

IN REGARD TO THE INDIVIDUAL: A ROUSSEAUIAN APPROACH TO THE NATURE
OF MAN IN SELECT FRENCH AND FRANCOPHONE FILMS AND IN FILM
ADAPTATIONS OF THE FRENCH AND FRANCOPHONE NOVEL AND PLAY

by

ROBIN SUZANNE MICELI

DR. BRUCE EDMUNDS AND DR. STEVE BURCH COMMITTEE CHAIRS

DR. JEAN-LUC ROBIN

DR. MICHAEL PICONE

DR. THOMAS FOX

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Modern Languages and Classics
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2011

ABSTRACT

The influence Jean-Jacques Rousseau's philosophy has on French and Francophone literary and cinematic works mostly likely occurs on a superficial level to most students. This manuscript attempts to unveil the profundity of his philosophical influence. Further research was necessary to validate the true impact of Rousseauian philosophy on various French and Francophone film adaptations of both novel and play. This research attempts to further define his philosophy. All research indicates a profound Rousseauian influence which specifies the importance of an individual, fundamental, natural state of man versus an artificial, civil and socially structured state. The following manuscript is an expository of specific film adaptations of both novel and play which support the findings of a highly influential Rousseauian philosophy defined as a juxtaposition of both these natural and artificial states. The findings indicate a Rousseauian promotion of equilibrium between these two states in each film expository. Along with this indicated equilibrium of the two states is an emphasis on the importance of the fundamental, individual nature of man. The consequences of the rejection of this nature and the movement away from it after man's creation are also indicated. The consequences of imbalance between the two states are indicated and expounded upon by tragic plots and sub-plots in which either the individual, fundamental nature of man or the Civil State of being have become too predominant. The research contained within this manuscript focuses on the need and promotion of an equilibrium as well as on the consequences of imbalance in connection with Rousseau and his profound legacy. Time and more research will continue to prove the findings in this

manuscript and enforce the importance of further study on Jean-Jacques Rousseau along with his apparent philosophical promotion of an equilibrium containing both natural and artificial states of being.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to those individuals who gave of their time in order to guide me through the process of manuscript writing. I thank my friends, family, and professors for assisting me in completing this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to all the faculty, family, and friends who assisted me throughout this research project. I hold in high esteem the effort that my two committee chairs, Dr. Edmunds and Dr. Burch, put into the process of finishing this manuscript. Their wisdom throughout my studies and their continual advice has helped me to undertake and structure my research clearly and soundly. In addition to my chairs, I also truly appreciate those who accepted a position on my committee. Thank you Dr. Michael Picone, Dr. Jean-Luc Robin, and Dr. Tom Fox.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. A FUNDAMENTAL SAVIOR.....	12
3. REJECTION AND DEATH OF THE FUNDAMENTAL INDIVIDUAL.....	35
4. RESURRECTING INNOCENCE.....	55
5. SELF TYRANNY.....	86
6. THE IRONIC INDIVIDUAL POET/ CIVIL ARTIST.....	101
7. A DEADLY TRIANGLE.....	126
8. CONCLUSION.....	146
REFERENCES.....	161

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The French politician and philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau emphasizes the importance of coexistence between the fundamental, individual nature of man and civilization. His promotion of a State's ethical responsibility to a fundamental, individual nature of man is apparent in his core works and particularly emphasized in *The Social Contract*. He demonstrates the way in which this fundamental, individual nature of man can become corrupted and forgotten in the Civil State.¹ Many French and Francophone films and film adaptations of the French and Francophone novel and play support the Rousseauian concept of the fundamental, individual nature of man and support what Rousseau feels to be its appropriate relationship to the Civil State.² Rousseau is not opposed to the Civil State. Rather, he desires a coexistence leading to

1. "...Rousseau is not the unambiguous representative for the 'realist' approach that he is so routinely assumed to be. Rousseau developed a unique analysis which accentuates historical change, dialectal paradox and the tendency for interdependence to foster inequality and conflict." (Knusten 247)

2. "Rousseau addressed what is often not considered, if, for example, one considers History to be a civil construct, "Except when referring to the modern academic discipline, people do not often juxtapose the words "art" and "history." They tend to think of history as the record and interpretation of past human events, but a visible, tangible artwork is a kind of persisting event. One or more artists made it at a certain time and in a specific place, even if no one today

the transcendence of the fundamental, individual nature of man into the Civil State or science. In his *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, Rousseau proclaims the sciences as useful but due to man's imperfection proclaims it an impossibility to study imperfect man within a perfect structure. This impossibility stems from forgetting that man's individual validity comes from a perfect Nature.³

The supporting films to be addressed in this dissertation are *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*, 1998 directed by Josée Dayaan, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, 1990 directed by Jean – Paul Rappeneau, *Ponette*, 1996 directed by Jacques Doillon, *L'Argent de Poche*, 1976 directed by François Truffaut, *Swann In Love*, 1984 directed by Volker Schlöndorff, *The Orphic Trilogy*: (the 1930 *Le Sang d'un poète*, the 1949 *Orphée*, and the 1960 *Le Testament d'Orphée*, directed by Jean Cocteau, *Jean de Florette*, 1986 directed by Claude Berri, and *Manon des Sources*, 1986 directed by Claude Berri.⁴

What is the Rousseauian Fundamental, Individual Nature of Man?

knows just who , when, where, or why. Although created in the past, an artwork continues to exist in the present, long surviving its times.” (Kleiner 1)

3. Discourse 12

4. Not all the films in this manuscript follow a traditional narrative, “Linear and teleological, mainstream films are structured according to a traditional, Aristotelian narrative pattern: there is a beginning, middle and end. A beginning disruption and conflict forces the hero or heroine on a physical or psychological journey. Upon completion of the journey, said conflict is resolved” (Andrews 7).

Rousseau asks in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, "...how can the source of inequality among men be known unless one begins by knowing men themselves? And how will man manage to see himself as Nature formed him, through all the changes that the sequence of times and things must have produced in his original constitution, and to separate what he gets from his own stock from what circumstances and his progress have added to or changed in his primitive state?" (12). He speaks, in the *Discourse's* introduction, of considering a return to man in his natural state to find the answers to that which is just and unjust. In his *The Social Contract*, he proclaims that man's fundamental, individual nature must be distinguished in order for a society to properly function for the good of its individual citizens and citizens as a whole. Despite Rousseau's belief that the fundamental is corrupted, he believes and implies that it is the fundamental that should remain in our existence or the fundamental that a Civil State should strive for, "...instead of a being acting by fixed and invariable Principles, instead of that Heavenly and majestic simplicity with which its Author had endowed it, one no longer finds anything except the deformed contrast of passion which believes it reasons and understanding in delirium." (*Discourse* 12). Rousseau himself establishes an equitable definition of this fundamental, individual nature of man. He defines our fundamental nature as coming from a divine Author and therefore, divine at its core. Rousseau's allusion to the Garden of Eden in Book II of his *The Social Contract* furthers his concept of the fundamental, individual nature of man as that of a divine creator. In Book II, he speaks of King Adam as being a direct descendant of this, "eldest branch", stating that the divine Author of the fundamental, individual nature of man has included free will and liberty of choice in his creation:

This common freedom is a consequence of man's nature...I have said nothing about king Adam or emperor Noah, father of three great monarchs who divided

up the universe among themselves, as did the children of Saturn who have been identified with them. I hope this moderation will be appreciated, for as I am a direct descendent of one of these Princes, and perhaps the eldest branch, how am I to know whether, through the verification of titles, I would not discover that I am the legitimate king of the human race? However that may be, it cannot be denied that Adam was Sovereign of the world, like Robinson of his island, as long as he was its only inhabitant. And what was convenient in that empire was that the monarch, secure on his throne, had neither rebellions, nor wars, nor conspirators to fear. (132-133)

Rousseau also likens the pureness of man's fundamental, individual nature, at its creation, to the statue, Glaucus, "Like the statue of Glaucus, which time, sea, and storms had so disfigured that it looked less like a God than a wild Beast, the human soul, altered in the bosom of society by a thousand continually renewed causes..." (*Discourse* 12). At its creation, the statue was a perfectly crafted individual image of its creator in godlike form. In accordance with the Rousseauian concept of man's fundamental, individual nature is René Descartes' *Principles of Philosophy*. Like Rousseau, Descartes alludes to God as the basis of man's fundamental, individual nature and also attaches the important aspect of free will to this individual nature. For Descartes, this nature is what is first innate in man:

The Supreme perfection of man is that he acts freely or voluntarily... The fact that we fall into error is a defect in the way we act, not a defect in our nature. The faults of subordinates may often be attributed to their masters, but never to God... God could have endowed our intellect with discernment so acute as to prevent our ever going wrong, we have no right to demand this of him... That there is

freedom in our will, and that we have power in many cases to give or withhold our assent at will, is so evident that it must be counted among the first and most common notions that are innate in us. (205-206)

Following Descartes' insistence on freedom of action, in *The Social Contract*, Rousseau further defines said nature as the power that the human has over his own body, "As nature gives each man absolute power over all his members..." (148). Rousseau continues to define the individual nature of man in terms of a primitive and instinctual self-love associated with happiness.

Rousseau claims that this love is in accordance with nature.

What Does Rousseau Consider to be the Antithesis to the Fundamental, Individual Nature of Man?

Rousseau clarifies the antithesis of man's fundamental, individual nature in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, *The Social Contract*, and *Emile*. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau states, "no man has a natural authority over his fellow, and force creates no right" (134).

Therefore, anything outside or above man is opposed to his fundamental, individual nature.

Returning to his example describing the statue of Glaucus, as man's divinely created fundamental individual nature, the antithesis to man's fundamental individual nature is evident, "...by the acquisition of a mass of knowledge and errors, by changes that occurred in the constitution of Bodies, and by the continual impact of the passions, has, so to speak, changed its appearance to the point of being nearly unrecognizable..." (*Discourse* 12). The "time", "sea", and "storms" existing outside the statue indicate the forceful opposition that the fundamental, individual nature of man is affronted with (12). This opposition of forces residing outside of man's fundamental, individual nature continues to be evident in the following quotation from *Emile*, in relation to his fundamental self-love. He speaks of the modifications to man's said

nature in this work by saying that modifications to this nature are a result of external influence which would never occur without external influence and which are not advantageous to us. He describes these modifications as quite harmful. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau further defines that which is outside the fundamental, individual nature of man as the Civil State which, changes man. For Rousseau, the Civil State is both a positive and negative force. It is the moral structure given to physical impulse, the force upon man to act upon principles that are not of his nature, the force that deprives man of some advantages he may have gotten from his nature, that which enables man to expand his ideas, that which brought man to his intelligence, that which takes away man's natural liberty and replaces it with civil liberty, and that which can become slavery. Rousseau also speaks of self preservation in *Emile* in order to embody the antithesis of man's fundamental, individual nature. He says in this work that although that which is tender has its origin in self love, hate and anger have roots in self preservation or selfish love. In further establishing the antithesis of man's fundamental, individual nature as the external forces upon it, Rousseau states that selfish love or self preservation changes man for the worse due to the dependence it creates on other's opinions.

How Is Man's Fundamental Individual Nature Lost and What Are the Consequences?

In all three of the works listed above, Rousseau points out the process behind the loss of man's fundamental, individual nature. In *Emile* Book III, Rousseau conveys his belief of loss through the false judgment placed on the fundamental, individual nature of man, through the false redefining of a once fundamental experience, and through the failed attempt to define the indefinable and contain the uncontainable. This is similar to the natural versus expected response that the child has to the sensation of cold in his mouth:

I see an eight-year-old child served ice cream. He brings the spoon to his mouth without knowing what it is, and, surprised by the cold, shouts, “Oh, it’s burning me!” He experiences a very lively sensation. He knows of none livelier than the heat of fire, and he believes that he feels that one. However, he is mistaken. The chill of the cold hurts him, but it does not burn him, and these two sensations are not similar, since those who have experienced both do not confound them. It is not, therefore, the sensation which deceives him but the judgment he makes about it. (354)

Rousseau points out the aforementioned as the beginnings of convention. He demonstrates the way in which convention erases the man’s fundamental, individual nature and natural experience. In the introduction to his *Discourse*, Rousseau expounds upon the term convention by describing it as the root of inequality. He believes convention creates a framework of individual versus common or conventional consent, “...moral or Political inequality...depends upon a sort of convention and is established, or at least authorized, by the consent of Men. The latter consists in the different Privileges that some men enjoy to the prejudice of others, such as to be richer, more honored, more Powerful than they, or even to make themselves obeyed by them” (18). The fundamental, individual nature of man is built out as the common frame grows larger and stronger until all that is perceivable is the structure. The strength of the structure makes attempts to dismantle it too difficult, and the structure is perceived to be more useful than the individual foundation it was built on. The seemingly strong structure towers above its victim, and its dominating presence and appearance of strength causes homage paid to it rather than to the individual who created it. The fundamental, individual nature of its creator is carried away in the vain worship of something that only appears to be strong by itself. This becomes

habit because it is easier to except the appearance rather than attempt to dismantle the structure.

The natural-law or foundation is then forgotten and the civil-law structure tumbles:

Nature was subjected to Law...The Philosophers, who have examined the foundations of society have all felt the necessity of going back to the state of Nature, but not none of them has reached it. Some have not hesitated to attribute to Man in that state the notion of the Just and Unjust, without troubling themselves to show that he had to have that notion or even that it was useful to him. Others have spoken of the Natural Right that everyone has to preserve what belongs to him, without explaining what they meant by belong. Still others, giving the stronger authority over the weaker from the first, have forthwith made Government arise, without thinking of the time that must have elapsed before the meaning of the words "authority" and "government" could exist among Men. All of them, finally, speaking continually of need, avarice, oppression, desires, and pride, have carried over to the state of Nature ideas they had acquired in society...(18-19)

Foundations, take children for example, come to be considered burdensome to their parents rather than helpful. Their wisdom and physical strength are compressed by the massive structure until the children can no longer hold it up. He uses the domestication of animals to demonstrate this:

The Horse, the Cat, the Bull, even the Ass, are mostly taller, and all have a more robust constitution, more vigor, more strength and courage in the forest than our houses. They lose half of these advantages in becoming Domesticated, and it might be said that all our cares to treat and feed these animals well end only in

their degeneration. It is the same even for man. In becoming sociable and a Slave he becomes weak, fearful, servile; and his soft and effeminate way of life completes the enervation of both his strength and his courage. Let us add that between Savage and Domesticated conditions the difference from man to man must be still greater than that from beast to beast; for animal and man having been treated equally by Nature, all the commodities of which man gives himself more than the animals he tames are so many particular causes that make him degenerate more noticeably. (24)

According to Rousseau, How is the Fundamental, Individual Nature of Man Preserved?

