



*Sidney Lumet and
The Politics
Of the Left:
The Centrality of
Daniel*

When I wrote *The Book of Daniel* in the late '60s there were more interesting questions to explore than the aberrant behavior of a pair of radicals. I was interested in the connection between the New Left and the Old Left. What was the role of the radical in America? Was it sacrificial? Why do the left movements always destroy themselves?

—E. L. Doctorow¹

Of the New Left of the '60s:

It revolted against its own father, which was the old Left. . . . Didn't even bother really to learn about it. . . . The agrarian and labor movements at the end of the nineteenth century were wonderfully moving, touching things, and of great importance. And by cutting itself off from the Old Left, the New Left made itself a one-action generation. The war, but after that, nothing.

—Sidney Lumet²

The Book of Daniel (1971) and Sidney Lumet's film adaptation in 1983, with a screenplay by the novel's author, E. L. Doctorow, embody many shared concerns. As the above quotations indicate, both men are intensely interested in the connections between generations, and in the case of these two works, in the way the Old Left, which came into being in the early part of the twentieth century, informs the New Left, that generation which came of age during the anti-war protests of the 1960s. In-between the Old and the New was the so-called "McCarthy era," an era of fear, repression, and the creation of what Irving Howe has called "the generation that did not show up" (47). They both see clearly the potential for self-destruction (presented figuratively through the character of Susan in *Daniel*) when people lose their connection with the past in *human* terms. Lumet has described himself as "an old thirties' leftist," and has said that:

politics is not about victories. It's about a constant lifetime struggle *because you feel a certain way* about what the function of government is . . . all work is political finally. It's

political by saying, "Look, you're a human being and these are the kinds of human beings and situations you are up against. And this is what greed means. This is what power means." Now what are you—on a human level—going to do to arouse somebody enough to make them spend their time in a sensible way? (Guthmann 55, italics mine)

It is through fiction that Doctorow seeks "to arouse" us and it is through movies that Lumet does the same. Doctorow has said of his craft, "I move ideas, images a certain distance. I try to make the invisible visible. I distribute the suffering so it can be borne" (Morris 456). In making the invisible visible, both men are intensely concerned with "social justice." In an interview, Doctorow said that his characters such as Billy Bathgate and Daniel Isaacson are "seeking some sort of patrimony, some kind of justice in the world for themselves" (Morris 441), while Lumet's films, from his first feature, *Twelve Angry Men* (1957), which he said is a rebuttal to the lynch mob hysteria of the McCarthy era (Smith 32), to the more recent *Night Falls in Manhattan* (1997), are all about the quest for social justice. As David Desser and Lester Friedman have written, "A deep and abiding commitment to social justice dominates Lumet's cinema" (161), a fact emphasized in 1985 when the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California honored the director "for his personal commitment to justice so brilliantly portrayed through his craft" (Lally 8).

Both E. L. Doctorow and Sidney Lumet have always stressed that *The Book of Daniel* and its film adaptation are not about Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, but about "the idea of the Rosenbergs." The novel has been called "a meditation on American politics," an "imaginative revisioning of the radical movement which attempts to bridge the generation gap and reconnect the new radicalism to its history" (Levine 38). In a joint statement about the film, they said:

There is no attempt here to be historically accurate. . . . Through Daniel's search for self-discovery in his own memories, as well as his contacts with people who were involved in his parents' case, we see from the inside three decades in the life of American dissent—from the Depression and World War II to the McCarthy period and the anti-war movement of the 1960s. The effects of parents on children, of ideologies on life, of history on individuals, are questions considered in the story of two generations of a family whose ruling passion is not success or money or love, but social justice. (Qtd. in Sarris 45)

The novel, as has often been noted, works on many levels and tells many stories. But one of the stories is about the American left and the generally sacrificial role it has played in history. The New Left of the '60s, by ignoring history, ended up defining political issues in personal, subjective terms (hence Lumet's critique of it as finally a "one action" movement), as opposed to the more objective social analysis of the Old Left with its Marxist Study Groups. Norman Mailer, who significantly appears as an isolated character in Doctorow's novel at the 1967 march on the Pentagon, articulated this divide between generations in *The Armies of the Night* when he described himself as feeling alienated from the young protesters' anti-intellectualism and ignorance of history, or as Leslie Fiedler described them, "dropouts from history" (193). But Doctorow does not view history as a collection of facts from the past, and this is crucial to an understanding of all of his work.

