005). This resulted in studios adamantly pressuring Kazan to name names and eventually, he decided to testify (Schickel, 2005). Schickel (2005) states, “Everyone who gave the committee names was a former Communist, not currently affiliated with the party. No one suddenly betrayed a current party colleague. All were, like Kazan, people who had fallen out with the party, and had, for many years, opposed its policies. All had just cause for their defections” (p. 255). Schickel (2005) goes on to note, “Kazan was increasingly miserable in this company and he was right, given his absolutism when it came to free speech and freedom of artistic expression, to quit the Communists in disgust. He even had a right to carry his personal grudge against the attempt to control thought and to suppress personal opinion across the years” (p. 271). On April 10th, 1952, Kazan testified to HUAC in Washington, D.C. (Schickel, 2005). After testifying, Kazan took out an advertisement for himself. This advertisement defended his decision to testify and quickly made himself look terrible. As Schickel (2005) puts it, “He became the celebrity informer-the
namer of names nearly everyone could name, the great symbolic stooge, rat fink of the era” (p. 272). Thus, Kazan had the image of a villainous traitor.

**On the Waterfront and the General Connections to History/Politics**

"On the Waterfront" is connected to Cold War politics through Kazan and Schulberg's experiences with HUAC, the Cold War era, and individualism/communalism. "On the Waterfront" was released in 1954 (Schwartz, 2004). Over the years, it has become one of the most enduring and popular films of all time. Many critics and scholars consider it to be one of the finest films ever made. With all of the praise, the film has been analyzed from a political point of view because of director Elia Kazan (Klehr & Haynes, 2004). Jones (2004) argues, "The film is largely a justification for Kazan's 1952 testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he named colleagues who had been Communists and admitted to having been one himself" (p. 59). The actual film follows Marlon Brando's character as a onetime boxer who does odd jobs for the mob. After horrible situations, Brando finds strength through a priest and a beautiful woman. Brando's character must go against his waterfront colleagues and become his own man in helping the exceptional people of his community.

Today, the film remains one of the most controversial post-war American films, because of its apparent allegory of McCarthyism. In the real life McCarthy era, Director Elia Kazan and writer Budd Schulberg agreed to testify in front of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which ended up destroying a handful of artists careers (Smith, 2009). According to Welsh (1981), "In 1951, Schulberg was called to testify, which resulted in Kazan being a "friendly witness" in front of the committee a year later" (p. 266). A review essay of the film notes, "Kazan named names of associates who had belonged to the Communist party with him in the 1930s. Denounced as an informant, he went on to make a movie that justified squealing"
(Klehr & Haynes, 2004, p. 393). For example, when Kazan received an Oscar lifetime achievement award, there were organized protests and a considerable amount of the audience refused to applaud him (Klehr, Haynes, 2004). Years later, Kazan stated in his autobiography that the experience of testifying before HUAC as a friendly witness made him a better artist and man because he worried about what was right, instead of what everyone else was saying (Smith, 2009). This allowed him to tackle serious content in his films (Smith, 2009). Thus, many have observed that Brando's character in the film is Kazan. Brando's character is stuck in a world of deceit, corruption, and agony. When Brando decides to turn on the corruption, he endures harsh criticism from the powers of New Jersey. Brando, like Kazan, is finally free because he does not care what anyone else thinks. A review essay notes, "Telling the truth allowed Brando's character to break the grip of the mob and serve the interests of the hard-working men they had exploited" (Klehr & Haynes, 2004, p. 394). Thus, many critics have stated that the mob is a metaphor for antagonistic communism. The mob controls society through violence, fear, and persuasion. This is not any different from communism that is the opposite of pure democracy, which should be about freedom, democratic justice and righteousness. Both evil powers (the mob and antagonistic communism) scatter fear in order to keep individuals' quiet. The powers want the people to obey, or else the citizens will meet terrible fates. In reality, Kazan and Schulberg's story reflects the way Americans viewed alien ideologies.

The film Trumbo is most definitely on the opposite side of Kazan’s spectrum. Trumbo (2015) goes into great detail about how the United States got super paranoid to the point that they imprisoned Communists who did not commit any crimes. This is why Kazan gets a lot of heat for his decision to name names. In “Trumbo” (2015), Dalton Trumbo and the rest of the Hollywood Ten decided not to name names. They would not give into the immoral practices of
HUAC (Trumbo, 2015). However, through Kazan’s earlier statement, it appears that he wanted to move away from the Communist/Democratic controversy and somehow fulfill his duties as a citizen and American filmmaker. Yes, he made a controversial decision, but, like Marlon Brando’s character in “On the Waterfront,” he moves away from the hostile drama and sets himself up as a democratic citizen. By making his own decision, Kazan was able to grow and learn. As a result, he challenged himself to tackle more serious subject matter and release his masterpiece of personal experience: "On the Waterfront."