Rousseau believes that every step of the structure known as the Civil State must be built for the use of and to strengthen the individual. The Civil State must be a frame to the individual rather than become a cage around and above the individual. In other words a Contract or “association” made in the best interest of the individual, by which the Civil State works with the individual, is the answer. Rousseau proposes in The Social Contract.⁵

5. “The clauses of this contract are so completely determined by the nature of the act that the slightest modification would render them null and void. So that although they may never have been formally pronounced, they are everywhere the same, everywhere tacitly accepted and recognized, until the social compact is violated, at which point each man recovers his original rights and resumes his natural freedom, thereby losing the conventional freedom for which he renounced it...Finally, as each gives himself to all, he gives himself to no one; and since there is no associate over whom one does not acquire the same right one grants him over oneself, one gains the equivalent of everything one loses, and more force to preserve what one has” (138-139).

Find a form of association that defends and protects the person and goods of each associate with all the common force, and by means of which each one, uniting with all, nevertheless obeys only himself and remains free as before.” This is the fundamental problem which is solved by the social contract. (138-139)

In *Emile*, Rousseau reflects upon the fact that the fundamental, individual nature of man is preserved through the actual individual experience of a state of being, not simply by an arbitrary explanation of the experience or by a perceived notion but by individual reasoning,

If the child rolls a little ball between two crossed fingers and believes he feels two balls, I shall not permit him to look at it before he is convinced there is only one... You are afraid that I am overwhelming his mind with this quantity of knowledge. On the contrary, I teach him far more to be ignorant of these things than to know them... Forced to learn by himself, he uses his reason and not another's; for to give nothing to opinion, one must give nothing to authority, and most of our errors come to us far less from ourselves than from others. (358)

In conclusion, Rousseau believes that man's fundamental, individual nature is imprisoned at birth:

Every man born in slavery is born for slavery; nothing could be more certain. Slaves lose everything in their chains, even the desire to be rid of them. They love their servitude as the companions of Ulysses loved their brutishness. If there are slaves by nature, therefore, it is because there have been slaves contrary to nature. Force made the first slaves; their cowardice perpetuated them. (*Contract* 133)

Despite this imprisonment, he believes that this nature and innocence could and can be incorporated into and respected throughout the construction and expansion of a Civil State or restraint. He states, “I see only one good means of preserving children in their innocence; it is for all those who surround them to respect and to love it. Without that, all the restraint [toward evil] one tries to use with them is sooner or later belied (*Emile* 368). Rousseau believes that this goodwill toward the fundamental, individual nature of man would make for a successful and productive State, “...especially with the perseverance or rather the succession of enlightenment and good will necessary on each side to achieve success” (*Discourse* 13). He believes failure is inevitable without goodwill toward this nature, “...the only means we have left to remove a multitude of difficulties that hide from us knowledge of the real foundations of human society. It is this ignorance of the Nature of man that throws so much uncertainty and obscurity on the true definition of natural right...” (13). Ultimately he strives to prove that the only truly strong State is based upon its duty to fundamental individual nature of man, and that the strongest State survives, “The Strongest is never strong enough to be the master forever unless he transforms his force into right and obedience into duty” (*Contract* 133).

CHAPTER 2

A FUNDAMENTAL SAVIOR

Alexandre Dumas' novel *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* provided a prime example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of the fundamental, individual nature of man as deformed by unnatural forces. The film director, Josée Dayan, of the 1998 adaptation, *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*, more clearly brings to light the concept of the fundamental, individual nature of man in her interpretation of the novel, than does its author Dumas. Her interpretation of Edmond Dantes, played first by Guillaume Depardieu then by his father Gerard, lends itself to a comparison with Rousseau's statue of Glaucus. The innocent, honest, young sailor, played by Depardieu's son, Guillaume was corrupted by forces not of his nature. This corruption placed his fundamental, individual innocent nature, literally and figuratively, in prison. After his escape, this nature hid inside a shell represented by the character, the Count of Monte Cristo. Whether imprisoned or hidden it is what guides his entire being, even under the corrupting force of his vengeful desire. Therefore, his corruption continually morphs into good throughout the film. He passes through a life guided by the fundamental essence within his being. Jean Jacques Rousseau states that, "The passage from the state of nature to the Civil State produces a very remarkable change in man, by substituting justice for instinct in his conduct, and gives his actions the morality they had formerly lacked" (*Contract* 148). That which was outside of Dantes' nature aided his imprisoned fundamental innocent nature by giving him tools to play the societal games of those who imprisoned both him and others unjustly. The playing of societal games disfigured Dantes and re-formed his Rousseauian fundamental, individual State thereby

becoming his moral structure. As Rousseau states, the Civility which is opposite to fundamental Nature is useful and important (*Discourse* 12). However, Dantes' individual, fundamental innocent nature provided his character with the ultimate guide and saves his character at the end of the film.⁶ Along with this, his alter egos, such as the Abbé Busoni and Lord Wilmore, helped, “play” savior, as well, in the process.

This idea, that man's truest guide and innate savoir is his fundamental, individual nature is first revealed to us through the title of Alexandre Dumas' novel and his choice of character names. Dayan focuses on this aspect of the novel in her film by, for example, including a large letter V for Villefort in multiple scenes throughout the film and by beginning the film with a monologue, which includes all the characters' names. The monologue, spoken by Dantes dressed as Le Comte, emphasizes the distaste felt by Dantes in carrying this name Le Conte de Monte Cristo. It also emphasizes his distaste for those responsible for this name, as he names each of them off. In analyzing the names, one must first look at the verb, *monter*. In French, the verb, *monter* can mean to transport towards a goal,⁷ a meaning pertinent to Rousseau's purpose. Despite Rousseau demonstrating the way in which man's fundamental nature is corrupted, he seeks to teach mankind how to maintain this nature within civil order. Rousseau asserts that through this maintenance society can be saved. It is for this reason that Dumas' title is befitting.

6. The idea of the innocent Captain Edmond Dantes continually being a guide throughout the film is more clearly understood through the following Heidegger commentary on existence, “The study was to be opened up through a study of human existence, *das Sein des Da-seins*. A study of our own particular way of being was to constitute a ‘fundamental ontology’: examining being initially in our own case, grasping it from the inside, so to speak...” (47).

7. All definitions given are my translations of those of *Le Petit Robert*.

Cristo or Christ is described as being a perfectly innocent savior. Cristo is juxtaposed to the title of the *Comte*. Therefore the coinciding *Comte* and Christ can reach Rousseau's and Dumas' goal to produce a being that is the savior of novelistic, cinematic, and social structure. This savior of both novel and film is juxtaposed by entities guided not by their fundamental nature but by that which the Civil State deems worthy. All of these entities, Caderousse, Villefort, Morcerf, and Danglars for example, come to their ruin, in the film, with the action of Dantes/Le Comte, and this ruin is clear through their names and titles as well. Many of the films' characters destined themselves to ruin by their involvement in the imprisonment of the young and innocent Dantes. This marked the time in their lives, as well, when they left their fundamental, individual nature behind, to collaborate, in the attempt to destroy Dantes. Mondego even sacrificed his birth name to one that was representative solely of social order, with the Comte signifying his social prominence. Le Comte de Morcerf. Caderousse is one of the first characters, along with Danglars, seen in the film. If his name is divided in half, *Cade* can be linked to the French *cadeau*, which means gift. Man's fundamental individual nature and its potential are essentially a gift, though man often abuses and misuses it. This is evident in the film by the gift of a diamond bestowed upon Caderousse by Abbé Busoni. It was this gift, misused by Caderousse, that set in motion his self destruction throughout the film. When he receives the diamond, the viewers see him grab a knife, as if to kill or at least keep his servant away from it, hence the meaning of the latter part of his name. *Rousse* can be linked to several French verbs and one French noun. As a noun or adjective it means red and often red is given the symbolic meaning in various texts of Death. Related verbs are *roustir*, to steal, *roussir*, to redden, and *ruser*, to misuse. The film character, Caderousse, comes to his demise through his continual misuse and killing of everything and everyone around him.

The character name, Morcerf, can be divided into *mor* and *cerf*. Its meaning points to a violent character. The French *cerf*, means deer, an animal which embodies innocence. The word, *mor*, can be linked with *mort*, meaning death. In the film, this count self-destructs to the point of committing suicide, even though he had already killed his fundamental individual nature with his decision to imprison its purest representation and most powerful symbol, Dantes. Dayan's emphasizes this implication of brutality of the name by depravity in all its brutality depicted through Morcerf's murder of an innocent horse after the lost a race against Lord Wilmore's older one.

Villefort and his family are also representative of an unnatural force taking hold and destroying that which is fundamentally good, threatening, in turn, society as a whole. In the film, Dayan often focuses on the letter V draped on the Villefort's mansion. Of course it is linked to the name but also what holds the household prisoner, in microcosm vanity. Like the divided name Ville and fort, the mansion is itself a strong Civil State about to break because it began in vanity and is being not only held together but also slowly poisoned by vanity. This association is reinforced by Dayan in the film through the gated Villefort estate being conquered by the young Maximillian, who is seen climbing the iron prisonlike fence and entering the mansion. The Villefort name began losing its true force when Villefort imprisoned Dantes supposedly to save his family name. At the beginning of the film, after speaking with the young captain Dantes, Villefort knew Dantes was innocent, but because Dantes had been carrying a letter that could compromise the Villefort family name, through Villefort's father's association with Bonaparte, he decided to imprison Dantes the innocent captain, the only one who knew the truth. This decision to lock Dantes up can be illuminated by Rousseau's quotation from *Emile*. Instead of choosing what was truly just and what would have come from a natural sense of

conscience, Villefort chose what best suited his family losing what fundamental sensitivity he possessed towards the rest of humanity due to his conscious denial of Dante's fundamentally, innocent being:

We are born with the use of our senses, and from birth we are affected in various ways by the objects surrounding us. As soon as we have, so to speak, consciousness of our sensations, we are disposed to seek or avoid the objects that produce them, at first according to whether they are pleasant or unpleasant to us...
(163)

Villefort, however, would face the consequences of rejecting the fundamental, individual nature that belongs to himself, the part of his being which discerned the truth. Dayan chose to emphasize this aspect of Villefort through a scene where a woman is crying for her son's life at the prosecutor Villefort's feet. Villefort coldly pushes her distress aside and continues down the stairs. The *Ville fort* or *Strong City* has become weak and corrupt. It has lost its mayor. Upon his rejection of said fundamental nature, Villefort is discussing his marriage to his first wife who later dies and is replaced by Heloise. Heloise is the character who represents the vanity slowly poisoning the family's strong hold. We see in Dayan's film a highly theatrical performance and acting out of Heloise's own dramatic death, by poison, in the front of a mirror. Heloise, in her pursuit of wealth, poisons all innocents in her path. All individuals who fall victim to her unnatural form of death had maintained their fundamental, individual natures and aided in the creation of the greater good as the film and the novel depicted it. Heloise, however, comes to her demise and, in the film, was forced to poison herself even though she had already done so morally and was simply taking the last step to her ruin.

Villefort placed a curse on his family with his decision to lock Dantes in the Chateau d'If. Along with breaking his tie or marriage to man's fundamental, individual nature, through his arrest of Dantes, Villefort also broke the tie Captain Dantes was about to make with the Civil State by arresting him on the day of his engagement celebration to Mercedes. In the film, Villefort and Dantes both spoke of their own marriages about to take place to their fiancés as Dantes was questioned by Villefort. Dayan focuses on this marriage break and Villefort's marriage to Vanity through the scene in which Dantes is arrested at his engagement party and through the clinking of the wine glasses of Danglars and Mondego at the party, this clinking signaling a, *salut* to an unnatural order.

In the film, Dantes desires to reunite with Mercedes, and does so, but if one analyzes her name and the fact that, in the novel, he does not reunite with her, one sees that she represents a corrupt State that Edmond needs to detach himself from in order to truly accomplish his goals. If her name is divided, one can first look at, *Mer* and then, *cedes*. *Mer* is the French noun for sea. This alludes to freedom in this film. However, the second part of her name, *cedes* can be linked to the French verb *céder*. *Céder* has two applicable meanings. First, it means, "Transporter la propriété de quelqu'un à une autre personne". Roughly translated this means to give the property of one to another. Secondly, it can mean, *abandonner*, to leave or to desert. The character Mercedes, therefore, contains the capacity to halt the potential freedom or fundamental, individual nature of Dantes, and exploit it, as she did after he was imprisoned, to her benefit. Mercedes married Mondego and gained great wealth, quickly forgetting the innocent individual that she had so loved. In the film, however, her ideal world revolving around Mondego/Morcerf breaks like the tea cup she is holding in her hand as she first encounters Le Comte.

Danglars is also a key character name to analyze in relation to Dantes. In reading the beginning of the novel, which is not shown in the film, the reader comes to understand that Danglars' name can be taken several ways. The name can be divided as follows: Dan gl ars.. Dan can be linked to the word *dans* meaning in or into, in French. In the film, Danglars is married to Hermine whose name stems from a Greek mythological character who blamed her husband for not being able to produce a child. This incapacity to produce an heir is as un-natural as the meaning alluded to in his name. In analyzing the name Danglars, one sees that it contains the word *ars*, or rear. Danglars' character was so unnatural and so hates that which is natural (the young Dantes) that he cannot produce anything natural (hence his over amassing of civil wealth/ money) that is ultimately successful, including an heir or a sound marriage. Hermine ends up cheating on him and, because of this unnatural act, produces a criminal son that she and her lover, Villefort, try to conceal and bury. The unnatural plus the unnatural immediately corrupts and imprisons the natural, innocent fundamental nature of their baby at its birth and condemns it. Their baby boy, Toussaint, becomes a thief and a murderer. Further analyzing the character name, Hermine, one discovers it is also a carnivorous animal whose fur is, in death, ironically a symbol of purity.