I think history is made; it's composed. . . . But history is not so much a discipline as it is a source of our own sense of ourselves, and therefore it is too important to be left to the historians and the politicians. . . . Since history can be composed, you see, then you want to have as many people active in the composition as possible. A kind of democracy of perception . . . multiplicity of witnesses. . . . If you don't constantly recompose and re-interpret history, then it begins to tighten its grip on your throat as myth and you find yourself in some kind of totalitarian society, either secular or religious. (Fruedl et. al. 184)

The Book of Daniel is such a recomposition and reinterpretation, and with its fractured structure of time and place, and its multiplicity of voices told through its primary narrator, Daniel, it becomes what Doctorow has called "a system of knowledge" (Morris 444). Beginning with this book, he:

gave up trying to write with the concern for transition characteristic of the nineteenth-century novel. Other writers may be able to, but I can't accept the conventions of realism any-

more. It doesn't interest me. . . . Obviously, the rhythms of perception in me, as in most people who read today, have been transformed immensely by films and television. . . . I don't know how anyone can write today without accommodating eighty or ninety years of film technology. (Qtd. in McCaffery 40-41)

The novel, Doctorow says, "was constructed like *Laugh-In*." From film and television "we've learned that we don't have to explain things. . . . My writing is powered by discontinuity switches in scene, tense, voice, the mystery of who's talking. . . . Anyone who's ever watched a news broadcast on television knows all about discontinuity" (Qtd. in McCaffery 40-41). As the "rhythms of perception" have been transformed in the author, so too have they been transformed in the fictionalized author of *The Book of Daniel*, Daniel himself. We know that Doctorow started out writing the book in a conventional third person voice, but it didn't feel right, so he just trashed the first 150 pages and let Daniel's voice take over. The work thereby becomes a perfect example of what he has called a "false document," history as "false document," where the text is ostensibly created by someone other than the author. In this case, the novel is "DANIEL'S BOOK" (302), a portrait of the artist as subversive who merges academic writing (his dissertation) and fiction (the novel) to create history, "the novel as private I," a sense of self. And Daniel's voice reflects the media age in which he grew up, a collage, like that we see on Sternlicht's wall "of pictures, movie stills, posters, and real objects" (135), of family stories, letters, biblical quotations, trial transcripts, with abrupt shifts from first to third-person point of view, like jump cuts in a movie. And the movies that have informed Daniel's sense of self sprinkle his narrative.³

The first reference in the book is to Charlie Chaplin's *City Lights* during a monologue about the Biblical Daniel and his insecure place in Biblical history: "We think of Charlie Chaplin taken home every night by the fat, wealthy drunkard and kicked out of the drunkard's house in the sobriety of the following morning. Like an alternating current, though quite direct" (11), the last reference connecting the Chaplin film to the theme of electrocution that runs throughout the book. *City Lights* is one of Chaplin's most painful films about the burden that self-sacrifice puts on those who receive it, and thus it is remarkably pertinent to a book that explores, as Lumet has said of his film, "who pays for the passions and commitments of the parents" (Lumet 14).

The next filmic reference is a more general one when Daniel is talking about his parents' radicalism and the poor families from which they came: "They rushed after self-esteem. If you could recognize a Humphrey Bogart movie for the cheap trash it was, you had culture. . . . In social justice you discovered your own virtue" (32).