Sefcovic (2002) argued that the film's use of union struggles (controlled by the mob) serve as the vehicle for narrative analogies that explore the philosophies between individualism and community (p. 329). These terms were huge in the Cold War era. Individualism means that a person progresses through life because of their personal efforts. These efforts could consist of personal decisions, determination, focus, and loyalty. Community is a concept that is pretty much the opposite of individualism. Community believes that personal progression comes from a combination of society. So, if a society shares values, knowledge, and mutual support, people are more likely to succeed in their personal lives. Thus, "On the Waterfront" is the relationship between individual and society (Sefcovic, 2002). Sefcovic (2002) argued, "The messages of art and entertainment offer an opportunity to support visions that empower a person through integration of the individual into the community or that perpetuate a schizoid national personality in which individual purity can be achieved only be cleansing the inevitably corrupt society" (p. 347). So, "On the Waterfront" has been known to walk both lines of individualism and community. Ultimately, Brando's character does indeed get progression through his personal choices and determination. This follows the path of individualism. The community aspect of the film is backed up by On the Waterfront: Another Look by Kenneth Hey (1979), which states,
“On the Waterfront”, like many other films of the fifties, offers a model of society in which power is the prerogative of experts in the law and its enforcement (police, judges, lawyers) in alliance with social engineers (priests, psychiatrists, social workers) and family (usually the hero's wife or girlfriend) to perform an essential task of social control" (p. 85). This statement backs up the fact that Brando's personal decisions would not be possible without the communities’ basis of moral ethics, genuine support, and shared beliefs, such as Christianity or Catholicism. On the Waterfront depicts for us the self-awareness of Terry Malloy (Brando) that grows with the help of the priest and the girl he loves (Hey, 1979). At the end of it all, Brando cannot become who he is without the help of the moralistic community, but he must ultimately make his own personal choice of what to do: good or bad. Thus, there is a true and pure combination of individualism and community.

Rationale

"On the Waterfront" has always been considered a timeless, classical piece of cinema because of its emotional and realistic story. Thus, "On the Waterfront" has plenty of political and historical research behind it. For decades, people have talked about the production of the film, along with director Elia Kazan's film career. Interestingly enough, with all of the research that has been done, there is not a true rhetorical analysis of the film. It is strange, since the film is extremely rich with historical and political contexts. This presents a unique opportunity for me to perform a textual analysis on the film.
Research Questions

--From a metaphorical perspective, who or what, precisely, do the characters and setting of "On the Waterfront" historically represent?

- From an analogical perspective, how is Kazan’s experience as an informant explained through Brando’s character logic? How is the nature of communism presented through how the mafia is represented?

- From a narrative perspective, what does the film’s theme teach the audience and what is the political function of that message?

Methodology

First, Kazan's political ideology of anti-Communism will be investigated. Kazan switched sides, so this has to be researched. His statements to HUAC in the early 1950's will be examined. These will reflect his ideological change from Communist to anti-Communist. As a result of this, we will see how his ideology was formed, which will tie into "On the Waterfront."

Secondly, the analogical and metaphorical aspects will be examined. The metaphorical/analogical comparisons are Kazan and Malloy, HUAC and the Waterfront Crime Commission, Communists and the mob, and Father Barry and moral order. All of these comparisons will help show how Kazan is improving his image, along with HUAC's. Essentially, he is using film to manipulate the audience an ultimately, making a situation where him and HUAC are heroic. These comparisons will be explained, sorted out, and lastly, broken down to showcase the key differences.
Lastly, Kazan's overall legacy will be discussed. His film career will be discussed, along with audience reception. For example, director Martin Scorsese and actor Robert De Niro are huge fans of Kazan. Scorsese is a big fan of "On the Waterfront." As a result, it is safe to say that "On the Waterfront" helped alter Kazan's legacy because of his uses of personal experiences and real-life communities. Yes, Kazan will always be a bit of a controversial figure, but he will also be remembered as a great filmmaker. It used to be that when a person heard his name, the word "HUAC" popped up. Now, "On the Waterfront" also pops up. Thus, research will be done on Kazan's supporters, why they support him, and his overall legacy, which will come from critics, actors, scholars, fans, and so on. In particular, Kazan's Honorary Oscar ceremony will be studied, since it showcased divisive audience reception towards the great filmmaker.

Analysis

Elia Kazan, a man of different legacies. As a film director, he is one of the most talented and influential directors ever. As a United States citizen, he is known as a traitor, because of his cooperation with the House Un-American Activities Committee (formerly known as HUAC). Kazan will likely always be remembered for his controversial and unique life. While controversy will be attached to Kazan, so will artistic greatness and talent. Elia Kazan once stated, "The motion pictures I have made and the plays I have chosen to direct represent those convictions (peace and freedom)" (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952, p. 2414). In my opinion, the positivity of Kazan’s legacy is largely due to his 1954 film "On the Waterfront," starring Marlon Brando, Eva Marie Saint, Karl Malden, Lee J. Cobb, and Rod Steiger. In the film, Terry Malloy (Brando) decides to fight against the organized crime outfit for which he works. Malloy decides to rebuke his life of crime and testify to the Waterfront Crime Commission, which disrupts the outfit. Jones (2004) talks about "On the Waterfront," saying, "The film is largely a justification
for Kazan's 1952 testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in which he named colleagues who had been Communists and admitted to having been one himself” (p. 59). Thus, my argument is that there are strong metaphorical/analogical connections between Kazan/Malloy, HUAC/Waterfront Crime Commission, Communism/the mob, and Father Barry/moral order. With this analysis of the film, I will examine how Kazan used the story to justify why he testified to HUAC. "On the Waterfront" has many similarities to Kazan's role, and the Cold War political climate of the early 1950’s, but the story is cleverly altered in ways that make him and HUAC more sympathetic. Slate talks about the origins of the film, stating, “A light bulb went off in Kazan’s head. What if you could make a movie that was pro-worker, pro-union, but anti-corruption, anti-conspiracy-a bold statement of anti-communist liberalism?” (Dessem, Longworth, 2016). By placing lines, scenes, sequences, characters, and props in historical and rhetorical contexts, critics can read the film as an anti-communist allegory, one that uses metaphors/analogies to redeem his reputation and makes him a hero-like figure, but if the contexts of these situations are looked at closely by audiences, they may have legitimate concerns about his legacy as a public citizen who contributed to a corrupt organization for personal gain and at the expense of his friends and colleagues.