All of the above characters corrupt the innocent fundamental being of Dantes who later states at the beginning of the film *Le Comte de Monte Cristo*, "Do you think I like being the Count of Monte Cristo? He's a dreadful man pitiless and cold. I didn't want to become that man. I was happy being Edmond Dantes. I wanted nothing more in life, but they prevented me... Villefort... Morcerf, Danglars and even that worm, Caderousse, who knew all but said nothing" (1998, TF1). By trying to kill the young sailor who asked for nothing, they create the avenger who returned for his dues. A Rousseauian-like statement by Dantes so well captures the

avenger they create, themselves, thereby consuming their fundamental, individual natures with the over abundance of the deadly civil structure among them. Dantes' states, "too bad for them", In Rousseauian terms veering from the fundamental, individual State represented by Dantes leads to ruin. Dantes hates being the Count, and ultimately he was successful in exposing and ridding the Civil State of corruption due to his good heart or said nature, but those around him who failed chose to do so by denying their fundamental, individual nature.

Every element of the filming supports this Rousseauian concept of the individual nature of man as Edmond Dantes. At the beginning of the film, the viewers see a bright blue sky through the portal of the prison Chateau D'If. A lit stairwell closed off by an iron gate appears. Two men are about to feed number 34 through a small slot. Some murky water and bread are then put in number 34's cell. This codification first enlightens viewers to the contrast between the free and the imprisoned with the juxtaposition of the blue of Dantes' cell to the walls of the prison in which he is contained. The viewers see what has happened and the potential of what could happen upon Dantes escape. The lit stairwell shows the potential of the imprisoned fundamental individual within and the fact that it is lit lets us believe that the knowledge held behind the iron gate will reach great heights once the gate is opened. Water alludes to freedom, but in this instance it is corrupted and murky and only feeds and sustains, not a person, but what has become the unnatural number 34. Dantes has become his cell number 34. Therefore, after receiving his prison nourishment, number 34 or Edmond Dantes slams himself against his cell door. Disgusted, he kicks aside the nourishment left him. That potential is still alive within the cell, and he has to put an end to the in perpetuity of his situation. After Dantes receives and kicks aside his prison nourishment, he screams to the sky above, "I don't want your soup. Don't bring me anymore. I don't want it. I don't want to eat anymore. I want to die" (1998, TF1). It

is as if he is speaking or crying out a prayer to God, the fundamental creator, but he is actually crying out to the ones who have created the corrupted State that he is presently living in. He says this three times. This is significant, because he is denying the unnatural creators who placed him in prison. He is, ironically, denying the state he is in just as Peter denied Christ three times, in the Bible. The above also shows how blasphemous his imprisoned state is to the fundamental state God gives us at birth. It is for this reason that Dayan focuses so much on Christ and the crucifix throughout the film, to show the viewers the blasphemy of denying the innocent fundamental state we are given at birth. Rousseau saw this movement away from said nature as a renunciation of humanity and as blasphemous in that the movement shunned the very essence of being a human”:

To renounce one’s freedom is to renounce one’s status as a man, the rights of humanity and even its duties. There is no possible compensation for anyone who renounces everything. Such a renunciation is incompatible with the nature of man, and taking away all his freedom of will is taking away all morality from his actions. Finally, it is a vain and contradictory convention to stipulate absolute authority on one side and on the other unlimited obedience. Isn’t it clear that one is in no way engaged toward a person from whom one has the right to demand everything, and doesn’t this condition alone – without equivalent and without exchange – entail the nullification of the act? For what right would my slave have against me, since all he has belongs to me, and his right being mine, my right against myself is a meaningless word? (*Contract* 135)

Later on in the beginning of the film Dantes is lying on his cell bed in the light, but he gets up and moves into the shadow. He begins to dig the mortar out between the stones using a

crucifix turned knife, after all this is what Dantes himself had become, a defiled crucifix, a mutated form, like Glaucus, of the savior he was meant to become. The original beauty and saving quality of the crucifix' form was altered by the outside force of Dantes. Viewers then see his prison door and the number 34 above the peep hole. The camera slowly zooms in on the number 34. When Edmond or number 34 meets Abbé Faria, the Abbé is crawling through the dark. The Abbé is a godlike figure reminding Dantes of his nature and the potential of combining his nature with that of civil order. He also enlightens Dantes with truth and wisdom. Edmond tells him, "I'm 34, but before my name was Dantes...Edmond Dantes" (1998, TF1). Faria asks Edmond how long he has been at the prison, and Edmond responds by saying, "I don't know. In the beginning, I counted the days, but ... I've been here 18 years...they took my sunlight away...they stole my love my youth my future". With these words, Dayan reinforces the hypnotic and suspended state society achieves when that which fundamentally created it and continues to hold it up is, like Dantes, imprisoned and forgotten.⁸ Society, like Dantes, is suspended in motion and exists in a quasi state. The fundamental Dantes is dying, and it is his shell, cell, and number that are existing. Viewers then see a flashback of Dantes' arrest.

8. The plight of Dantes is reflected perfectly upon in the following quotation by Chamoiseau in his: *Founding – Ancestors and Intertextuality in Francophone Caribbean Literature and Criticism* : "These forces imposed themselves upon me with the imperial authority of their world, which obliterated mine. They had destroyed me while enlarging me. And it is with these foreign worlds that my writings operated in a complete alienation...I expressed what I was not. I only perceived the world as a western construct, uninhabited, and it seemed to me the only one that mattered..." (1).

Horsemen simply call out, “Edmond Dantes” I have a warrant for your arrest from the crown prosecutor”. Rousseau points out the arbitrary power, solely based on the power of position by the crown prosecutor, used to arrest Dantes, “Men at first had no other Kings than the Gods, nor any other Government than Theocracy” (*Contract* 216). Therefore, it is the crown of nonexistence, which at the moment of his arrest, is placed on his fundamental individual nature causing a metamorphosis of the human into a number. In the Comte de Monte Cristo film scene, a young Danglars and Caderousse are clinking their wine glasses. The camera is then on young Mercedes when the horsemen say, “In the name of the law, Dantes, follow me” (1998, TF1). The anonymous name of civil law replaces the fundamental individual at the moment where this individual, Dantes, would unite with the law in the state of marriage. Reinforcing the immanent loss of his said nature, Dantes takes one last look at Mercedes and his father, played by an aged Gerard Depardieu. Dantes makes the following statement, “My friends enjoy yourselves...I’ll be straight back”. After Dantes is taken from his engagement party, the scene, like his chance to properly unite his fundamental, individual nature with the Civil State changes.

The prosecutor, Villefort, is now standing in front of an ominous painting of the prison The Chateau d’If. He is in his office and is holding a letter. He reads to Dantes, “This letter denouncing you is anonymous, of course”. There are two lit chandeliers flanking the enormous painting. The anonymity of the fictitious letter, without an author, is juxtaposed with and will replace the divinely created fundamental individual nature of man, Dantes. Villefort, the strong city, holds the two opposite natures in his hand. It is almost as if the letter is a fictitious contract or perversion of the contract promoted by Rousseau which instead of excluding the individual, like Dantes, includes the “private person”. Rousseau argues that the Civil State can either

contain or rid itself of the individual, but that it must do the former if it is to maintain its stronghold or its, “Ville-fort”:

Instantly, in place of the private person of each contracting party, this act of association produces a moral and collective body, composed of as many members as there are voices in the assembly, which receives from this same act its unity, its common *self*, its life and its will. This public person, formed by the union of all the others, formerly took the name *City*, and now takes that of *Republic* or *body politic*, which its members call *State* when it is passive, *Sovereign* when active, *Power* when comparing it to similar bodies. As for the associates, they collectively take the name *people*; and individually are called *Citizens* as participants in the sovereign authority, and *Subjects* as subject to the laws of the State. But these terms are often mixed up and mistaken for one another. It is enough to know how to distinguish them when they are used with complete precision. (*Contract* 139)

Villefort then walks in front of Dantes, to continue our analysis, who is standing in front of the door and beside the painting. Again Villefort, the embodiment of the Civil State, is faced with what could be a successful duality of nature and state, the door to freedom or the door to prison, and in the middle, making the connection between the two, is Dantes, the fundamental, individual nature of man. To be set free or to be imprisoned, by the Villefort or Civil State, is the question. Villefort says, “Do you know what you are accused of” (1998, TF1). Then, he sits down. Dantes replies, “Absolutely not sir”. Dantes is now standing in front of the painting with his body hiding the lighted chandeliers. Of course, he is not lit. How could he understand or be enlightened to, in his innocent state of nature, what diabolical unnatural accusations await him?

Dantes replies, "I can't see what harm I could have done. I've just returned from a long trip to the east Indies on the Pharaon, one of Morrel's ships". Camera moves to Villefort who is sitting. Villefort states, "...You served as first mate, did you not?" Edmond replies with a simple, "Yes sir". Villefort continues, "What led to you taking command of the ship?" The camera is switching back and forth from character to character. Edmond insistently replies, "As I said in my last report, the captain died of fever off the coast of Gibraltar, and...I'm not accused of murdering him?" Quickly, Villefort says, "No, of having disembarked on the island of Elba." This is the point at which one understands how the knowledge of the Civil State can work to aid the fundamental, individual nature of man on his voyage. Dantes remained in such an innocent state that he was unable to predict what would happen in a land ruled by that which is opposite to his nature. Elba represents a world alien to the fundamental nature of Dantes, a world of civil law not one of simply innocent obedience and protection in return. The camera has stopped on Dantes.

Villefort. "Is that correct?"

Dantes. "Yes, I did...was that wrong?"

Villefort. "The ex-emperor Napoleon's aid gave you a letter, did he not?"

Dantes. "Yes".

Villefort. "Why...did you know contact with the tyrant is prohibited?"

Dantes. "[responds in all his state of fundamental innocence, defensively] I acted on the order of the captain of the Pharaon. Before he died, he made me swear I'd fetch the letter. I was uneasy".

Villefort. “Are you Bonapartist?”

Dantes. “I am a sailor, nothing more. I’m too often out of France to be interested in politics”.

This statement by Dantes supports the idea of a dual state of being. Rousseau’s explains the necessity of this dual state of being in *Emile*, “To be something, to be oneself and always one, a man must act as he speaks, he must always be decisive in making his choice, making it in a lofty style, and always stick to it. I am waiting to be shown this marvel so as to know whether he is a man or a citizen, or how he goes about being both at the same time” (164-165). There is juxtaposition of two opposing states, the Bonapartist and the sailor. The word sailor is used to describe Dantes and proves that he should guide or captain inside the boat known as life. The Bonapartist is a traitor and could never steer this boat in the right direction. The traitor, Bonaparte, was in exile. He was no longer ruling. He had failed. The use of Bonaparte within the context of the film supports Rousseau’s assertion that society must not betray its fundamental individual nature. In speaking with the prosecutor, Villefort, Dantes continues, “How I could I refuse the wishes of a dying man, the sole master of the ship which I served?” (1998, TF1). Villefort states, “You defend yourself well.” Dantes combatively responds, “I don’t defend myself, sir, the truth does.” Dantes represents truth, and truth stems from that which is fundamental in his nature. Villefort says, “I believe you young man, come now. It’s quite obvious. We’re used to anonymous letters. We get about ten a day”. Talking on a man to man level, Dantes is able to reach the man hiding beneath the name Villefort. However, that soon changes when the power associated with the name becomes more important than the man under its stronghold. The camera moves to the bell being rung by Villefort then to the door being opened. Two guards walk in. Villefort demands, “Remove his chains.” The man or the

fundamental, individual, nature under the, “Villefort” wanted to bring about freedom and could have done so. Villefort’s forthcoming rejection, of Dantes, along with his own fundamental, individual nature are reinforced through the use of the position of the soldiers, door, and painting in his office, during this scene of the film. Freedom will remain repressed by the strong city or Villefort. Standing in front of the half open door and half of the painting, the two soldiers walk behind Dantes and take off his hand cuffs. Dantes, in relief and shock, but on the brink of his destruction asks, “Am I free?” The soldiers are now well lit and obviously Dantes’ fundamental individual nature is distorted and hidden as he stands in the shadow. Villefort, being momentarily repossessed by his fundamental individual nature, responds to Dantes by saying, “Better, you are innocent”. Camera moves back on Villefort. Villefort explains, “Justice can only reproach your compassion for a dying man and your obedience which is honorable”. The camera is on the back of Dantes and facing Villefort, “Return to your fiancée and I to mine”. Villefort speaks to Dantes as if he considered him an equal; however, the duality alluded to by both of their engagements will be broken by Villefort. Villefort’s unnatural vanity overtakes the Rousseauian stance on the importance of the engagement of the fundamental, individual nature to the Civil State. His engagement will soon be one of powerful, arbitrary existence, “Today we both celebrate our engagements” says Villefort.⁹ The camera moves to the face of Dantes.

9. Rousseau only validates an engagement to natural “legitimate” power not arbitrary power, “It seems important, however, that Rousseau himself does not say that his intention is to show how a regime compatible with “an essential human freedom” can be established. He does not talk of constraints but says quite clearly that he will describe ‘legitimate chains’” (Bluhm 361).