From the Hollywood commercialism of Bogart, Daniel reveals a sixties' intellectual's familiarity with surrealism and the *avant-garde*. He gives us a long and detailed description of disturbing, disjointed, and perversely violent scenes from Salvador Dali's and Luis Buñuel's *Un Chien Andalou*. Thematically, these reflect on his own abusive treatment of his wife, Phyllis, a shameless exploration of the entwined desires of sadism and sex:

—and if I recall these images inaccurately that is just as good. . . . And just as you, the audience, have settled for his symbolic mutilation of the woman's eyes, the camera cuts back to the scene, and in close-up, shows the razor slicing into the eyeball. (61)

Stanley Kubrick's *Paths of Glory* is cited as Daniel reflects on how "all governments stand ready to commit their citizens to death in the interest of their government" (73), and *Father of the Bride*, with Elizabeth Taylor and Spencer Tracy, to illustrate the bond between his parents, torn asunder in prison. And not surprisingly, Elia Kazan and Budd Schulberg's *On the Waterfront* comes up in a letter from Paul Isaacson to his wife Rochelle, written while they are in prison:

I glanced at a copy of the Daily News one of the marshalls had folded to a review of a new Marlon Brando picture about a gang member who decides to brave the wrath of his comrades and testify in court against their criminality which he has come to see is wrong. Thus is promulgated for the millions the ethic of the stool pigeon. (198)

It is by no means universally agreed that *On the Waterfront* is a justification for being a stool pigeon, although both authors of the movie did "rat." However, this would be the perspec-

tive that Paul Isaacson would take on the film.

With *The Spy Who Came in From the Cold*, a movie being shown on the plane as Daniel flies west to confront Linda Mindish about their past, we not only have the obvious references to the Cold War and spies, but also to the Berlin Wall in a resonant passage in the book where Daniel sees his parents as having fallen through a crack in that wall (262). Daniel has seen gangster films also, or maybe Billy Wilder's *Some Like It Hot* (1959), or even Jerry Lewis's *The Ladies' Man* (1961), because he refers to George Raft's infamous coin flipping from *Scarface* (1932), and he has grown up on westerns such as the Lone Ranger as he muses on the myths we all have in our cultural unconscious: "*We have our daredevils too. We have our cat burglars and laughing caballeros. Our George Raft's flipping coins. Our masked riders of the plains. We have them*" (279).

All these films have helped shape who we are, but perhaps the biggest of all is Walt Disney, and it is with his influence that Doctorow concludes his evocation of how our sense of self and of our nation come from various forms of media. Daniel is, significantly, to meet his family's nemesis, Selig Mindish, in "Tomorrowland" at Disneyland. As he enters the theme park he notes initially the absence of minorities in the crowd. After a recitation of various figures in literature and history, he observes that:

most of them have passed through a previous process of film or film animation and are made to recall the preemptive powers of the Disney organization with regard to Western culture. . . . The animated cartoon itself. . . . came to express the collective unconscious of the community of the American Naïve. (287)

As the action in *City Lights* was earlier described "like an alternating current," Daniel's ongoing preoccupation with his parents' electrocution, which in Lumet's film is shown through Daniel's four direct addresses to the camera on different forms of capital punishment as we watch fragments of the actual death scenes, continues in his scathing ruminations about Disneyland.

What Disneyland proposed is a technique of abbreviated shorthand culture for the masses, a mindless thrill, *like an electric shock*, that insists at the same time on the recipient's rich psychic relation to his country's history and language and literature. In a forthcoming time of highly governed masses in an overpopulated world, this technique may be extremely useful both as a substitute for education and, eventually, as a substitute for experience. (289 italics mine)

In hindsight it is ironic that the film, *Daniel*, has been criticized for the very reductivity that Doctorow attacks in his novel, that only knowing characters and history through their Disney films is a "radical process of reduction occurring, too, with regard to the nature of historical reality" (288). Stanley Kauffmann wrote in his review of the film: "Tell the screenwriter, Doctorow, that he hasn't served the novelist well." Doctorow's screenplay is severely reductive of his novel and simplifies the political issues of the period, glamorizes the Rosenbergs, and fails to resolve the question of their guilt or innocence (Kauffmann 204).