In order to effectively discuss and analyze Kazan's "On the Waterfront" from a historical and political perspective, one must first delve into his political ideology, which was formed from his time as a Communist party member. Ideology shapes every human being. According to Kuypers and King (2016), "Ideology is defined as being a set of opinions or beliefs of a group or an individual (p. 16). Elia Kazan was a member of the Communist party from July 1934 to around January 1936 (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). Kazan talked about the positives of joining the Communist party, stating, "It seemed to me at that time that the party had
at heart the cause of the poor and unemployed people whom I saw on the streets about me, I felt that by joining, I was going to help them. I was going to fight Hitler, and as strange as it seems today, I felt that I was acting for the good of the American people" (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952, p. 2409). Kazan also told HUAC that he had no idea the American Communist Party was taking its orders from the Kremlin and acting as a Russian Agency in the United States (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952). During this time, there was a cell of communists within the film industry. According to Kazan, his cell was devoted exclusively to individuals who were associated with the functioning New York Theater (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). In 1935, Kazan became a member of the Actors Committee, which ultimately put him in contact with Communist member Victor J. Jerome (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). Basically the Group Theater was ran by three directors, but the group of actors used to have meetings, and eventually elected a committee where Kazan would speak to them or consider issues that primarily had to do with the actors (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). Jerome and Kazan had a big difference of opinion when it came to the Group Theater's operations. Jerome felt as though Kazan should democratize the group (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). To Jerome, the selection of the plays and the group's artistic policies should have been more in the hands of the members and not in the hands of the three directors (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). Kazan believed that the group was being run very well, especially since theater is known to be erratic in nature (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952). Kazan said the Communists felt that if the authority went to the actors, they would have a chance to dominate through block voting, and confusion of issues (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952).
Eventually, Kazan's hesitance in further democratizing the group resulted in him being tried by a group of Communists. Kazan stated, "There appeared a figure who I hadn't seen before, a man who turned out to be an organizer, they said, for the Auto Workers Union. He conducted this trial. And at the trial, without really knowing much about the situation, having never seen me before, he raised hell with me, generally castigated me, and said that I was this, that, and the other, and that I had better hew to the line. A vote was taken, and I voted for myself, and the other folks there voted against me" (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952, p. 9). It should be noted that Kazan later acknowledged that a goal for the American Communist Party was to make the theater organization a Communist mouthpiece (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952). Thus, this is probably why the Communist party overreacted and disapproved of Kazan's methods. Of course, this resulted in Kazan officially resigning from the Communist party. Kazan told HUAC, "I have stayed away from it. I detest what they did to me. I hate their policies. And I have had personal experience with it, and believe me, my feeling is based on a good deal of personal encounter" (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952, p. 11). Clearly, Kazan felt a great deal of animosity towards the party he used to support. Kazan also talked about the Communist parties misguidance, saying, "I think the Communists like that (referring to people automatically agreeing with the status quo's opinions) are die hards, will never change. I think they are a conspiracy. I think that in many industries, like all the key war industries, and radio, in anything that has to do with communications, they are a menace. I think they should be exposed. I think most of the people I knew, I would say all of them are misguided and erratic, pitiful" (Kazan to HUAC January Testimony, 1952. p. 14).

Ultimately, Kazan's experiences with the American Communist party gave him a new type of ideology. Kuypers and King (2016) state, "We can't escape some form of ideology since
we are raised and educated in a society that is organized around a particular ideology (p. 16). In this situation, Kazan dealt with the Communist party for a couple of years and saw the error of their ways. He was embedded into their culture. It should be noted that his placement in the United States (a Democratic nation) contributed to his anti-Communist stance. Kazan told HUAC, "I had enough regimentation, enough of being told what to think and say and do, enough of their habitual violation of the daily practices of democracy to which I was accustomed" (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952, p. 2410). Thus, the unfair culture of Communists, along with the freedoms of America, shaped Kazan's political views and actions. According to Ronald Lee and Adam Blood (2016), "Ideology in the most general sense is any system of ideas...directing political and social action" (p. 216). In this case, Kazan's political and social actions were shaped. Kazan's ideology became one that was against Communism. In other words, it was an anti-Communist stance. Kazan clearly states to HUAC, "First-hand experience of dictatorship and though control left me with an abiding hatred of Communist philosophy and methods. It also left me with the passionate conviction that we must never let the Communists get away with the pretense that they stand for the very things which they kill in their own countries. I am talking about freedom of speech, a free press, the rights of labor, racial equality, and, above all, individual rights. I value these things. I take them seriously" (Kazan to HUAC April Testimony, 1952, p. 2414). Kazan's newly found ideology of anti-Communism was reflected through his decision to testify in front of HUAC two different times. Also, his directorial decisions reflected his support of peace and freedom. Two years after Kazan testified to HUAC, he would unleash "On the Waterfront," which justified his political decision towards Communism.
First, we must start with the director himself, Elia Kazan. It has been said by many that the Terry Malloy character is a stand-in for Kazan (Dessem & Longworth, 2016). Thus, Malloy can be interpreted as a metaphor for Kazan. According to Henry and Burkholder (2016), "A metaphor consists of two terms that draw a comparison between two things, people, places, situations, or events that belong to different classes of experience" (p. 106). So, a metaphor normally takes a topic and uses it in a different way. This harkens back to the different classes of experience. Using a topic in a different away normally results in getting a legitimate point across to people. Overall, a metaphor also consists of a tenor and vehicle. Henry and Burkholder (2016) describe the tenor, saying, "The tenor, or focus, is relevant to or continuous with the topic under discussion" (p. 106). The tenor can be seen as the underlying focus of the comparison, and is the lesser known concept. Henry and Burkholder (2016) explain the vehicle, stating, "The other term, usually called the vehicle or frame, is discontinuous with, or of a different class of experience from, that topic (p. 106). Since the vehicle is the frame of the metaphor, it allows the metaphor to exist. If a metaphor did not have a frame, there would not be a legitimate focus. Also, the vehicle is the more well-known concept of the comparison.