Dantes is surprised by the temporary change in Villefort's being as Dantes says, "What a coincidence... All my best wishes, sir our fiancées may become good friends". The candle light is now illuminating both faces as if signaling the importance of a union not disconnect between their states, that of nature and that of civil structure. Villefort continues, "...and unite to ruin us at the same dressmaker". Camera is now back on the face of Dantes as Villefort shakes Dantes' hand. Villefort states, in a dramatic foreshadowing of the theft, "Goodbye". Dantes is exiting and camera is on the right side of Villefort's face. Reflecting, Villefort asks, "One more thing Captain Dantes [Dantes is to the right of the closed door. Camera is peering over the left shoulder of Villefort who is facing Dantes mid-body] ...The letter from Elba...Do you still have it?" Dantes looks down to get it out from behind his captain's coat and next to his heart, "Of course, here it is". He turns and hands it to Villefort who is approaching Dantes. Villefort takes the letter and turns his back to Dantes, signaling to the viewer that the written traitorous words, of the letter, are about to possess Villefort and reject the fundamental, individual nature of man. He then walks away, reading the front of the letter with the seal facing the camera, sealing the fate of Dantes' said nature. Villefort asks Dantes, "Did you read the name on it?... Do you recall the address?" Dantes states, "Of course, I was to deliver it personally". Dantes approaches Villefort whose back is to him as a gesture of the Civil State's rejection of the individual, fundamental, innocent state of Dantes, and Dantes is now facing the camera along with Villefort in a mid body frame. They both approach the camera. Dantes states, "... A Mr. Noitier 13 Rue du Coq – heron in Paris, I think." Villefort looking down approaches the camera from the shoulders up. Dantes is in the background. Villefort opens the letter and the camera is now only on the writing on the letter itself as Villefort reads the words aloud. He reads the possessive traitor's words (recall that an empire consumes the individual), supposedly isolated to keep from

harming mankind, “I’m preparing to flee Elba and reclaim power in France to facilitate this you are to eliminate [the camera is moving down the letter] my most dangerous adversary [the viewers see the seal and the signature of Napoleon]”. Villefort’s fate is sealed as well. The camera is back on the face and shoulders of Villefort, now possessed with a nature in opposition to that which is fundamentally his. He is with the now blurred Edmond facing the camera mid body behind Villefort, “...You have complete trust in Napoleon”. Villefort turns to face Edmond who is now in focus, “Edmond Dantes, I must arrest you”. Dantes starts to move toward him, “What? But you said ...”. Dantes turns to Villefort runs to the door, opens it, and turns back around. All the candle light that was once visible is gone as if it were signaling the condemnation of the individual, fundamental truth and light. Villefort demands, “Take him to the Chateau d’If... Isolate him.” This is an isolation of the good, young, fundamentally true, and honest young captain from a Civil State, in the film, doomed to ruin without him. Two guards come in and grab Dantes from behind as he faces Villefort, whose back is turned to the camera. Dantes screams, “You have no right”; [Villefort stops him and screams], “not another word”. The guards back him out of the door while Villefort, his back to us from waist up, is to the left of the door, in front of Dantes. Villefort explains, “The accusation is extremely serious”. The vase that was next to one of the candles is blocking the entire view of Dantes as he is no longer in contact with the *ville fort* or Civil State. The door closes, and Villefort turns around. The camera scrolls down to where the viewers can see him wadding the letter up. He is in front of the vase. The theme song begins to play and the camera moves along his hand in the process of wadding the paper. The camera is then on his hand throwing the paper into the fire signifying the hellish prison that has been created by the division of the fundamental from the Civil State. He pulls his hand away from the fire, and then the camera scrolls from the fire to the painting of the Chateau

d'If above the fireplace, as if to insinuate the hell to come for both him and Dantes because of the separation of the fundamental from the state of being. The distant cries of Dantes are heard, "You have no right". Camera moves up the painting from ocean to Prison. The camera is now at the outside of the dimly lit house and door of the prosecutor. Dantes is no longer wearing his fundamental, guiding captain's coat but only a loose white (possibly alluding to innocence) shirt and knickers, as he is pushed through the door. The door is flanked by guards. He is turning toward the door yelling, "stop Villefort". He is now center of the frame from his waist up. The camera then moves with him as he falls to the ground. He is looking at the door with only his shoulder, face and arms, of the guards visible. He screams in agony, as if the fundamental God himself is returning the sentence of condemnation to Villefort, "Damn you Villefort... one day I'll find you and kill you!" The camera quickly sweeps first to the guards then to Dantes being hit in the head by the guard. As his head falls forward to face the ground, the guards' legs are visible. One of them grabs the back of Dantes' head and pulls his head up until Dantes faces the camera. The guard is wearing a white glove. Dantes is then shoved, his back to the camera and door opened, into a prison coach. The camera then zooms into the barred window, of the coach, onto Dantes' lit face and shirt. Dantes' head is propped by another barred window and acts as a foreshadowing of that which will consume his thoughts and keep his own fundamental nature imprisoned, hidden from the outside world. His face is turned up toward the free sky. The camera is now focused on a rock on which a crucifix is being sharpened, ironically, into a weapon/escape tool. It is being sharpened by a man's hands extending from his body and arms, seen to the left of the frame. In the faded background, the now older Dantes is crouched down in the dark against the prison wall. In front of Dantes, to the right of the frame is a large stone block. Dantes is conversing with an old man while sharpening the crucifix. This is reflective of

Rousseau's promotion of a continual return to an ancient, fundamental state of nature and God. It is later revealed that the ancient or old man has a connection to God through his ecclesiastical title. The old man is speaking of what provoked Villefort to turn on Dantes. Dantes replies, "It is the name of the person to whom I was to deliver the letter". At first the crucifix being sharpened was in focus, then as Edmond speaks Dantes comes into focus and the crucifix becomes blurry. The crucifix acts as a Rousseauian symbol of Dantes' fundamental individual nature. The viewers then discover that the voice coming from the hands is the now older Dantes. Dantes begins to state the address that sparked his condemnation, "Noitier Rue de Co- Heron, Paris". The camera is now facing up and the old man is in the light, as he sits on the prison cell bed with a window lit to his right. The crucifix or, symbolically, the said fundamental, individual nature is not visible as he speaks to the heart hardened Dantes. The old man asks, "The name means nothing to you?" Dantes responds, "No". The Civil address is of a different state and nature than that of Dantes. The camera switches back to the crouched Dantes who says I have sailed the coasts of Africa, rounded the cape of Good Hope (the camera is zooming in on Dantes) I've put in at Columbo...and I've never been to Paris (Dantes is now center of the frame) I don't know anyone". Dantes' fundamental nature is individual and separate from that of city life. The old man begins to speak, "Noitier's full name is Noitier de Villefort" (the frame changes). The old man's face is lit on the right side as he reveals the fundamental individual beneath the civil title /address. The man's face is in the center of the frame, and his shoulders and head are visible against the now dark cell, "The father of the prosecutor who had you locked up," [the word "father" signifying the birth of a Civil State or *ville fort* lacking a fundamental individual foundation] "I might add he's well known as a Bonapartist". The camera is now back to the lit Dantes who is crouched down as if his importance is pushed to the level of an animal.

The cell wall behind him is lit, and Dantes is looking to the right of the frame. Faria continues, “The letter you carried [camera back on old man] probably compromised Villefort’s father”.

The camera switches back to crouched Dantes, “Yes, that makes sense...that explains why they let me rot here without giving me a trial. But, Napoleon is dead too [he gets up]. These stories of a Bonapartist plot are senseless.” (Dantes has stood up and the camera zooms in on his face and shoulders. He is well lit.)

The old man adds, “For Villefort danger is everywhere...if you appear in court you’ll mention the letter”. Dantes continues, “To protect his father and himself Villefort didn’t hesitate to sacrifice me, to bury me alive”. Dantes then begins to remember back to the engagement party where he was arrested as he speaks. This old man, lit on the right side of his face, is a God-like figure/creator who brings Dantes back to a place where he is once again confronted with his fundamental individual nature. Bringing back to life this essential nature of Dantes, the old man, simultaneously, creates the character the Count of Monte Cristo. Dantes becomes a dual being, symbolized in the film by the sharpened crucifix, mirroring a Christ-like savior. This somewhat divine and human being is essentially driven by his fundamental individual nature, since all his actions morph into a greater good at the end of the film. The old man, Abbé Faria, reveals his secret inheritance to Dantes. This inheritance was bestowed upon Faria by a count. The inheritance is that of a treasure hidden on an island, Monte Cristo. He gives him this inheritance of worldly treasure but more importantly he returns, in his God-like nature, the fundamental individual, or Cristo, back to Dantes. In a sense, Dantes inherits both natures from the God-like Faria. Dayan’s uses light on the right side of the old man’s face, during the conversation they have on Villefort, as codification for his God-like status in the film. It is through his reliance on this old man and his words, Abbé Faria, that Dantes escape’s his own

prison and the prison walls of Le Chateau d'If. The acceptance of Faria's essential gift and the reciprocation of it is given symbolic meaning, in the film, by Dantes cutting of his wrist with the sharpened crucifix and offering of blood to the dying and starving ancient, ecclesiastical and now imprisoned Faria. Faria, in this scene, represents the Rousseauian explanation of a dying state due to the imprisonment of that which is fundamental and essential to it, its fundamental, individual creator God. Following this is another reference to Faria being a Christ or God-like figure; through Faria's death, Dantes is able to escape the civil prison he is in. After escaping in the body bag of Abbé Faria (signifying the ecclesiastical title and fundamental contract of freedom), Dantes must escape from the bag using his sharpened crucifix. Free and struggling against the waves, around the Chateau D'If, Dantes holds the sharpened crucifix above the agitated water. As he arrives on land, he finds some clothes on a clothes line and changes. Dayan uses this scene to prove that Dantes has begun his journey away from the imprisonment of others, although he must first rid himself of the vengeance they have possessed him with. In this scene, he is now a man, putting aside prison clothes and putting on simple peasant like garments, therefore embracing his fundamental, individual nature not the society which imprisons said nature. In the film, he is then faced with a prostitute's proposition. However, in his accepting savior state of existence, he politely and respectfully refuses the lady's proposition. Her lips are red like blood as if signifying the temptation of returning back to an all consuming Civil State of sole state possession rather than essential, individual possession. After Dantes has escaped and arrived in Marseilles, he meets a contraband captain (a guide of a different kind in its juxtaposition the Captain Dantes). The captain asks Dantes, "You are debarking from what boat?"

This Rousseauian juxtaposition rests between the State represented by a contraband captain who plans on turning in Dantes to the authorities and by the emerging Christ-like Dantes. Dantes temporarily catches a ride on the captain's ship. In the film, when the captain is speaking of the monetary value of turning Dantes in to the authorities, he says that Dantes is the milk's cream or the most nourishing part of the milk.¹⁰ This is Rousseauian reflection on the value of the fundamental individual nature of man to the State. The contraband captain releases Dantes from his boat a good ways from the Island of Monte Cristo and is questioning his ability to swim that far. Dantes states that he is a good swimmer. He can navigate freely in the tumultuous seas. This is yet another allusion to Rousseau in referring to that which enables him to swim and not drown, his fundamental being. As Dantes begins to search for the fundamental and Civil contract or treasure/inheritance given to him by Faria, he continues to recall Faria's guidance/direction leading to the inheritance. Dantes is concerned, though, that he trusted before but was living under the allusion that his friends actually existed as true friends and not enemies. He states, "I hallucinated before" as if he is making the viewers aware of the emptiness of society by his friends' desertion of him. He finds the treasure by digging with the crucifix. After having fundamental hallucinations while on the island of Faria's guiding words, Dantes finds the treasure. Adding to the Rousseauian nature of this scene of the film, Dantes digs up the treasure with the crucifix, as though he is like the individual savior of the plot. It is the crucifix that brings him to wealth, an ironic Biblical allusion. After Dantes has acquired the literal treasure, he visits the bank to invest some of his money. The banker asks him for whom does he work,

10. See Rousseau's explanation of the success of bringing up a child on "Separated or curdled milk" and how society rejects feeding it to young in spite of the human stomach being made for it (*Emile* 186).

and Dantes responds, “Well sir, I have the honor of being my own master and to live off my fortune”. Dantes also says he follows his own inspiration. This dialogue is a reinforcement of the fundamental, individual nature starting to help guide his being, despite his existing desire for vengeance. There is a statue in this scene and is a clear allusion to Rousseau’s statue of Glaucus. Dantes tells him he is there to buy his bank. The banker says, “Buying a bank?” Dantes tells him sternly, “The greatest imprudence dear sir is to question my orders”. In other words, the most blasphemous and damning thing a being could do would be to dispute the orders from that which is fundamentally in our being and the necessary perpetual contract with it. This is the philosophy Rousseau desired to impart.

CHAPTER 3

REJECTION AND DEATH OF THE FUNDAMENTAL INDIVIDUAL

When speaking of the fundamental, individual nature of man, one must consider both Edmond Rostand's play *Cyrano de Bergerac* and its film interpretation by Jean- Paul Rappeneau. Looking first at the actors Rappeneau chose for his interpretation, Gerard Depardieu plays the central character, Cyrano. Depardieu's menacing physique is a drastic juxtaposition to that of the weaker Vincent Perez who plays Christian. This director's choice in actors creates an almost Rousseauian narrative in their opposite natures, both aesthetic pleasing and uniquely strong. Depardieu plays a charismatic Cyrano whose ability shines through an atypical facade to the typical role of a debonair lover. His features are rough and unrefined in contrast to the delicate fine-lined features of Perez, whose character was that of a much shallower nature. Along with his charismatic role, Depardieu's physical stature is much stronger and impressive than the smaller slighter Perez. This is a necessary juxtaposition when considering Rousseau's claim that the fundamental, individual nature of man, represented by Cyrano, is the core to a strong Civil State.¹¹ Cyrano, who is also representative of the strength of the fundamental individual, and of the fact that it is capable of accomplishing goals, could have been played by no other actor. However, his ultimate death, despite his potential victory, through the Civil

11. "Finally, each man, in giving himself to all, gives himself to nobody; and as there is no associate over whom he does not acquire the same right as he yields others over himself, he gains an equivalent for everything he loses, and an increase of force for the preservation of what he has" (*Contract* 139).

State's rejection of his fundamental, individual nature shows the tragedy that occurs when the contract between it and the Civil State is broken.

The fundamental, individual character, Cyrano, wins battles no other could win and writes soulful verse like no other. Inspired by his fundamental nature, he is able to recover from all wounds except the final one, his love, the Civil State's Roxanne's, rejection of him that seals the denial of his importance, as an individual, and of his existence. He is the only individual character (he is often juxtaposed to strong crowds in combat against him) who, with his strength of body and soul, is able to pierce through the soul of a Civil State, unveil the theatre's mockery of the human fundamental individual, draw blood from an aristocrat, dressed in an overly-presumptuous, stately, collective white, and inspire men who are physically starving, giving them the will and sense of self they need to fight. He states in the midst of the sword fight with the overly stately, aristocrat, Viconte de Valvert, "At the end I 'touche' you" (1990, TF1). In other words, he touches or reaches the human individual reality within the aristocratic façade. During the sword fight, Cyrano is inspired to recite an improvisational poem.¹² Inspired by the

12. During his recitation, Cyrano embraces the concept and Rousseauian promotion of form placed on fundamental inspiration. This is well exemplified in Dobel's explanation of Rousseauian theory, "... The dilemma of politics centered upon how to create legitimate authority compatible with humanity's freedom and dignity. In Rousseau's political theory, language helps shape and establishes communal authority. His careful concern with language in all his political writings suggests that establishing a community of shared meanings and discourse is essential to his project of making freedom, authority, and virtue compatible" (639). Cyrano has a unique language in comparison with societal discourse and more clearly embraces the concept of a Rousseauian individual fundamental nature.

real cathartic action of the fight and the fundamental, almost savage experience, he wishes to emotionally and viscerally move the onlookers along with the Viconte. In his soulful, individual visceral nature, Cyrano attempts to create a cathartic experience that touches the human soul of the whole pretentious and over stately man not God created human race. Cyrano, despite his own death, is the glue that holds the entire play together. He is the hypothesis and thesis to Rostand's play and to Rappeneau's film. He embodies Rousseau's fundamental, individual nature of man.