Kauffmann seriously misunderstands the intentions of the film, although he is correct that what is perhaps the major theme of the novel, "the writing of a book within the novel," is not translated onto screen. But *The Book of Daniel* is such a complex work, with so many levels of meaning, that the translation of just a few of the themes into the visual and aural medium of film created what for Sidney Lumet was "a first-rate collaboration" with Doctorow and "one of the best pictures I've ever done" (Lumet 46).

At the outset of the book, which is about the writing of itself, Daniel lists seven "subjects to be taken up." They are first, the picture poster, "FREE THEM," of their parents found in Susan's Volvo after her attempted suicide. Lumet and Doctorow use this scene, and the poster, to make the first transition in the film from the present to the past, where we see hundreds of the posters at a rally to free the Isaacsons. The poster is a visual link between present and past, but it is also metaphoric, because from the perspective of the present, it is now the children who must be freed. As the movie unfolds, Susan will be freed from her increasing madness only in death, but Daniel's liberation, what Lumet called his "coming back to life" (91), will be the spine of the narrative.

In the film, Lumet shows this opening up, what he described as “a young man digging himself out of his own grave” (92), visually through the use of filters. For the scenes of the past, with the parents, he initially used double 85s, giving them a golden glow. For the present, the exteriors were shot without 85s, so that the ambiance was “a ghostly, cold, blue pallor.” This same chill blue was created for interior scenes by adding blue gelatins to the lights. As the movie progresses, and Daniel slowly comes to life, “we started adding 85s to his scenes and removing them from the scenes of the past with his parents” (92). The color change is subtle; almost subliminally, the viewer feels the emotional changes without ever being told them. Normal color is finally achieved, blue and gold tints having slowly overcome each other, in the sequence where Daniel and Susan visit their parents in jail, although it is not fully obvious until the next sequence when Daniel goes to visit Linda Mindish in Los Angeles. This is not filmed in Disneyland, as it is resonantly set in the book, but in an old-age home. But as in the book, it is paradoxically Selig Mindish, whose name, spelled *seelig* in German, means “blissful” or “holy,”⁴ who finally releases him. For Lumet, “Daniel had purged himself of his obsessive pain and life could now resume for him” (92).

The film’s structure is quite different from Doctorow’s novel, but it is a structure that allows the filmmakers to remain faithful to most of what Daniel called the “subjects to be taken up.”

The first is the “FREE THEM” poster. The second comes up in the third sequence of the film, after Daniel’s opening monologue on theories of electricity, followed by stock footage of the October 1967 march on the Pentagon. In Doctorow’s novel, Daniel attends this march and it is where he sees Norman Mailer, and Dr. Spock, and William Sloan Coffin, and Robert Lowell, and senses the deep divide between generations. In the film, the Pentagon footage is masterfully cut to the present of the narrative just as a door slams on a paddy wagon, the imprisonment of the demonstrators echoing the imprisonment of Daniel and Susan in their own lives at the home of their adoptive parents, the Lewins.

The third is simply “Our mad grandma and the big black man in the cellar” (16). Both these people figure in the movie, but neither is developed. They are shadowy presences, echoes of yet an earlier generation’s struggles (the grandmother) and the racial inequality in America. Lumet highlights this last issue by including two other black characters in the movie, Susan’s nurse in the asylum and Rochelle’s prison matron.

The fourth subject has to do with “fleshing out the Lewins.” The Lewins are treated similarly in the book and the movie and they are not fully “fleshed out,” especially Mrs. Lewin who has very little role other than ineffectual peacekeeper. But in the film Robert Lewin is played by John Rubinstein, son of famed pianist Artur Rubinstein, who knew firsthand the difficulty of growing up as the son of a famous parent. However, Susan’s three-sentence refrain—“They’re still fucking us. You get the picture. Good boy, Daniel”—runs systematically through both texts, and is equally ambiguous. Who is the “they”? Does “the picture” also refer to the poster of the Isaacsons Daniel finds in Susan’s car and is clutching in his hand as he hears her repeat the words in a voice-over? What does it mean to be a “good boy”?