In this case, Kazan is the tenor, while Malloy is the vehicle. Kazan is the tenor because he is the underlying focus. Malloy is the vehicle because he is framing the metaphor. Malloy is the more well-known concept, since he is on the big screen. Audience members learn more and more about him because the film continually showcases Terry Malloy’s character development. Malloy is a metaphor for Kazan because his story invites audiences to draw inferences about the director.

In the film, Terry Malloy is a former boxer who works for the mob. His brother, Charley Malloy, is a high-ranking mob official. The leader of the mob, Johnny Friendly, is almost like a
family member to Terry Malloy. In the film, Friendly is referred to as "Uncle Charlie" on a couple of occasions and Malloy also mentions that as a kid he used to go to ball games with the mob boss (On the Waterfront, 1954). On Malloy's part, there is a sense of loyalty when it comes to Friendly. Malloy's loyalty will ultimately be tested once Friendly begins imposing his harsh will on the community. This same sense of loyalty is found in Kazan's situation. Kazan was a member of the film community and the Communist Party. Kazan was in a position where he had to also go against his own colleagues because they were surrounded by the controversies of potentially being Communists (Jones, 2004). Malloy wrestles with his demons just as Kazan must have wrestled with his. Whereas Malloy opposes his former Longshoreman’s Union, Kazan opposes the Communist theater that expelled him.

Terry Malloy is presented as a somewhat tough figure. However, there is another layer to the character. Malloy is also emotionally sensitive. He is good with children, loves birds, and showcases guilt. First off, the birds are vital. Birds are often a symbol of democracy and freedom. They represent the beauties of America. In this case, Malloy's love for birds could be seen as a secret analogy which states that Kazan is a man who loves Democracy and freedom. Kazan's love of Democracy and freedom is clearly stated in his HUAC testimonies. Malloy's guilt is interesting. We first witness his guilt when Joey Doyle is thrown off the roof. Malloy feels responsible because he tricked Doyle into going on the roof (On the Waterfront, 1954). Malloy did not know the mob was going to kill Doyle. Malloy states, "I thought that they was just going to rough him up a little" (On the Waterfront, 1954). Then, the guilt builds as Malloy finds that he is in a situation that pits him against two sides of life: the community and the mob. Malloy's guilt showcases Kazan's real-life guilt. Clearly, Kazan was in a tough situation. He was stuck between two causes and had to go against an organization that he was once a part of in life.
The guilt that we see in Malloy's life is genuine and it makes the audience feel compassion for him. Out of everyone involved with the mob, Malloy is the only one who feels compassion. Audience members who do not know much about the overall HUAC situation with Kazan may see On the Waterfront's portrayal of guilt and automatically feel sympathy for Kazan because they constantly hear that the film is a justification for Kazan's decision to testify against Communists.

According to Michael T. Schuyler (2011), "Some scholars make passing reference to the character as sensitive, but they stop short of calling him feminine (p. 99). Schuyler (2011) goes on to note, "The parallels between Brando’s fictional character and Kazan’s public persona make sense: each must turn against the life he knows (union work and Communism, respectively), must speak out publicly in government-sanctioned hearings, must ‘bite the hand that feeds him’ by betraying friends, co-workers, neighbors, and colleagues alike" (p. 108). The colleagues of Kazan are Johnny Friendly's organization, which is murdering and cheating the citizens left and right. The mob is a true menace to society. Schuyler (2011) notes, "In Kazan’s view, Terry can’t possess ‘dignity’ or ‘self-respect’ until he shows strength in his decision to testify. In feminizing this character, then, he makes him unworthy (in his view) of respect, for in Kazan’s America, womanly men deserve none" (p. 109-110). Thus, Malloy is truly a man of Democracy once he decides to testify. This fits a statement that Kazan said one time. Kazan once noted, “The biggest loyalty a man has is to all the people, which in a democracy is the state. The biggest obligation a man has is to be a citizen” (Schickel, 2005, p. 283).

At the end of the film, Terry Malloy goes face-to-face with Johnny Friendly and literally stands up for the community. Malloy is taking on role model and leader status, which will inspire the Democratic community. Kazan talked about this scene, stating, "When Brando, at the end,
yells at Lee Cobb, the mob boss, 'I'm glad what I done—you hear me? Glad what I done!' That was me saying, with identical heat, that I was glad I'd testified as I had" (Mondello, 2013). This shows that Kazan is proud of his decision to testify. Kazan feels as though he became a true, independent United States citizen. Kazan once stated in his autobiography that the experience of testifying before HUAC as a friendly witness and the criticism that followed was his making as an artist, since it liberated him from the opinion of others and allowed the exploration of more ambiguous subject matter (Smith, 2009). In other words, just as Malloy eliminates his corrupt associates, becomes a better citizen, and embraces his love for Democracy and Edie Doyle, Kazan (in his own mind) is elimination his associations, doing the right deed, and embracing his love for Democracy and cinema. It is no accident that in the film, the mob ruined Malloy's career, which was boxing. That could be Kazan's way of saying that if he did not testify, he would lose his career, which was filmmaking. Thus, Kazan's decision to testify made him a free, fully fledged man and artist. Of course, freedom is often a key association of America.