Rappeneau's film adaptation of Rostand's play begins with a symbolic Rousseauian juxtaposition of man's fundamental, individual nature and the Civil State. A young boy, symbolic of this nature, is riding in a man- pulled, crowded carriage, symbolic of the Civil State.¹³ The carriage is heading to the theater alluding to the conflict and drama that arises when the fundamental and the civil are unequally yoked. With this opening scene, the director enforces the Rousseauian filter through which the film can be viewed. One can see the young, aristocrat-like boy's face through the window, as if his life has already been confined to the narrow path of the civil carriage.¹⁴ The crowded carriage is almost like a hearse carrying the boy away from his free innocent state or his fundamental, individual character. He enters the theater, with a drunken, fundamental poet Lignière, who drunkenness is perpetuated by the forthcoming overly- structured and overly-falsified representative of human life performance approaching its opening act. Poets are often the truth tellers of society, but like the young boy on the path to becoming object to the Civil State, Lignière's fundamental now drunken sensations are already

13. It is almost as if the young boy is a literary allusion to Rousseau's *Emile*.

14. "Men are not to be crowded into anthills but to be dispersed over the earth which they should cultivate" (*Emile* 187)

objected to and subjected by the state of the performance to come, “Children’s first sensations are purely affective, they perceive only pleasure and pain. Able neither to walk nor to grasp, they need a great deal of time to come little by little into the possession of the representative sensation which show them objects outside of themselves” (*Emile* 191). The fact that Lignière is prematurely drunk, upon the opening act, stands as a foreshadowing of what is to become of the little boy’s fundamental, individual nature and of the potential held within that nature for him to grow towards that which is good, natural, and instinctual, in a pretentious Civil State that is against his fundamental nature.

Rappeneau’s film *Cyrano de Bergerac*, like Rostand’s play alludes to the fact that the deadly masking of man’s fundamental, individual nature by the pretentious Civil State is inevitable. This mask, in tangible form, is represented in Rappeneau’s interpretation of Rostand’s character, Roxanne. As the pretentious, theatrical performance begins, the chandeliers are raised, and Roxanne enters the theatre holding her black mask. The mask also alludes to the above Rousseauian idea of the fundamental becoming object to and dying to that which falsely represents it.¹⁵ Occasionally, she peers around it. Rappeneau strategically chose the color black

15. Recall Rousseau’s story of a little boy’s reaction to the sensation of cold in his mouth, “I see an eight-year-old child served ice cream. He brings the spoon to his mouth without knowing what it is, and, surprised by the cold, shouts, “Oh, it’s burning me!”” He experiences a very lively sensation. He knows of none livelier than the heat of fire, and he believes that he feels that one. However, he is mistaken. The chill of the cold hurts him, but it does not burn him, and these two sensations are not similar, since those who have experienced both do not confound them. It is not, therefore, the sensation which deceives him but the judgment he makes about it.” (*Emile* 354).

to symbolize the arbitrary mask of a Civil State that hides and that kills her fundamental, individual nature.

Rappeneau's other superficial character, Christian, watches the masked Roxane as she walks by him. The stage is being set, and the crowd begins to scream, "The play the play the play" (1990, TF1). The use of Roxane's mask juxtaposed to these words is Rousseauian in nature in that her fundamental nature is being masked just as the overly representative play about to begin plays off of and masks a potentially more truthful human existence. Further supporting this Rousseauian juxtaposition and explanation of the condemning effects of the play upon the fundamental is the artificial sky-like stage backdrop behind the aristocratic actor, Montfleury. The sky is perhaps alluding to the freedom of a more natural state. Shortly after Montfleury's overly-constructed and inhibited lines, the drunken Poet has just spoken to the young boy saying "an eternal name in the hall of fame". The Poet's words enforce the unnatural legacy of the pretentious Civil State of being supported by the audience's attentiveness at first to Montfleury and to the stage. The deadly impression Montfleury, the audience, and the ambiance of the theatre begins to have upon the little boy is evident by his blue aristocratic clothing.

At the theater, Roxanne is sitting between the two aristocratic men, the Viconte de Valvert and the Duke de Guiche. She looks at de Guiche, and raises her black masque in front of her face. Roxane's action presents a Rousseauian message referencing the masking quality of the aristocracy, embodied in the fops beside her.

Montfleury, whose theatrical face is painted white, begins his performance and Cyrano's voice cries out from behind a balcony railing, the railing serves to suggest a prison-like state of being as well. Cyrano, who has arrived in the theater, is loudly tapping the railing, disrupting the hypnotic verse of Montfleury, with his walking stick as if he is symbolically tapping on the door

to the soul. Then, he storms down stairs and enters the crowd. Cyrano exclaims that he wishes to see this pretentious theatre, cured of the pretentious inflammation exhibited by Montfleury. Following this, then Cyrano cuts the white and blue cloud covered backdrop, a fake sky masking the fundamental, God like internal mechanism, the Deus ex machina. The backdrop falls over the actors that he has just herded up like cattle to make them exit the stage. Cyrano's action of releasing the backdrop onto the actors is a reflection on the loss of fundamental, individual nature in the mass of a crowd. It is also a reflection upon the loss of Rousseau's "amour de soi" or respect for one's self in the midst of a collective state of being.¹⁶

Now, as the crowd is covered by the tarp a scream of "au secours" is heard (TF1, 1990).¹⁷ An audience member whom Cyrano has just called "mon chat" asks Cyrano about his reason

16. De Maistre gives an explanation of *amour de soi* and *amour propre*, "Rousseau's position is somewhat more complex. In his analysis, one of the characteristics of pre-social human beings is a benign love of self he calls *amour de soi meme*. In the social state, however, this is transformed into an aggressive form of selfishness Rousseau calls *amour propre*. In his description in the *Discourse on Inequality*, man moves from the golden age of "nascent society... to the most horrible state of war." Since the human race is "no longer able to turn back or renounce the unhappy acquisitions it has made," the great problem of politics is to create order artificially. In effect, while Maistre blames original sin and Rousseau blames *amour-propre* both believe powerful forces are required to preserve social unity and public order. Both need the state, but they differing their accounts of how the state comes into existence" (XV).

17. The crowd can be likened to the collective in the sense presented in the following quotation, "The insoluble problem of the *Social Contract* finds its most striking formulation in

behind the intense dislike he has for the actor, Montfleury. Cyrano replies that Montfleury is a deplorable actor, implying the fact that theatrical performance has moved too far from the human life it should represent and the soul it once embodied. From the stage the actor, Bellrose, addresses Cyrano. Cyrano retorts exclaiming that he does not wish to see these Thespis robes. Therefore, in an abstract sense, he was disgusted by the culturally-artificial, established robes worn by real physical individual actors/ fundamental beings. Another audience member, calling Cyrano mad, then asks if Cyrano has a protector. Cyrano answers that his response has been given. Cyrano firmly states that he “said it twice must it be a third”. Putting the argumentative audience member behind the Civil prison-like balcony railing and pointing at him, Cyrano, in his blood- red cape juxtaposed to artificial Thespian robes, asks the imprisoned man why he doesn’t want to look at Cyrano’s protruding nose. Cyrano continues to question the man asking if the sight versus reality of his physical nose is obscene, and later if Cyrano’s nose is too small. The fundamental individual nature of Cyrano’s nose is rejected by the man and his human nose’s large potential for inspiration is met with a lie, claiming that Cyrano’s nose is miniscule. After Cyrano cries out to God in his frustration, at the denial of his fundamental individual truth and

the familiar matrix of the Prisoners’ Dilemma game (PDG): Reflecting on the multiple symmetrical confrontations between single individuals and the anonymous collectivity in the State of Nature, the dominance of a strategy of defection clearly bars the possibility of the emergence of a Civil Society. Attempts to clear up or clear away this fundamental problem of collective action abound. At stake is not merely a plausible historical reconstruction, but more importantly a normative justification: the quest is for an argument supporting voluntary civic and ethical behavior, independent of necessarily fallible external controls” (Hadrai 1).

nature, both men move to the stairs and begin to mount them as Cyrano explains the true state of his nose. After reaching the top of the stairs, Cyrano, grabbing the man by the collar, uses the words genius and soul in relation to his large, obtrusive nose. He also makes another important Biblical allusion in relation to his nose representing his fundamental individual nature. It represents and is symbolic of his soul. He describes it as part of his individual human body, as bleeding, soul, like the Red Sea.¹⁸ In relation to this, Cyrano calls his nose “the index of the soul”. The aristocrat, Viconte de Valvert, responds to the confrontation between the man and Cyrano descending the stairs with the aristocrat, the Duke De Guiche. Valvert states, with a shallow and pretentious air that offends the fundamentally-inspired individual Cyrano, that Cyrano’s nose is very large. Cyrano responds, zealously, by claiming that his nose is a

18. The Red Sea as the bleeding and dying of the soul can be paralleled to an excerpt from the play *Waiting for Godot*, “Pozzo : [They stop looking at the sky.]What is there so extraordinary about it? Qua sky. IT is pale and luminous like any sky at this hour of the day. [Pause.] In these latitudes. [Pause.] When the weather is fine. [Lyrical.] An hour ago [he looks at his watch, prosaic] roughly [lyrical] after having poured forth even since [he hesitates, prosaic] say ten o’clock in the morning [lyrical] tirelessly torrents of red and white light it begins to lose its effulgence, to grow pale [gesture of the two hands lapsing by stages] pale, ever a little paler, a little paler until [dramatic pause, ample gesture of the two hands flung wide apart] pppfff! Finished! It comes to rest. But- [hand raised in admonition] – but behind this veil of gentleness and peace night is chagrin [vibrantly] and will burst upon us [snaps his fingers] pop! Like that! [his inspiration leaves him] just when we least expect it . [Silence. Gloomily.] That’s how it is on this bitch of an earth” (qtd. in Auster 31).

peninsula (as if it extends into the free waters of the ocean). As Cyrano creatively expounds upon the fundamental truth, nature, and potential of his nose, all the nobles crowded together as one begin to exit. The fleeing, pretentious nobles lacking in any individuality are wearing the same style of hat adorned with ostentatious feathers. In contrast to their adornment, Cyrano, at one point, says “My elegance is interior”. He, then, declares “My sword has gone to sleep”. This declaration comes after he has just bent over and moaned as if he were in pain. He is now inspired to fight and takes off the blood red cape draping his fundamental being. Using his physical strength, he approaches Valvert. Cyrano pushes him back with his chest. It is clear that Cyrano’s fundamental individual nature will no longer be killed by a blood red cape of shallow words. Therefore, he takes off his blood red cape and will be heard and felt by the crowd surrounding the two fighting men. In a cathartic manner, Cyrano begins to physically, verbally, and emotionally move the crowd surrounding the two men. Cyrano is creating a contract between his individual nature and that of the crowd. Once again, Cyrano, by his fundamental, individual nature, is playing the game of life by bringing life back to a once pretentious, collective crowd with an improvisational ballad as he begins to fight Valvert. Cyrano, with the words at the end “I hit” brings the real life/ blood out of the seemingly non-existent aristocratic, as he pierces Valvert with a now awakened, like a pen that writes, sword. After the hit, Cyrano is lying on the ground as if he is the fundamental foundation of the society. He is holding up Valvert, by a sword, in the abdomen. He pulls the sword out of Valvert’s belly. Red blood and therefore fundamental humanity is evident under the veil of Valvert’s white clothing and finery.¹⁹

19. “One of the miseries of rich people is to be deceived in everything (*Emile* 184)

Cyrano came into the world not being loved by his mother due to her rejection of his fundamental beauty and of an appearance that was considered not socially accepted. Both in the play and film “mother” seems to represent society.²⁰ Therefore Cyrano is representative, like Glaucus, of man’s soul or fundamental, individual nature which has come into a civil society that acts as foster parent and one that, at the beginning, is already against and wearing away at his life-giving fundamental, individual nature (*Discourse* 12). Cyrano’s nature is viewed as grotesque and foreign to his pretentious civil family. This echoes Rousseau’s commentary on the pretentious mothers, “Do they know, these gentle mothers who, delivered from their children, devote themselves gaily to the entertainments of the city, what kind of treatment the swaddled child is getting...?” (*Emile* 169) This self-destructing, civil-structured family/society of characters, who are at war and under siege, have moved so far from what Cyrano is and represents that they don’t recognize him as being one of them. This society of empty characters is on a destructive path, throughout the course of the narrative, due to its rejection of Cyrano and its rejection of man’s fundamental, individual nature. Rousseau proclaims the antidote to Cyrano’s failed potential and to the failed civil states within the film. Rousseau points fault at mothers like Cyrano’s who need to fully embrace their young:

All our wisdom consists in servile prejudices. All our practices are only subjection, impediment, and constraint. Civil man is born, lives and dies in slavery. At his birth he is sewed in swaddling clothes; at his death he is nailed in a

20. “That is nature’s rule. Why do you oppose it? Do you not see that in thinking you correct it, you destroy its product, you impede the effect of its care” (*Emile* 173). Cyrano’s mother destroyed Cyrano’s ability to realize the potential of his fundamental nature represented by his large nose.

coffin. So long as he keeps his human shape, he is enchained by our institutions...
But let mothers deign to nurse their children, morals will reform themselves,
nature's sentiments will be awakened in every heart, the State will be repeopled.
This first point, this point alone, will bring everything back together. The
attraction of domestic life is the best counterpoison for bad morals. (*Emile* 167-
171)