The longest of Daniel’s subjects is the fifth, which has to do with his life as a graduate student, avoiding commitment by hiding in the Columbia University library with “Secondary Sources.” Because the movie does not deal with Daniel’s writing, it embraces this subject only at the end through Daniel’s embrace of his family, including them in an anti-war protest. Stephen Farber has put it well in writing that *Daniel*:

not only links the radicalism of the thirties to that of the sixties; it also links family loyalty to the idea of political involvement, a far more original connection. . . . Daniel’s determination to rebuild the family that had been destroyed leads to his rediscovery of the political activism that represents the best part of his parents’ bequest to him.” (Farber 35)

So unlike the novel, which begins with Daniel Lewin driving to the Worcester State Hospital to see his sister, a possible metaphor for the country in the late 1960s, and ends with three endings—Daniel returning to his old house in the Bronx, Susan’s funeral, and writing in the library—the film begins and ends with political protest.

The sixth subject (Artie Sternlicht) is omitted entirely from the film. Apparently some of this was shot, but the additional character only added confusion to an already disjointed narrative. Artie is crucial to the understanding of the 1960s in the book, but Lumet chose instead simply to give us footage of anti-war protests.

The seventh subject is the Isaacson Foundation. This idea, however, triggers a meditation in caps about his heart, asking if it is wrong "TO EMPTY MY HEART OF THIS MATTER? WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH MY HEART?" Daniel, as he begins his book, does not have much of a heart. It is only with the three endings that he discovers his heart, his humanity. These endings are not given to us as choices; they are, as Harter and Thompson stress, "actually one" (46). Doctorow, in his interview with Morris, says simply, "I like that ending for *Daniel*. . . it seemed to me at the time that given Daniel and his character, three endings were appropriate to him—he would do that. And they would all together be a proper closing" (444). When he visits his old Bronx home he is able to let go of his past, at Susan's funeral he opens himself to the present through tears, and at the library he commits to the future through writing.

Daniel's evolution is evoked not just in the visuals and dialogue, but also in the soundtrack. Paul Robeson sings, "Now Who Will Be a Witness?" at the protest rally at the beginning of the film. At the closing rally, his question is answered by a Joan Baez arrangement of Robeson's "This Little Light of Mine," sung by Caroline Doctorow.

Lumet knew he wanted to use Robeson. "He was perfect for the period. He was right politically" (Lumet 181). But picking and spotting the songs were difficult. At the end of the film Lumet mingles the funerals of the Isaacsons and Susan as we hear Robeson singing, "There's a man going 'round taking names." The lyrics include the lines, "He has taken my mother's name and left my heart in pain," and "He has taken my father's name and left my heart in pain," and finally, "Now death is the man taking names" and he has "taken my brother's name." Although in this case it is a sister, the lyrics eloquently express the deaths of a mother, a father, a sibling, and the cruel "naming of names" that was so much at the heart of the witch hunts in this country in the late '40s and early '50s. It is at Susan's funeral that Daniel pays old Jewish men to say prayers for the dead, "For all of them. I hold my wife's hand. And I think I am going to be able to cry" (302). It is one of the three breakthrough moments at the novel's ending, but it is the primary one for Lumet's film because it represents Daniel's "thawing," his coming back to life.

Robeson's music also encapsulates Doctorow's themes as Daniel flies to Los Angeles to visit Linda Mindish. As the plane lands we hear Robeson singing, "My soul is a witness," the lyrics of which include lines explaining that "Daniel was a Hebrew child" who "went to pray to his God for awhile," and that he was cast "into the lion's den" and that "he lay down and went to sleep," but that now "Daniel was a witness." At the beginning of the film we got only the question—"Now Who Will Be a Witness?" Now we hear Robeson's full rendition, that "Daniel was a witness," an idea crucial to Doctorow's conception of a "multiplicity of witnesses" in the writing of history. But Robeson's song over this scene ends, not with Daniel, but with the next question, for us, "Now who will be a witness?"