The similarities between Kazan and Malloy are blatantly obvious and similar, but through their organizational associations, we can begin to see how Kazan is altering his story. However, the fictional Waterfront Crime Commission could be seen as an analogy for the real life HUAC organization. Both organizations are related to the metaphoric comparison between Kazan and Malloy. The Waterfront Crime Commission is the organization that Malloy is associated with in the film. HUAC is the organization that Kazan was associated with during the Cold War era. Both organizations are acting as a heroic cause that wants to rid Democracy of corruption and evil infiltration. Ultimately, the Waterfront Crime Commission and HUAC act as the channels in which the main characters (Malloy and Kazan) can testify their knowledge towards Democracy.
If it were not for these organizations, neither character would be under the pressure to testify. Also, if the organizations did not exist, neither character would endure controversy.

However, while the similarities seem simply obvious, there is a key moral difference between the Waterfront Crime Commission and HUAC. In terms of the Waterfront Crime Commission, we, the audience, are pulling for Malloy to collaborate with the organization so that the mob will be destroyed. The mob commits obvious acts of violence, manipulation, and deception. Democratic citizens/workers are constantly being killed, threatened and controlled. So, the Waterfront Crime Commission is justified in investigating mob activity on the waterfront. Clearly, the mob can be seen as a stand-in for communism. Thus, the mob is a metaphor for communism. The mob and communism are the opposing forces. The mob is the antagonist of Malloy and the Waterfront Crime Commission. The communists are the antagonists of Kazan and HUAC. When some crosses the mob, Friendly strikes. Joey Doyle was going to testify and the mob threw him off a roof (On the Waterfront, 1954). Kayo Dugan decides to collaborate with Father Barry's crusade against the mob. This results in the mob crushing Dugan with a load of merchandise, which is made to look like an accident (On the Waterfront, 1954). Towards the end of the film, Charley Malloy attempts to protect Terry, who is being questioned by the mob. As a result of Charley's actions, he is murdered and hanged on a meat hook (On the Waterfront, 1954). Overall, the Waterfront Crime Commission is portrayed as an organization that is ethically justified to perform their tasks of justice because the mob is portrayed as an inherently evil force that has given the organization permission to take a stand.

After covering the Waterfront Crime Commission and the mob, we must now look at HUAC. This Cold War organization has often been accused of performing witch hunts. According to Gary Simmons (2009), With the cold war as the backdrop, the early 1950s saw a
hysterical witch-hunt at high levels in the United States government, attempting to elicit
confessions of Communist Party membership" (p. 95). Thus, HUAC hunted down Communists
and suspected associates through controversial means. Their methods have often been described
as unethical, unfair, and disgusting. Eckstein (2004) notes, "The most famous victims of the
resulting blacklist were the ‘Unfriendly Ten’ or ‘Hollywood Ten’, who were a group of
‘unfriendly’ witnesses (mostly screenwriters) that refused to give political information about
themselves before HUAC in October 1947" (p. 424). Of course, HUAC did not respond well to
the Hollywood Ten's refusals.

The most well known man of the "Hollywood Ten," Dalton Trumbo, took the Fifth
Amendment claiming the committee had no right to inquire into his political beliefs, and was
found in contempt of Congress, fined $10,000, and sentenced to a year in prison (Trumbo, 2005,
p. 98). The daughter of Dalton Trumbo, Nikola Trumbo, (2005) states, "The case was appealed
and went to the Supreme Court. It ruled against the Ten, and my father went to prison in 1950"
(p. 98). According to Eckstein (2004), "The Hollywood Ten were sentenced anywhere from six
months to a year in Federal prison for refusing to answer HUAC's questions (p. 425). Nikola
Trumbo's mentioning of her father's stance about his First Amendment rights is in line with the
film 2015 film "Trumbo," which was directed by Jay Roach and starred Bryan Cranston as the
iconic figure. In the film, Dalton Trumbo tells John Wayne, "All it says is that Congress has no
right to investigate how we vote or where we pray, what we think, say or how we make movies"
(Trumbo, 2015). According to Arthur Eckstein (2004), "Those who were either publicly or
privately denounced as members of the American Communist Party (CPUSA) found it almost
impossible at least for a decade to get employment in the motion-picture industry" (p. 424). Of
course, this eventually inflicted permanent damage upon many artists. As a result of the
Hollywood blacklist system, many film careers were completely destroyed, while others suffered severe setbacks (Eckstein, 2004). Eckstein (2004) notes, "The placement of primary political and moral blame on HUAC for what happened to people during the blacklist is obviously correct. The lawyers defending the original Hollywood Ten had an excellent point that the First Amendment’s guarantee of freedom of association meant that Congress had no right to investigate Communist Party membership unless it first passed legislation outlawing the Party" (p. 425). Overall, many innocent citizens were condemned even though they were contributors to society and did not commit any crimes.