After Cyrano has loosed the truth of man's theatrical games at the theatre, he is seen in front of a river speaking to Le Bret of his love for Roxanne his cousin. This is the first inkling that the viewer gets in relation to Cyrano's Rousseauian desire to be a part of civil society. This idea of cousin love is a Rousseauian statement meaning that Cyrano should be included in and not cast out of the human family. He is the fundamental, individual nature lacking in the shallow society and machine like people, such as Roxane, that surround him, "In the natural order, since men are all equal, their common calling is man's estate and whoever is well raised for that calling cannot fail to fulfill those callings related to it" (*Emile* 166). These *précieux* are a societal collection of people precisely trained to behave and speak in a manner that hides and manipulates their fundamental, individual nature and that produces an expected and contrived response to life's situations. This is quite contrary to Cyrano's improvisational nature.²¹

After the duel with Valvert, Cyrano confides in his dear friend Le Bret. In the midst of their conversation about Cyrano's mother and his feeling as if he were unworthy of human

21. Dunning gives a sound explanation of a contract between wisdom and tradition that is demonstrated by Cyrano, "he was full of literary tradition that clothed their institutions with the perfection of wisdom and their heroes with the perfection of virtue" (381).

affection, Cyrano is wearing this deadly feeling of rejection, internally, and externally through his blood red cape and black hat. His black hat seems foreshadow not only the death of his heart and soul, due to societal rejection but his ultimate physical death at the end of the film. The hat is also symbolic of the hat classification placed on his head by society; one that does not allow man's fundamental, individual nature to play a role in his own life. The black hat is representative of Death itself and the red cape is symbolic of the murder of his passionate fundamental, individual nature. It is during this scene, with Le Bret where the two discuss love for a woman, that Cyrano has revealed his lack of motherly guidance. During this scene, the viewer may start to notice the profiling of Cyrano's nose, as he often turns to the side revealing it throughout the film. Towards the end of this scene, with Le Bret, Roxane's nurse maid comes running toward Cyrano, and he runs into the shadow. Roxane was not brought up by her natural mother but rather by a nurse-maid. Rousseau protests this, "But let mothers deign to nurse their children, morals will reform themselves, nature's sentiments will be awakened in every heart" (*Emile* 171). Roxane lacked the mother, like Cyrano that would have embraced a fundamental, individual nature. The nurse maid represents the Civil State which rejects Cyrano's individual nature. As in this confrontation by the nurse maid, Cyrano is often in the shadow throughout the film when faced with outer forces that deny his individually soulful, human existence. This is a brilliant ploy and reinforcement by the director of the imprisonment of man's fundamental individual nature. This occurs along with the addition of light in the proceeding scene where Roxanne reveals her love for Christian to the pained and about to be rejected Cyrano. First, Cyrano converses in the shadow with the nurse maid who informs Cyrano of Roxane's desire to see him. Cyrano then speaks the words "I exist" at the moment he self- deceptively thinks he is his cousin's object of love (1990, TF1). After this misplaced revelation of a contract between

fundamental, individual existence and the Civil State, Cyrano reaches some of his potential. He has the temporary power to conquer 100 men who lie sleeping on the river's boardwalk in hopes of killing the poet, Lignière. Cyrano jumps down on the sleeping men, sword in the air, and wakes them up just as he is the one that will awaken the sleeping society out of its arbitrary existence and stupor-like, weak civil state, represented by Roxane, who swoons. Before the conversation with Roxane, when speaking with his soldiers Cyrano takes off his blood, red cape of death holding it and reveals he is wearing a white blood-stained shirt. This seems to symbolize the contract Rousseau promotes between the fundamental, individual soul and the civil structure surrounding it. Cyrano speaks, like Rousseau, to his soldiers about the wayward ways of society. The taking off of his coat, during his speech, and the pierced flesh that has bled onto his white shirt creates a visual narrative supporting his Rousseauian styled speech.

On the day that Cyrano was to speak with his cousin-love Roxanne, the reoccurring little boy in blue, seen at the beginning of the film, enters chef/ poet Ragueneau's pastry shop. He signals the temporary rebirth of the fundamental through memories of a childhood union shared by Cyrano and Roxane that will occur during their meeting. The focus is first on Ragueneau. The baker, like Rousseauian thought, wishes the body to be filled with beautifully truthful poetic nourishment. The young boy enters with a little girl, another allusion to Roxanne and Cyrano's prior love and acceptance of each other as children. Cyrano speaks with Roxanne after having rid the pastry shop of Roxane's nurse maid and thereby attempting to free Roxane's individual nature. He makes certain that the nurse maid fills her condemning mouth with pastries from Ragueneau's poetic shop. In this scene, the nurse maid is symbolic of societal constraints which would block any tangible communication with Cyrano. Cyrano believes that Roxanne is about to profess her love for him. Of course the reality of the situation that is about to occur between

Roxanne and him, has no relation for her to the reality of Cyrano's love at all. Roxanne was, with the exception of moments of remembrance of their childhood contract, connection and love, stuck in her societal-trained, masked, nurse-maid induced state of being. Rousseau says in relation to the gravity of Roxane's nursed state of being, "There is no substitute for maternal solicitude. She who nurses another's child in place of her own is a bad mother. How will she be a good nurse? ...the child...will have to perish a hundred times ... (*Emile* 170). Roxane has moments of clarity and light and moments of death in her interaction with Cyrano. The viewers begin to see this shift from this innocent, fundamental, state of enlightenment to the societal mask through the director's use of sun and shadow. Again in the moments where Cyrano's fundamental, individual nature is in a state of denial by Roxane there is shadow. The essential moments where Roxanne remembers her own fundamental individual nature there is light, sun, and a garden included in the scene, almost as if the garden is referencing her essential or "first nature/occupier" not her nurse maid's cultivation within her. The moments reference the way the land or Roxane was first occupied by the essential nature of her fundamental being one that could reflect at minimum Adam in the Garden of Eden before man's fall:

In general, the following conditions are necessary to authorize the right of the first occupant to any land whatsoever. First, that this land not yet be inhabited by anyone. Second, that one occupy only the amount needed to subsist. Third, that one takes possession not by a vain ceremony, but by labor and cultivation, the only sign of property that others ought to respect in the absence of legal titles.

(*Contract* 142)

Roxane had the intention of symbolically proving her deadly connection to societal constraints through her confession of her love for the outwardly handsome, yet unwise and empty, Christian.

The scene shifts from the shadow of the covered porch, where Cyrano and Roxane are conversing about themselves, to the sunny garden. In the brilliance of the sunshine and the natural beauty of the garden outside of the cement porch, the two recall a time past when they truly and innocently loved each other on an equal level. When the two were innocent children unformed by society they “relied” on each other and considered it one of life’s pleasures, obvious through their recollection precious, sincere, past moments spent together:

The bother of children, which is believed to be an importunity, becomes pleasant. It makes the father and mother more necessary, dearer to one another; it tightens the conjugal bond between them. When the family is lively and animated, the domestic cares constitute the dearest occupation of the wife and the sweetest enjoyment of the husband. (*Emile* 171)

During this soulfully, reflective part of their conversation, Roxane takes Cyrano’s hand, and as if replacing Cyrano’s maternal mother, accepts him and tries to tend to his symbolically soulful wound received during his prior victory, but his individual nature causes him to pull away from her. He is too fundamentally wise and too distrustfully hurt to be drawn in by her allure. The actress, during this scene, speaks in an almost satanic tempting tone throughout the film as to make the viewer aware that she too is trying to pull her mask over Cyrano’s fundamental, individual existence. Cyrano is drawn in at first by her motherly allure, but as she reveals the facts under the temptress tone of her voice, he is not fooled. He knows truth and has maintained his fundamental, individual nature of discernment. Cyrano is able to distinguish his natural state of being from Roxane’s facade. While the two are in the shade of the stone covered porch, not residing in the natural garden, Roxane cunningly muffles the unpronounced feelings of love Cyrano has toward her. She tells him that she is in love with Christian and elaborates on what

she has judged to be handsome about his appearance. In the film her focus on the word “beau” reflects the fact that this is his sole quality. Like his character, her tone of voice is that of a weak, swooning, woman who has been taken over by something not of herself. This moment revealing their weakness of character due to their lack of fundamental individual nature is in harsh juxtaposition to the way in which Cyrano’s, strong, natural, soulful physique and sentiments have been viewed by the Civil State of being up to this point in the narrative:

We are born weak, we need strength; we are born totally unprovided, we need aid; we are born stupid, we need judgment. Everything we do not have at our birth and which we need when we are grown is given us by education.

This education comes to us from nature or from men or from things. The internal development of our faculties and our organs is the education of nature.

The use that we are taught to make of this development is the education of men.

(Emile 162)

Roxanne’s whole Civil State of being, revealed by her tone of voice, has no real connection with the reality of Cyrano’s true and deep “cousinly” or human love facing her or the necessity of a (Rousseauian) contract between two of them. She is consumed by her deadly ideals. This rejection is what prompts Cyrano to turn his cheek revealing his profiled nose when she touched his face. She is consumed by her superficial fascination with Christian’s appearance. Cyrano knows that her touch was not genuine but connected with an ideal image of Christian “beau visage” instead of any true contract to his own unsightly by civil definition appearance. The fundamental individual in front of Roxane does not exist in her current possessed state of being. That which she touches, Cyrano’s being is thrown further into condemnation:

Everything is good as it leaves the hands of the author of things; everything degenerates in the hands of man. He forces one soil to nourish the products of another, one tree to bear the fruit of another. He mixes and confuses the climates, the elements, the seasons. He mutilates his dog, his horse, his slave. He turns everything upside down; he disfigures everything; he loves deformity, monsters.

(*Emile* 161)

Rousseau also stated the following and this statement provides an excellent explanation of the state that Roxane is in, one of a pretentious mother figure, and therefore a worldly, unnatural, pleasure seeking, infatuated state of an inhuman idealistic society:

Superfluous speeches! The very boredom of worldly pleasures never leads back to these. Women have stopped being mothers; they will no longer be; they no longer want to be. If they should want to be, they hardly could be. Today the contrary practice is established. Each one would have to combat the opposition of every woman who comes near her, all in league against an example that some did not give and the rest do not want to follow. (*Emile* 171-172)

Returning to the director's use of the garden juxtaposed to the cement or stone covered porch the director brings up the question of whether Roxane is living in her ideals or whether she will preserve her fundamental nature, retreat from her ideals and become contracted to her nature:

Do you, then, want him to keep his original form? Preserve it from the instant he comes into the world. As soon as he is born, take hold of him and leave him no more before he is a man. You will never succeed without that. As the true nurse is the mother, the true preceptor is the father. (*Emile* 174)

Cyrano's death and the way in which Rappeneau chose to portray it as the death of man's fundamental individual nature, through the physical death of the character of the play of life, called Cyrano, is best summed up by the following two Rousseau quotations, also from *Emile*:

From these contradictions is born the one we constantly experience within ourselves. Swept along in contrary routes by nature and by men, forced to divide ourselves between these different impulses, we follow a composite impulse which leads us neither one goal nor the other.. Thus, in conflict and floating during the whole course of our life, we end it without having been able to put ourselves in harmony with ourselves and without having been good either for ourselves or for others. (165)

From the moment that the child breathes on leaving its envelope, do not suffer his being given other envelopes which keep him more restricted: no caps, no belts, no swaddling; lose and large diapers which leave all his limbs free and are neither so heavy as to impede his movements nor so hot as to prevent him from feeling the impressions of the air. (188)

Cyrano's death blow to his head occurs by a loosed log. During the incident, Cyrano is wearing a black hat, and his neck is wrapped in a white scarf. It is clear that from his birth he has been plunged into a black-hat killer society in which his white fundamental individual nature only worked to suffocate/strangle him. In Cyrano's civilly- oppressed, individual nature and soulful mind, a successful peace and ending to his internal war of life or "play" with life is never obtained. Societal or civil mannerisms, Cyrano's character flaws, and man's fundamental

individual nature are shrouded in black and only united in Cyrano's physical and metaphysical deaths.²²

In order for peace to finally occur death of her vain self had to play out, for Roxanne. This play came to its conclusion with both the ironic marriage and death between the individual and the civil state. In order to reinforce this, Rappeneau used Cyrano's white scarf and the way in which it wrapped tightly around Cyrano's neck on the day of his death to symbolize this death and marriage. He juxtaposed this with the black hat Cyrano was wearing along with the black mourning dress worn by Roxanne, still in mourning for the image she thought she loved Christian. Cyrano's scarf would have been free flowing, at the beginning of his life along with

22. As for the discourse accompanying the gestures, Banda explains its role as follows: « Mais lorsqu'il est question d'émouvoir le cœur et d'enflammer les passions, c'est toute autre chose. L'impression successive du discours, qui frappe à coups redoublés, vous donne bien une autre émotion que la présence de l'objet même, où d'un coup d'œil vous avez tout vu. Supposez une situation de douleur parfaitement connue, en voyant la personne affligée vous serez difficilement ému jusqu'à pleurer ; mais laissez-lui le temps de vous dire tout ce qu'elle sent, et bientôt vous allez fondre en larmes. Ce n'est qu'ainsi que les scènes de tragédie font leur effet. La seule pantomime sans discours vous laissera presque tranquille ; le discours sans geste vous arrachera des pleurs. Les passions ont leurs gestes, mais elles ont aussi leurs accents, et ces accents qui nous font tressaillir, ces accents auxquels on ne peut dérober son organe, pénètrent par lui jusqu'au fond du cœur, y portent malgré nous les mouvements qui les arrachent, et nous font sentir ce que nous entendons. Concluons que les signes visibles rendent l'imitation plus exacte, mais que l'intérêt s'excite mieux par les sons » (7,8).

his fundamental, individual nature, if he would have coexisted and also been allowed to coexist within the Roxanne's societal civil structure and the structure of the Theatre that now used his nature against him. However, Cyrano and his said nature existed only in isolation ironically by choice and non-choice, too pushed from, and too strong to submit to any civil opposing side. Like Rousseau states, a state of giving up and giving in or compromise must exist in the "play of life". If no compromise between man's fundamental, individual nature and the Civil State of being can be had, man will live in a perpetual state of "DEATH" paralleling the end of Rappeneau's film.