Frank Cunningham has suggested the ending of *Daniel* is ironic, that Lumet is commenting "on the sentimental and fashionable piety of the late 1960s that claimed that the revolution had spread and that thus things were automatically better" than they had been for the Old Left. One of his arguments for this is what he calls "a less-powerful version" of Robeson's "This Little Light of Mine," a pop display of "rock music" that seems to him "tinny" (67) in comparison to the exhortations of a committed generation. It is true that the ending of the novel is hardly sentimental and that its look at '60s radicalism is profoundly critical. But Lumet's film takes a different course. Although he too has expressed disappointment in the failure of the New Left of the '60s to understand the Old Left, *Daniel* is much more about the importance of family and the continuity of generations than *The Book of Daniel*. He has said, "I am, I hope, like every intelligent American, a political human being, but I don't make political films. I hope I make films about feelings, about emotions, about families, which is basically what *Daniel* is about" (Benchly 185). The first time we hear "This Little Light of Mine" in the movie is when Daniel and Susan escape from the children's shelter in

the Bronx and walk across that borough to their old home. The visual motif of bars, the "hard passage" movement of the two small figures against the cold skyline, and the hiding of Susan in a corner of the frame all evoke the emotional situation of fear, despair, anger, loneliness, confusion, and loss. Only the music maintains that glimmer of hope. It is a hope that is not lost, but is transferred to the next generation that must "be a witness" in the film's last sequence. The rendition is not "tinny"; it echoes a folk hero of the time, Joan Baez, and maybe even the new voice of women. That Lumet wants us to see the family bond and the next generation seems clear as we see Daniel hoist his son onto his shoulders and they join the throng in Central Park where they sit next to a black man in a shared quest for peace.

A more cogent argument for an ironic or cynical view of this ending would be that Daniel, his wife, and son sitting at a protest rally in Central Park mirror Paul, Rochelle, and their son sitting at the Robeson Peekskill concert shown earlier in the film. Their radicalism led to their deaths, the suicide of their daughter, and the torment of their son. Is Daniel repeating the sins of the father rather than learning from him? Such a pessimistic view would be darker than the novel, and it would not be consistent with what we see in the rest of Lumet's work. Although he never embodies a facile optimism, Lumet consistently suggests that even in a complex and corrupt world it is possible for individuals to come to terms with their pasts, as in *The Pawnbroker*, and do something worthwhile with their lives. For example, in a rare moment of genuine human feeling in a film Lumet made two years after *Daniel*, *Power* (1985), a scathing, insightful look at how the media make or break political candidates, calculating spin-master, image-maker Pete St. John (Richard Gere) comments to retiring Senator Sam Hastings (E. G. Marshall), "You're one of three or four guys who made a difference up there." At the end of *Running on Empty* (1988), a work that in many ways picks up where *Daniel* leaves off and looks at what happened to the '60s generation in the '80s, Judd Hirsh as Arthur Pope says to his son, played by River Phoenix, "Go and make a difference." What every one of Lumet's films shows us, from his very first feature, *Twelve Angry Men* (1957), in which Henry Fonda, as Juror number eight, convinces eleven others to vote "Not Guilty," is that one individual *can* make a difference. He has said, "While the goal of all movies is to entertain. . . the pictures I've done that I'm the proudest of have something to say about the human condition" (Shewey 34). Although Doctorow has said that in general he dislikes film adaptations because they made the story elements too specific (Fruedl et. al. 196), *Daniel* is an exception. In evoking, often just through the visuals and music, most of the seven "subjects" of his novel, except for the idea of writing as a "system of knowledge," both Doctorow and Lumet bear witness and ask us to do the same.

Joanna E. Rapf
University of Oklahoma

Notes

¹ Quoted in Arthur Bell, "Not the Rosenbergs' Story," *Village Voice* 6 Sept. 1983: 41.

² Quoted in Gavin Smith, "Sidney Lumet: Lion on the Left," *Film Comment* 24 (Aug. 1988): 36.

³ All quotations from *The Book of Daniel* are from the New York Plume edition, 1996.