These three key comparisons are clearly different from an ethical point of view. In terms of the Kazan-Malloy metaphorical comparison, the source known as Slate states, "The ethical shades of gray of his (Kazan's) own decision to inform were totally smoothed out in Malloy’s story" (Dessem & Longworth, 2016). As stated earlier, the Waterfront Crime Commission is a clean organization that Malloy decides to help. Malloy is legitimately trying to take down evil and help the innocent. With Kazan, he associated himself with HUAC, which was a corrupt organization, and decided to contribute to the organization by naming names. Simmons (2009) says that Kazan "took it upon himself to ‘out’ other current and former members" (p. 95). By contributing to a corrupt organization that was unethically taking away innocent people's jobs and ways of living, Kazan was going to receive backlash. In other words, Kazan's actions were controversial and not morally justified, unlike Malloy's in "On the Waterfront." Kazan was looked at as a rat and traitor. By making himself look more like Malloy (who was morally justified in his decision), Kazan makes himself look like a truly formed hero of Democracy who represents ideals of justice.
Thus, the Waterfront Crime Commission is meant to make HUAC look like a Democratic organization that is doing the right thing. In the film, the mob is eventually correlated to the death of Malloy's birds. This can be seen as an analogy towards Communism threatening and ultimately destroying Democracy, which was what HUAC often preached to the masses. HUAC's often stated theses are being reinforced in secret ways. Early in the film, the Waterfront Crime Commission tells Malloy, "You have every right to not talk if that is what you choose to do, but the public has the right to know the facts too, you know" (On the Waterfront, 1954). This sentence is interesting. First off, the last part of the sentence represents HUAC's approach to their cause. Often times, they would state that the United States public had the right to know the facts when it comes to communism. To them, it was an entity that completely threatened everything. Stephen Underhill (2017) notes, "J. Edgar Hoover told the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) on March 26 that communism was a “way of life—an evil and malignant way of life. It revealed a condition akin to disease that spreads like an epidemic and like an epidemic a quarantine was necessary to keep it from infecting the Nation" (p. 454). Now, the first part of that movie quote firmly separates the Waterfront Crime Commission and HUAC. The Waterfront Crime Commission is understanding and will not penalize people for remaining silent. On the other hand, as noted earlier, if citizens do not cooperate with HUAC, the organization will put people in jail, give them a bad reputation, and take away their film careers. The "people need to know" essence of HUAC is the backbone of the Waterfront Crime Commission. But, HUAC's immoral nature is covered up through the Waterfront Crime Commissions morally right organization. Peter Biskind (1987) backs this up, stating, "Power is confronted not with power, but with Christian virtue. Liberal institutions (the Crime Commission) hand in hand with the Christian soldier (Terry) will ensure the reign of the meek."
Kazan made the implicit claim not only that those who named names before HUAC were Christian saints, but indeed, that fifties America was the secular City of God on earth" (p. 194). After viewing this film, audience members, especially those who do not know much about HUAC's controversial methods, may view HUAC as being justified and right. Today, whenever you hear about "On the Waterfront," you hear about its connection to Kazan's decision. Upon first viewing of the film, people, like me (beforehand) may automatically view HUAC as being an organization that was truly ethical and trying to rid the world of evildoers. In America, when we hear the word communist, we automatically assume that every single member is evil.

The metaphorical connection between the mob and Communists adds to the manipulation factor. It has been noted that in the film, the plot of union corruption and testimony (mob involvement) before a judicial inquiry stands in for the real life Communist infiltration of Hollywood during that time (Smith, 2009). In the film, the mob is portrayed as an evil, Communist-like faction. The mob kills Malloy's pigeons, attacks Churches, and constantly threatens or kills citizens. This is Kazan and company taking HUAC's myths about the dangerous communist threats and literally putting the terrible actions on the big screen. The myths are being turning into reality on the big screen. Biography.com notes, "McCarthy ratcheted up the rhetoric, going on a colorful anticommunist “crusade” through which he cast himself as an unrelenting patriot and protector of the American ideal" (Biography.com Contributor, 2017). The mob killing pigeons could be seen as an analogy for Communism trumping Democracy. The mob attacking churches echoes fears that Communism could potentially destroy Churches across the globe.

The opening sequence of the mob oozes Communist imagery. In the scene, Friendly has large amounts of cash and is paying each member at a table (On the Waterfront, 1954). Friendly
is literally sharing the wealth. This fits into the Communist ideology. According to Business Dictionary, Communism is defined as an “economic and social system in which all (or nearly all) property and resources are collectively owned by a classless society and not by individual citizens” (Business Dictionary writer, 2018). Of course, Communism is also notorious for dictatorships. Examples of this could be Adolph Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Fidel Castro, and so on. In the scene, Friendly is the dictator who is distributing the wealth. However, he is not distributing the wealth like he should. Friendly is only giving wealth to the people who listen to his orders. Friendly is not helping the entire collection of waterfront workers, just the ones he deems suitable. Here, the tenor (communism) is truly being explained through the vehicle (the mob). The Communist-like makeup of the mob is telling us that Communism is a corrupt political cause. In other words, one leader cannot properly lead a cause and make all of the decisions because the power will get to them. The film tells us that the Communist government is essentially a selfish entity that controls everyone and makes its own decisions without any care for the public’s input. And a majority of the population will suffer because of the dictator's ego. The constant killings by Friendly echoes real-life dictators (Hitler, Stalin, Castro, etc.) high body counts. The Communist government will suppress people's rights and overall freedom. This belief of Communism is thoroughly echoed through Kazan's HUAC testimonies, which was stated earlier in the ideology section of this paper. Also, the fact that Kazan and company bring up the redistributing wealth aspect in regards to the mob could be seen as a deconstruction of political idealism. Again, political idealism was all about sharing, harmony, forgiveness, and so on (Underhill, 2017). Thus, Kazan is deconstructing political idealism and the New Deal altogether, with the intent of building his political realism, which is the (ratting) ideology he contributed to.
By making the mob a Communist-like organization, Kazan gives his former antagonistic force, Communism, a distinct, evil feel. In America, when one hears the word "mob," we automatically think of the term as an evil faction that operates outside of Democracy and will hurt anyone who is in their way. Kazan is trying to act like his antagonist was that type of evil force (even though it is the exact opposite). As stated earlier, using a topic in a different way normally gets legitimate points across to people. By presenting the Communist population as a mob organization, Kazan is attempting to help people understand Communism. The mob was a perfect metaphor for Communism because the mob was closer to the ordinary United States citizen. If a person fully embraces this metaphoric comparison, they will view Kazan's decision as being right because to them, the Communist population was an evil population that had to be stopped (according to the mob comparison). Thus, the mob is meant to make every Communist seem inherently evil, which would make audience members (who do not know the context of the real life situation) feel as though HUAC was justified in their investigations.