CHAPTER 4
RESURRECTING INNOCENCE

Rousseau states in his *Emile*:

I shall only remark that, contrary to common opinion, a child's Governor ought to be young and even as young as a wise man can be. I would want him to be a child himself if it were possible, to be able to become his pupil's companion and attract his confidence by sharing his enjoyments. (177)

Rousseau insists upon a continual resurrection of the savage/primal/childlike state of being within a developed State. This primal state of being is confounded with man's fundamental, individual nature. The primal/ child / savage is fundamental in that its being has just emerged from the very hands of its creator. It is uncorrupted by the progressive movement away from the creator's original mold however at birth it "begins to die":

The body politic, like the human body, begins to die at the moment of its birth, and carries within itself the causes of its destruction. But each can have a constitution that is more or less robust and suited to preserve it for a longer or shorter time. The constitution of man is the work of nature; that of the State is a work of art. It is not within the power of men to prolong their life; it is within their power to prolong that of the State as far as possible, by giving it the best constitution it can possibly have. Even the best constituted State will come to an end, but later than another, if no unforeseen accident brings about its premature downfall. (*Contract* 188)

The juxtaposition of the fundamental, primal state within a developed State resonates in Antoine de Saint- Exupéry's novel *The Little Prince*. Carrying the same juxtaposition, Exupéry's novel themes have been re-interpreted by two French directors' films: Francois Truffaut's *Small Change* and Jacques Doillon's *Ponette*. As Rousseau views the resurrection of the primal within the developed State as necessary, so do the two aforementioned film directors and the one novelist.

Rousseau's view is expounded upon, within all three works, through theological allusions, Exupéry's narrative style, and filmic elements such as codification of color. Exupéry's style is one that encompasses a play on words which clues the reader immediately into the Rousseauian philosophical framework of the novel, in that his play on words juxtaposes the fundamental/ primal with the Civil State of being. Exupéry, ironically, chooses words which, upon analysis, can be divided in an almost 50 to 50 percent ratio. The division of words clarifies themes of the primal /fundamental individual nature of man versus man as a part of a developed sometimes corrupt State, and clarifies themes related to Truffaut's film and Doillon's film through the use of an adult and child metaphor. All three works address these various themes of imagination, empathy, understanding, wisdom versus intelligence. The works are connected and clearly map out the movement, including the consequences, away from man's fundamental, individual nature/ primal state and into a perpetual, deadly, developed state of being. The works, in their Biblical and Rousseauian allusions/metaphorical comparisons show the unforgivable sin or the non resurrection of the Christ/ man's fundamental individual nature.

Doillon's *Ponette* addresses the condemnation of a little girl's imagination, which she uses to cope with the death of her Christ-like mother. Ponette's mother as an unearthly representation of Christ is further clarified as a part of the film's Rousseauian framework through

Rousseau's proclamation, "Jesus Christ whose reign is not of this world..." (*Contract* 27).

Ponette is almost pushed by her heartless tyrannical father into a purgatorial corrupt state of being.²³ In order to cope with the perpetuity of imposed arbitrariness and the imagined purgatorial state of nothingness desired by her father and others in the film, little Ponette uses ritualistic methods of purification and self cleansing to escape and try to avoid condemnation.²⁴

23. Ponette's father can be compared to Creon in Sophocles' play *Antigone*, "Creon buries the living Antigone, and refuses to bury the dead, Antigone's brother, the fallen Polynices, thus getting it just backwards. More generally, Creon seeks to subsume death under politics, to make of it just one more political category robbed of its mystery and transcendence, as he would also subsume *eros*, his son's love for Antigone. As such, he is the ultimate totalitarian, seeking to include death itself. Yet Antigone's relation with death is also problematic. She seems death-drenched, too much in love with death" (Alfred 88).

24. Coates gives a good reinforcing explanation of this concept of religious ritual, "A crowd gathers. The maimed and disabled lean forward expectantly, their careers beside and behind them. All wait patiently as rain drenches them; after all, it is only minor hardship among the many that have scored their lives. The crowd longs for a sign, be it blood welling from the wounds of the carved figure on the cross, or the cripple's surprised joy as he casts his crutches aside. As the sign appears imminent, the dams of patience burst and the serried mass presses forward, struggling to touch the healing image, obtain the wholeness denied them hitherto. All yearn for the god's descent, tangible proof of his compassion-in the Christian tradition, of his nature as Father, Emmanuel; in other words, 'God with us'. Such images pervade most

Her ritualistic efforts to avoid the oppressive state through these means are ludicrous without her imagination and childlike faith that can save her and that can achieve a state of being believed by Rousseau to be achieved only by the imaginative compassionate resurrection of the child or fundamental, individual nature of man.²⁵ In the film, Ponette consults her Jewish friend Ada, who is called a “child of God” (Studio Canal, 1996). Ponette undergoes a series of trials to try and become like Ada. The resurrection is finally fulfilled by Ponette through her resurrection, by child-like faith, of her mother, the Christ figure in the film, and the restoration of the lives of those around her.

Rousseauian in his word play, Exupéry begins his narrative with the French word, *Lorsque*, or *when*. This word is fundamental in that it brings the reader’s awareness and reflection upon that which began and has ended. In Exupéry’s novel it is continually resurrected into the novel’s present narrative. Within the present narration of the pilot character, the pilot reflects upon his past. He first speaks of the extraneous, “picture” in a nature book. The picture is of a boa constrictor and its prey. The English word picture came from Exupéry’s French word choice, “image”. Exupéry juxtaposes this extraneous French word *image* to his the French tangible word, *dessin* or drawing. It is a gesture that Rousseau helps illuminate:

The idea of Representatives is modern. We get it from feudal Government, that wicked and absurd Government in which the human species is degraded and the

conceptions of popular religion. For all their near-stereotypical recurrence in cinema’s renditions of its manifestations, however they can never be its sole staples” (135).

25. Nietzsche held an opposite opinion to Rousseau’s stance on compassion, “Treating this “general compassion” as a vice, rather than a redeeming virtue of modern democracy, Friedrich Nietzsche diagnosed pity as a kind of democratic “sickness” or “nausea” (Boyd 519).

name of man is dishonored. In the ancient Republics and even in monarchies, the People never had representatives. The word itself was unknown. It is very noteworthy that in Rome, where the Tribunes were so sacred, it was never imagined that they could usurp the functions of the people, and that in the midst of such a great multitude; they never tried to pass a single Plebiscite on their authority alone. Yet the difficulties sometimes caused by the multitude can be judged by what happened in the time of Gracchi, when part of the Citizenry voted from the rooftops. (*Contract* 192-193)

The *image* substitutes for the *dessin* as the representatives substitute for the people, with the same result: degradation and confusion.

The pilot tells how, as a child, he had begun to draw from his imagination the savage images he saw in the book and put them to paper. His drawings were numbered. As the number of drawings progressed, they became less imaginative and more developed and realistic. He was forced like Doillon's character Ponette to draw more to appease the adult, developed state that lacked the imagination and compassion to understand his primal or first drawings. The first time the pilot draws the boa, he draws it with the understanding that there is an, "elephant" inside hoping that the adults are able to surpass what they perceive through their Civil State filter and imagine what is inside. Instead, they see a hat of their own perception. The adult is too blinded by their civil hat that is empty of fundamental imagination to see the elephant that has been swallowed by the boa. The hat is boa constrictor, constricting their imagination. Just as the snake is constricting the child pilot's imaginative elephant the adults are blinded by the process of constriction, to the imaginative elephant hidden inside:

Whenever I met one of them who seemed to me at all clear-sighted, I tried the experiment of showing him my Drawing Number One, which I have always kept. I would try to find out, so, if this was a person of true understanding. But, whoever it was, he, or she, would always say, "That is a hat." Then I would never talk to that person about boa constrictors, or primeval forests, or stars. I would bring myself down to his level. I would talk to him about bridge, and golf, and politics, and neckties. And the grown-up would be greatly pleased to have met such a sensible man. (5)

Exupéry's choice of words within his narrative style links his novel to Doillon and Truffaut's films. Exupéry's strategically chooses the words, "grande personne". His narrator the pilot is the main, "grande personne" at the beginning of his novel who is speaking about the way he was influenced by them as a child, "J'ai montré mon chef-d'oeuvre aux grandes personnes et je leur ai demandé si mon dessin leur faisait peur" (4). *Ponette* and, *Small Change* have a definitive civil adult world separate and often not at all in contact or direct social contact with the essential fundamental child world juxtaposed to it.²⁶ The children are isolated individuals in their daily experiences often not by choice but by force. Exupéry's pilot is confronted in his isolation, from the desert crash of his plane, by an image of himself as a child or his fundamental, individual nature, the unique and fantastical Little Prince.

The Little Prince, in Rousseauian fashion, brings wisdom to the isolated adult pilot the same way *Ponette*, in her isolation, brings maturity to her grief stricken father in Doillon's film.

26. The context of this story of the death of the pilot's fundamental, individual nature and his arrival/crash into the desert, is nicely captured by one of Sophocles' famous statements, "Death is another country" (Alfred 87).

Parallel to the Little Prince, who is persistent in his demands of the pilot, as when he was demanding that the pilot draw him a sheep, “No, no, no! ... What I need is a sheep. Draw me a sheep!” (10). She maintains her countenance better than her father who can’t control his own demeanor. The pilot becomes angry, just as Ponette’s father did due to the circumstances of his wife’s death, by the demands of the Little Prince. The anger of Ponette’s father, like the pilot’s anger, becomes a hat hiding what is truly the fundamental issue. The hat overshadows his ability to get himself out of the crashed state he is in. The Little Prince or his fundamental individual nature is resurrected to save the pilot from isolation; just as Ponette saves her father from self destruction.

Truffaut’s *Small Change* also creates a wise child character, Patrick. Patrick fundamental individual nature is isolated as well, and this isolation is evident in his character’s tendency to daydream. Alone, the adolescent boy cares, as an adult would, for his crippled and soon made to be extraneous father. Patrick does all the tasks for his father who now is incapable of caring for himself. His father doesn’t have a need to do anything for himself and express any individuality, because Patrick does it all and is his father’s foundation of existence. Patrick however is consumed by his father’s demands. Neither Ponette’s father nor Patrick’s father contributes to the raising/nurturing/resurrection/of their children. Both fathers live a rather arbitrary despaired existence, like Exupéry’s pilot at the beginning of the novel. All three, “grandes personnes” are consciously choosing to deny the Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature of the children that would in affirmation of it save them from their condemnation (*Le petit prince* 4).

Exupéry’s narrative style is Rousseauian in that it is primitive in construction, random, imaginative, and individualistic, and takes on a very childlike tone. Truffaut and Doillon’s

films mimic this style in that the narratives depict the children's authentic individual lives which are being lived out on screen. The films' characters, just like the random nature of the Little Prince in Exupéry's novel, speak and act in a much unrehearsed style. Truffaut's and Doillon's characters act on a very individual basis doing what children will do. Doillon focuses on the natural progression of an individual girl dealing day by day in an isolated state with the death of her mother. Truffaut focuses on the individual children's stories and struggles in and of one community. Several of Truffaut's characters' stories take a prominent and fundamental position within the structure of the film. Julien, Gregory, Sylvie, and Patrick are the most prominent individuals within Truffaut's Rousseauian narrative. Gregory is a toddler who is continually curious and random in his mischievous but unmonitored behavior. His mother does not embrace nor correctly nurture his intuitive mind, because she is too self consumed. Therefore, what could allow her to have a closer connection with her son becomes a death trap due to her neglect of his fundamental, individually curious and imaginative nature. Gregory's mom is an example of a Civil State concerned only with its selfish gain or profit. She is so consumed throughout the film by her desire to gain a boyfriend and the way in which that gain of a mate would benefit her that she loses sight of her little Gregory's precious life. Her use of the personal ads, quite an *amour propre* motivated action to accomplish her desire of finding a mate, leads her to selfish gain not selfless progression. She is a very Rousseauian character in her representation of *amour propre*, an "aggressive" self perfection or reason existing without will and reflection. Rousseau speaks out against the denial of this *amour de soi* or her denial of her little son Gregory and his fundamental individual instinctual nature and curiosity. To move away from him and his innocent adventurous curiosity is to be against nature and humanity itself. Gregory's Mom is in this state of reason without reflection upon this fundamental said

nature. Her unnatural drive in turn drives her little boy out a window. After taking him shopping, she constantly chats with her neighbor. Meanwhile, Gregory is dragging the bread on the ground. Opening all the various food items to see what they are, dumping them out and playing in them and trying to find out what happens to a cat if you throw it out an open window several stories high. In her neglect of Gregory, he falls out the window in his chase for the cat and almost dies. The hypnotic state of denial that her own selfish desire has put herself in almost kills her little boy both metaphorically and physically when he falls from the window due to her neglect. A Rousseauian juxtaposition is created by the development of these two characters. Gregory is *amour de soi* and his mom is *amour propre*.²⁷ We see the fundamental, individual instinctual nature of Gregory in his hunt for food as he tears through his mom's grocery bags to fill his stomach with cookies. In addition he carries the bread to the table like a mini hunter in the making, dragging the bread along the ground as if it were his prey. Truffaut continued metaphorically showing the death of the fundamental, individual nature of Gregory at the hands of his mother through his use of the color red throughout the scenes involving him and his mom. Her selfish desires are evident when she descends the blood red railed staircase case, leaving Gregory upstairs unattended, so she can go and search for her lost wallet. She doesn't reflect on him and his state of being or whereabouts at the time she is in search of her lost money. She has left him up high in their apartment next to an open window. The state of being she exists under is one of failure. Just as her dates with men fail, she as an individual feels like she can't exist, and due to her lack of individuality, shown through her interest in men who do not share her interests, she is unable to achieve what she hopes to turn into a successful

27. De Maistre XV

Civil State of being or marriage. She has failed and continually fails through her lack of a dual existence, an existence which should include reason and reflection, *amour de soi*, or a fundamental, individual nature. Gregory, whose fundamental, individual innocent nature is continually being put to death by his mother, is wearing red overalls throughout the film. This seems to be a brilliant use of codification on the part of Truffaut in his film Small Change. Gregory falls out the red curtained open window his mother left him by but survives through a, “natural cushion of green bushes” (MGM, 1976). Later when the non traditionalist teacher in the film, Mr. Richet, and his wife are reflecting upon the incident with Gregory, his wife states, in a very Rousseauian manner that, “kids are in a state of grace....God, nature saves them, but the adults just stood there” .