⁴ See Robert Detweiler, "Carnival of Shame: Doctorow and the Rosenbergs," *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 6 (Winter 1996): 74.

Works Cited

Bell, Arthur. "Not the Rosenbergs' Story." *Village Voice* 6 Sept. 1983: 41-42.

Benchly, Peter. "The Direct Approach." *American Way* Dec. 1983: 182-86.

Cunningham, Frank R. *Sidney Lumet: Film and Literary Vision*. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1991.

- Desser, David, and Lester D. Friedman. "Sidney Lumet: The Memory of Guilt." *American-Jewish Filmmakers: Traditions and Trends*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1993.
- Detweiler, Robert. "Carnival of Shame: Doctorow and the Rosenbergs." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 6 (Winter 1996): 63-85.
- Doctorow, E. L. *The Book of Daniel*. New York: Plume, 1996.
- Farber, Stephen. *Film Quarterly* 37 (Spring 1984): 32-37.
- Fielder, Leslie. "The New Mutants." *A Fiedler Reader*. New York: Stein & Day, 1977.
- Fruedl, Herwig, and Dieter Schulz, eds. "A Multiplicity of Witness: E. L. Doctorow at Heidelberg." *E. L. Doctorow: A Democracy of Perception*. Essen: Blaue Eule, 1989.
- Guthmann, Edward. "Timothy Hutton Talks Back." *San Francisco Bay Guardian* 29 Sept. 1983: 32-33, 50-55.
- Harter, Carol C., and James Thompson. *E. L. Doctorow*. Boston: Twayne, 1990.
- Howe, Irving. "New Styles in 'Leftism.'" *Steady Work*. New York: Harcourt, 1966.
- Kael, Pauline. *State of the Art*. New York: Dutton, 1983.
- Kauffmann, Stanley. *Field of View*. New York: PAJ, 1986.
- Lally, Kevin. "Versatility Gives Lumet Staying Power." *Film Journal* 89 (Jan.1986): 8, 26.
- Levine, Paul. *E. L. Doctorow*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Lumet, Sidney. *Making Movies*. New York: Random, 1995.
- McCaffery, Larry. "A Spirit of Transgression." *E. L. Doctorow: Essays and Conversations*. Richard Trenner, ed. Princeton: Ontario Review, 1983.
- Morris, Christopher D. "'Fiction is a System of Knowledge': An Interview with E. L. Doctorow." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 30 (Summer 1991): 439-56.
- Parks, John G. "The Politics of Polyphony: The Fiction of E. L. Doctorow." *Twentieth Century Literature* 37 (Winter 1991): 454-63.
- Sarris, Andrew. "The Rosenbergs, the Isaacsons, and Thou." *Village Voice* 6 Sept. 1983: 45, 51.
- Shewey, Don. "Sidney Lumet: The Reluctant Auteur." *American Film* Dec.1982: 31-36.
- Smith, Gavin. "Sidney Lumet: Lion on the Left." *Film Comment* 24 (Aug.1988): 32, 34-38.
- Williams, John. *Fiction as False Document: The Reception of E. L. Doctorow in the Postmodern Age*. Columbia: Camden, 1996.

Doctorow's *Daniel*: A Screenplay

E.L. Doctorow *Three Screenplays*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. 480 pp. \$36.95

"These film scripts adapted from my novels *The Book of Daniel*, *Ragtime* and *Loon Lake* are published not for the general public," Doctorow writes in his "Preface" (vii), "but for students of film, who might find the comparison of novel to film useful to their studies," for "there can be no other rationale" for publication.

Of the three screenplays included, only *Daniel* was actually filmed (by Sidney Lumet—see Joanna Rapf's discussion in this essay). The *Ragtime* script was intended for a failed Robert Altman project that would have resulted in either a six-hour feature film or a ten-hour television miniseries. Nor was Doctorow's *Loon Lake* screenplay ever produced.

Paul Levine of Copenhagen University has rounded out the book with an overview of Doctorow's career and interviews with Sidney Lumet and Doctorow himself.

J.M.W.