In the film, the priest, Father Barry, is a very important figure. He is constantly stating his opinion to the people of the waterfront through sermons of God and righteousness. According to Paul Coughlin (2011), “The figure of the priest is integral to marrying basic principles of Christianity – brotherhood, fairness, egalitarianism – with a socialist outlook that values the interests of the rank and file above those of the ‘hawks’ on the rooftops" (p. 143). Thus, Father Barry can be seen as analogy for moral order. In the film, the moral order deals with religion and how one must be true to their soul. In other words, a person must go against the evil that is the mob and be true to God. In real life, Kazan and others were provoked to speak in the name of the country. Often times, America has been associated with God. The United States is supposed to stand for peace, freedom, honesty, and so on. All of these terms are staples of God. In the film,
Father Barry helps push Malloy towards his heroic destiny. At one point, he asks Terry, "How much is your soul worth if you don't (testify)?" (On the Waterfront, 1954). Thus, this reflects religion's atmosphere. There are bigger problems than your own personal problems and dilemmas. You must not get caught up in worldly, petty problems; you must have a heavenly perspective and do the right thing. In terms of HUAC and that particular moral order, people were meant to believe that testifying was in the best interest of God and the country.

However, the character of Father Barry also gives Kazan the unique opportunity to serve as a narrator. Through certain statements by Barry, we can see Kazan commenting on his situation and time. My favorite quote of the film is when Father Barry yells at the union workers after Dugan has died. Barry lashes out at the workers, saying, "And anybody who sits around and lets it happen, keeps silent about something he knows that happened, shares the guilt of it just as much as the Roman soldier who pierced the flesh of our Lord to see if he was dead" (On the Waterfront, 1954). This statement paints HUAC as being justified. In other words, if a person is against HUAC, they are also against God. Thus, God is on HUAC's side. Oddly enough, this idea harkens back to a statement by J. Edgar Hoover. Underhill (2017) talks about FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's beliefs, stating, "Those were the “times when faith in God, superior physical endurance, high courage, utter fearlessness, and the ability to thrive on adversity were requisites of success.” Such attributes, he argued, needed to be duplicated by our Country’s defenders if we are to preserve America for tomorrow, because Americans allowed the spirit of Americanism to be drugged with alien ideologies. This battle was cosmic in nature and was against the Axis forces and the pagan evil, which could only be met by a superior force of spiritual development. He suggested, for example, that the world was “bruised and bleeding because the forces of the anti-Christ” had ascended “over the forces of decency" (p. 473). Hoover basically compares alien
ideologies to being the anti-Christ. With these ideas, if you are against HUAC, you are against God. If that is the case, you are on the side of Communism, which is the anti-Christ or devil reincarnated. It makes audience members wonder, "How much is a person's American image worth if they refuse to eliminate the enemy?" How are you living up to the essence of the United States, which is one nation under God? Again, it makes less knowledgeable audience members think that HUAC was ethical and fighting the devil.

Another quote by Barry is, "He sees you selling your souls to the mob for a day's pay."

This is pointing towards patronage. Dictionary.com defines patronage as "the control of or power to make appointments to government jobs or the power to grant other political favors" (Dictionary.com Writer, 2018). Essentially, patronage is an unethical means of appointing jobs. Of course, this is the mob in the film, which basically states that Communism is a patronage. Dictators will hand out jobs to people who put them over God. The patronage argument is hand in hand with the mob and communist metaphor. It further pushes the argument that Communism is dangerous, sickening, and corrupt.

Barry tells one of the union workers, "One thing we got in this country is ways of fighting back. Getting the facts to the public. Testifying for what you know is right against what you know is wrong. What is ratting to them is telling the truth for you" (On the Waterfront, 1954). The statement gets at different subject positions. Malloy was on the side of the mob, which meant that ratting was not allowed. Ratting would show society the mobs illegal activities. However, Malloy has a Democratic subject position now. Ratting is recommended because it alerts the Democratic society of evil. In this case, the Democratic society can rid themselves of known evils. Of course, this reflects Kazan's situation. Kazan testified and made "On the Waterfront" in the 1950's. J. Edgar Hoover, who shared an interest in Hollywood with HUAC,
used rhetorical realism (a darker, more cynical ideology) to shape that time (Underhill, 2017). Thus, Kazan is talking about the fact that it is okay to get your hands dirty now. The ratting statement is cleverly commenting on the ideological shift from idealism to realism. Idealism had an overly positive view of humanity and talked about harmony and forgiveness (Underhill, 2017). This type of cynical (dirty hands) worldview comes from political realism, which views the world as being filled with adversity (Underhill, 2017). In other worlds the world is a dark, slimy place, which means that you have to make tough decisions. A person, or country, must get their hands dirty in order to endure. The world is not a place where everyone genuinely loves one another.

The last Barry quote is where he tells Malloy, "Don't fight him like a hoodlum down here in the jungle. Fight him tomorrow in the courtroom with the truth as you know it" (On the Waterfront, 1954). Once again, this paints HUAC as being moral, but the first sentence marginalizes the mob. Barry calls them animals and labels their land "a jungle." Of course, this reflects that Communists are savage animals with no remorse. They live in a jungle where it is kill or be killed. This points to rhetorical realism, where writers began marginalizing groups in terms of animalistic names (Underhill, 2017). Kazan and company are painting the Communists as being subjective brutes who use violence to get what they want. However, the second statement paints HUAC as being objective, since they are in the court room. So, in this case, HUAC is objective because they operate in the courtroom. It is "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God." Kazan and company are essentially saying that while the Communists pounce on each other like brutal animals, HUAC is operating through investigation, objectivity, and God's honest truth.
In closing, today, Kazan has a legacy that is most definitely divisive, but not entirely negative. "On the Waterfront" is a big reason as to why Kazan is partly respected for his artistry. Overall, the metaphorical and analogical comparisons of "On the Waterfront" is intriguing. The metaphorical and analogical comparisons are genuinely a part of the film and only add to the film's richness, realism, and style. Without Kazan's experiences outside of the text, the inside text structure of "On the Waterfront" would not be as great as it is. Almost 65 years on, we have seen how much respect Kazan gets from audience members. Yes, Kazan is still known as a controversial figure, but that is not his absolute image. This is proven through his honorary award by the Academy. In 1999, Kazan was given an Honorary Oscar Lifetime Achievement Award for his contributions to cinema (Klehr & Haynes, 2004). When Kazan received an Oscar lifetime achievement award, there were organized protests and a considerable amount of the audience refused to applaud him (Klehr, & Haynes, 2004). However, a good portion of the crowd did indeed pay their respects to Kazan by applauding him (Klehr & Haynes, 2004). Thus, one can see that "On the Waterfront," a film filled with personal experiences and legitimate realism, has given Kazan a legacy of respect. There is true divisiveness when it comes to his legacy, as supported by the 1999 Oscar ceremony, but there are supporters. One of Kazan's biggest supporters during his 1999 awards stint was filmmaker Martin Scorsese (King, 2010). The Italian American Scorsese is a great director in his own right and is known for classic films, like "Taxi Driver," "Raging Bull," "GoodFellas," "The Departed," and so on. Through Scorsese, we can see the different ways in which Kazan's newly formed legacy owes a lot to "On the Waterfront."

Kazan's technical skills as a director allow him to be appreciated by great filmmakers, like Scorsese, forever. Yes, the controversy will always be there, but his enormous, personal, and
emotional contributions to cinema will always be there to inspire enthusiasts of film. Scorsese has always considered Kazan's films to be truly beautiful because Kazan had an "eye" for visual flair (King, 2010). To Scorsese, Kazan had a command of filmmaking itself, which includes editing, lighting, music, and camerawork (King, 2010). In particular, Kazan's use of Boris Kaufman's cinematography for "On the Waterfront" had a beautiful, but realistic element to it (King, 2010). Kazan's personal and realistic storytelling is a trait that is often talked about when it comes to his films. The Wall Street Journal notes, "Significantly, the films that won Mr. Scorsese's heart were the ones Mr. Kazan made after he identified eight friends as members of the Communist Party" (Dollar, 2010). This statement goes along with a statement by Kazan (in his autobiography). Kazan once noted that the experience of testifying before HUAC as a friendly witness and the criticism that followed was his making as an artist, since it liberated him from the opinion of others and allowed the exploration of more ambiguous subject matter (Smith, 2009). Kazan's tackling of ambiguous and personal subject matter (post-HUAC era) most definitely got Scorsese's approval. Kazan's films had personal and realistic traits that gave Scorsese a profound respect for him. Scorsese notes, "I saw On the Waterfront when it opened in 1954. It felt quite different from most of the other American films I’d seen up to that point. I would never have put it this way at the time, but I realize now that it was a breakthrough, emotionally and psychologically, into a new, stylized vision of reality" (Scorsese, 2003). Scorsese has even said that "On the Waterfront" felt like his life as a younger man growing up in New York City, stating, "It is almost like the camera was with me in the streets and in the apartments. For me, growing up in Elizabeth Street ... it looked exactly like where we were growing up" (King, 2010). Klehr and Haynes (2004) note, "In late 1953, the Republican governor of New York and the Eisenhower administration were attempting to assert direct
political control over the New York waterfront unions as the first step in acquiring control of unions nationwide" (p. 394). Doesn't this sound very familiar? Schwartz (2004) notes, "Kazan and Schulberg made a film, which included an acknowledgement to Malcolm Johnson, a reporter for the old New York Sun, who had published a series of Pulitzer Prize-winning articles exposing racketeering on the New York docks" (p. 378). Kazan took the HUAC issue and combined it with New York's fight against mob corruption. Essentially, Kazan took his HUAC vs. Communism background and basically grounded it into a story about Democratic citizens going against the mob. Right away, many United States citizens like to think of themselves as true patriots who are democratic in nature. Kazan's utilization of a poor and struggling Democratic society automatically creates sympathy from actual U.S. citizens. Thus, the regular movie going audience would be able to legitimately understand the political message of corruption and truthfulness that Kazan was sending. Overall, the type of story that Kazan and Schulberg structured is easy to tell and understand (Sefcovic, 2002). The uses of lower/middle class dock workers and mob members are a staple of "the streets of America." Other than understanding the story, audiences may automatically feel respect and gratefulness to Kazan because of his realistic portrayal of the mob and dock workers. Scorsese is an example of such respect and admiration.

To legitimately conclude, it is safe to say that Kazan's artistry will always allow him to be partly respected by the masses. His artistry and contributions to cinema will allow him to endure. On the flip side of being a traitor, Kazan is known as a respected director who gave a lot to cinema. This is proven through the 1999 Oscars ceremony. Yes, many people refused to cheer, but others applauded him. This shows a split. There will always be people who simply love artists for their art. Many film enthusiasts, critics, directors, writers, and so on will respect Kazan...
because of his personal additions and the realistic qualities of his art. Kazan's combination of his real life events and American life is a big reason as to why he will endure. When a man's work is attached to personal experiences and real-life events, it makes the work that much more rich. Audience members go to the theater to be entertained and/or inspired. Kazan's work most definitely does both, but it more so does the latter. Kenneth Burke believed that the purpose of art is to provide equipment for living (as cited in Sefcovic, 2002, pg. 344). Apparently, Kazan bought into that notion. Kazan's artistic work speaks for itself and as always, the medium of film will continue to inspire audiences.
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