Among the individual stories ironically used to build one Rousseauian framework, Truffaut follows a postcard written by a young girl and her story of growing up and falling in love. At the beginning of the film, a young girl is standing in front of a monument holding a post card and standing in front of a French flag flying in the air of a very blue sky. As she is standing in front of this real location, we see the exact” image’ or representation of this location on the post card that she is writing.²⁸ This juxtaposition of that which is real and exists and that which is just an image of existence is a Rousseauian theme in all three works, those of Exupéry, Doillon, and Truffaut. All their characters grow up and progress to the point where the real

28. “Children’s first sensations are purely affective, they perceive only pleasure and pain. Able neither to walk nor to grasp, they need a great deal of time to come little by little into the possession of the representative sensation which show them objects outside of themselves” (*Emile* 191).

essential part of their existence and start of their lives is replaced by ideas and images.²⁹ They grow up to the point of losing their fundamental, individual natures, hence the very individual Patrick falling in love, at the end of the film with the young girl who wrote the post card. He loses his individual nature to her image and to the idea of romance, therefore becoming a part of her more idealistic existence.

In keeping with Rousseau's teaching on the statue of Glaucus, Truffaut and Exupéry believe that adults must stop allowing the growing up process to become a growing up and growing out of their fundamental, individual God given nature they possessed as children, "...But certainly for us who understand life, figures are a matter of indifference. I should have liked to begin this story in the fashion of the fairy-tales. I should have like to say: 'Once upon a time there was a little prince who lived on a planet ...'" (*The Little Prince* 16). The pilot is regretful that he did not grow up embracing his fundamental, individual nature.

Many author and film directors believe that adults must fight against growing up in a manner that demolishes their fundamental, individual natures. Truffaut's film moves from the scene with the girl writing the postcard to the classroom where a little boy is reading the postcard. He uses this scene as a metaphor for this belief. The black board is at the front of the

29. Rimbaud states the following about the replacement of the natural with "intelligible" ideas, "I know at the very least how gratuitous it is to substitute oneself, comfortably, for someone else's conscience.[...] To organize someone else's life into intelligible and convincing fragments, in order to translate it, is nothing less than impertinence; all that remains for me to do is push this kind of misdemeanor as far as it can go. Only, I do seek out the facts" (qtd. in Lloyd 2).

classroom and Mr. Richet, the non-traditionalist teacher, is explaining how one must properly address a post-card, as if to instruct the viewer on the two paths a person can follow as they grow up. The board is strategically divided in half like a postcard, but the board acts almost like a metaphor of human existence. Mr. Richet, the grown up, is posed to the left side of the board in front of the properly written postal address, and a child/student is posed in front of a map of France with no words written on it. It is a map of the whole of France, a representation of the actual tangible country. Rousseau states that man can't totally exist without any representation although a more childlike true to form reflection, like the drawn out map, is a more phenomenological form of existence than the officially and standard written address . This makes yet another allusion to the progressive drawings made by the Little Prince of the boa constrictor swallowing the elephant. The drawings progressively conform more and more to the grown up's perception of what they should look like. The boa drawing number one is totally imaginative in that one has to use the imagination and not explanation to understand it, but as the child has to draw it more clearly for the adult to comprehend it, the drawing loses its essence or fundamental individual nature in its conformity to what society in general accepts as appropriate:

I showed my masterpiece to the grown-ups, and asked them whether the drawing frightened them. But they answered, "Frighten? Why should anyone be frightened by a hat?" My drawing was not a picture of a hat. It was a picture of a boa constrictor digesting an elephant. But since the grown-ups were not able to understand it, I made another drawing: I drew the inside of the boa constrictor, so that the grown-ups could see it clearly. They always need to have things explained. My Drawing Number Two looked like this: ...The grown-ups' response, this time, was to advise me to lay aside my drawings of boa

constrictors, whether from the inside or the outside, and devote myself instead to geography, history, arithmetic and grammar. That is why, at the age of six, I gave up what might have been a magnificent career as a painter. I had been disheartened by the failure of my Drawing Number One and my Drawing Number Two. Grown-ups never understand anything by themselves, and it is tiresome for children to be always and forever explaining things to them. So then I chose another profession, and learned to pilot airplanes. I have flown a little over all parts of the world. (*The Little Prince* 5-6)

Exupéry uses the elephant of his numbered drawings to symbolize not only the enormity of a child's imagination but also to enforce the encumbering view that the adult civilized State takes on a child's uncivilized savage imaginative or fundamental creations. Exupéry takes the side of the child speaking out against adult criticism, and he does so through the use of his character the Little Prince.

Truffaut furthers, through his individual stories of children's lives, Exupéry's focus on this ironic view of the Rousseauian necessity of a child's fundamental imagination in a developed Civil State. The elephant, a representation of fundamental imagination, of his character the pilot's childhood drawing is represented by little Sylvie's elephant purse in Truffaut's film which she wants to carry into the very civilized adult environment of a restaurant. However, like the encumbering enormity of the elephant, Sylvie's cherished purse and her imagination are viewed by her parents as monstrosities. They tell her that if she takes it people eating will lose their appetites. The Sylvie scene in the Truffaut film begins with Sylvie and her elephant purse as she stands in front of her blood red bedspread- covered bed. The preceding scene is very important, however, to set the framework for the situation Sylvie had with her

parents in regard to her carrying her dearly loved purse to the restaurant. This preceding scene focuses on adults who are incapable, in their overly Civil State of being, of understanding neither the fundamental nature of a child's imaginative mind nor the enormity and importance of it. There are two of the girl's goldfish in this scene. Sylvie names her two seemingly identical goldfish Plic and Ploc. She distinguishes them as individuals by choosing names according to their physical qualities. She is able to distinguish them from the whole due to her own fundamental, individual nature. In the Civil, intellectual mind of her father and due to his lack of a fundamental, individual nature, he has an incapacity to understand or see the way she knows to distinguish one fish from the next. Rousseau answers why Sylvie is capable of naming her two similar fish, "What is it that makes laws so sacred, even independently of their authority, and so preferable to simple acts of the will? It is first that they emanate from a general will that is always right with respect to private individuals" (*Contract* 28). Her father takes her knowledge to be absurd just as Exupéry's pilot takes the little Prince to be absurd, in his childlike qualities, when he demands that the Pilot draw a sheep, " 'What I need is a sheep'. So then I made a drawing. He looked at it carefully, and then he said: 'No. this sheep is already very sickly. Make me another'. So I made another drawing. My friend smiled gently and indulgently" (10).

When the scene changes from the dispute between Sylvie and her father on the way he thinks it is impossible for her to know the difference between the two fish, the dispute over the elephant purse begins. First, Sylvie is caringly washing her elephant purse by dipping a brush into the distinguished fish water. In an effort to maintain her fundamental, individual nature and purity in her fight against her father's words which puts her nature down. She washes the dirt off the elephant trying to keep her imagination uncorrupted. Her imagination is and has been violated by her father's rude comments. She says I'll wash you more. You are a mess. In the

course of her *Small Change* dialogue, her inner dialogue with her imagination and fundamental nature uses a word taboo to her fundamental nature: “look” (MGM, 1976). It is taboo because it makes reference to image and perception bonded with what should be fundamental truth rather than judgment. She, because of her father, is no longer as innocent as she was the moment before he criticized her about her naming and truly knowing her pet fish. Her loss of innocence is best clarified by Rousseau when he states, “the human body begins to die as soon as it is born” (*Contract* 188”).³⁰ Sadly, after she washes the purse, trying symbolically and ritualistically to purify and maintain her fundamental, individual imagination. In the effort of purifying what has now been corrupted (like Ponette and her rituals, in her efforts to cleanse herself of her father’s imposed corruption in order to become a child of god) Sylvie’s father looks at the washed elephant purse and tells Sylvie, “It’s disgusting if people see that they will lose their appetites” (MGM, 1976.). This is similar to the father that Rousseau portrays in *Emile* who over corrects his child’s natural syntax (200-201). Her father speaks in a manner overtaken by perception and judgment. This moves Sylvie’s innocent being away from her fundamental individual nature

30. Here is the full quotation: “The body politic, as well as the human body, begins to die as soon as it is born, and carries in itself the causes of its destruction. But both may have a constitution that is more or less robust and suited to preserve them a longer or a shorter time. The constitution of man is the work of nature; that of the state the work of art. It is not in men's power to prolong their own lives; but it is for them to prolong as much as possible the life of the State, by giving it the best possible constitution. The best constituted State will have an end; but it will end later than any other, unless some unforeseen accident brings about its untimely destruction.”

and replaces it with her father's deadly plurality. Her father, like Ponette's father, is blind to the actual individuality of his own child standing in front of him. He only sees societal worries and constraints in front of him and in turn allows Sylvie to go without her physical need for food by not taking her to eat with them, if she takes the elephant purse, to the restaurant to eat with him and his wife. *Small Change* the title of the film alludes to the individual power that little Sylvie will have to change the circumstances she will be placed in as her parents decide to leave without her. They leave her with no food, but she gathers the community together to help her by crying "I'm hungry... I'm hungry...". The fundamental individual Sylvie does not exist to her father just as Ponette does not exist under the barrier of grief her father places on Ponette.³¹ This concept of replacement is reinforced when Sylvie's father states, "your mom will lend you a new purse" (MGM, 1976). The new purse is a more ascetically pleasing purse in societal terms, but like the innocent, unknowingly wise child she is, Sylvie decides not to submit to this deadly change of purses. She chooses to stay home from their going to eat at the restaurant, symbolic of an overfull-of- themselves, dead society. She keeps the elephant purse that her parents wanted her to give up for the new so that she could go. The other wise adults in her apartment complex see what has happened when Sylvie screams out that she is hungry (hungry for true guidance).

31. The invisibility of the two girls is reflected in the following excerpt about a Rousseauian approach to education, "Counteracting invisibility, having a sense of mission, providing hope and optimism, and creating a sense of belonging describe ways that educators can sustain the dignity of the child. Each requires paying some particular attention to the core stories of our students" (Books 119).

One of the adults mentions that Sylvie's father is criminal for doing this even though ironically her father is a policeman. This supports the two states that Rousseau necessitates a contract between. Ponette's father tries to do the same thing to Ponette. He gives her a watch in exchange for her teddy bear. He wants her to hear the hypnotic tick tock and wants to suspend her fundamental actions which reveal her feelings of mourning.

Ponette's father insinuates that her actions in mourning prove she is crazy even though it is her actions that make him face the truth, of his wife's death, which he rejects. Sylvie's father rejects her fundamental, individual nature in the same manner. He exclaims, "you are obscene". However, in her retort and defense she exclaims that it is all equal to her, as if questioning the ridiculous and arbitrary barrier drawn between her fundamental self and the state of her father. It is as if at that moment Sylvie and Rousseau himself are vying for a dual existence of compromise between God's fundamental, individual nature still in little Sylvie and the worldly aesthetics which crucify it. After all, Sylvie is a prophet, Christ-like figure in the film. Christ was crucified because he spoke out against and refused to conform to Pilot's Roman State at the time.

Truffaut's use of the two brothers, who pack Sylvie a basket of food when she is left hungry by her parents, supports the idea of equality through being an individual. The two boys are brothers and they are both dressed in a natural green, but yet they are still individual, one is younger and one is older. The boys' father is representative of the kind of adult that doesn't want their child to submit totally to the drunkenness and conformity of society.³² When the boys

32. The boys were able to rely on their own innate and original nature. This concept is seen in films addressing African loss of identity, "Hondo's debut film *Soleil O* (1970) reflects his earlier work in theatre...the film opens with a ringing affirmation of African identity: 'We had

pack a bottle of wine in the basket, their father removes it and tells them that children don't drink. In explaining this to his boys, the father reinforces the fact that children's innocent fundamental, individual natures are not yet made drunk by societal conformity. He also gives them the individual freedom to make their own breakfast on Sundays, allowing them to exert their independence in a manner they are able. He doesn't prepare the food they are capable of preparing by themselves; therefore he does not control or mold their fundamental, individual natures that enable them to take care of themselves. The boys are not slaves to the adult state of being; rather they contribute to it and live in a free state able to do things for themselves, a state Rousseau celebrates:

It is involvement in commerce and the arts, avid interest in profits, softness and love of comforts that replace personal services by money. One gives up part of his profit in order to increase it at leisure. Give money and you will soon have chains. The word *finance* is a slave's word. It is unknown in the City. In a truly free State the citizens do everything with their hands and nothing with money. Far from paying to be exempted from their duties, they would pay to fulfill them personally. I am very far from commonly held ideas; I believe that *corvées* are less contrary to freedom than taxes. (*Contract*192)

After the boys pack the basket, or make their own *Small Change*, the neighbors lower the basket to Sylvie, and in stark contrast to her father, who told her that her elephant purse would

our own civilization. We forged our own iron. We had our own songs and dances... We had our own literature, our own religion, our own science, our own methods of education'. But it ends in a scene of alienation and anguish..." (Roy 112).

make the people at the restaurant lose their appetite, the neighbors yell out, “bon appétit!” (MGM, 1976). She is now going to consume that which was packed by the two individual yet dressed alike boys. Sylvie is pleased that she has been accepted by her neighbors, that the world accepts her imagination and her fundamental, individual nature. In her satisfaction, “everyone is looking at me” and the key Rousseauian word here is the, “me” the fundamental individual nature of Sylvie.

Many of the two films’ and Exupéry’s characters’ fundamental, individual natures are in a state of purgatory due to the societal constraints placed on them. Indeed, many of the children have already given up their true natures to the nothingness of a “perpetual” purgatorial existence. For Rousseau, it is true, there is a genuine and valid burden of participation in civil society.

It is not sufficient for an assembled people to have once settled the constitution of the State by sanctioning a body of laws. It is not sufficient for it to have established a perpetual Government or provided, once and for all, for the election of magistrates. In addition to extraordinary assemblies that may be required by unforeseen situations, there must be some regular, periodical ones that nothing can abolish or postpone, so that on a designated day the people is legitimately convoked by law, without need of any other formal convocation. (*Contract* 190)

The danger is that the burden may become excessive, grinding away the individual’s ability to think and act for himself.

Two of Doillon’s *Ponette* characters and young cousins of Ponette, Delphine and Mathias, have already begun to be consumed like Exupéry’s elephant in the boa, by a state of nature against the God and Christ world of Ponette. Along with his sister, Delphine, Mathias criticizes Ponette’s natural and childlike manner of grieving the death of her mother. In one

scene where Ponette is re-telling to her cousins the night she and her doll Yoyotte spent with her dead mother, they criticize her and make her feel badly:

Ponette. "I like the night more...."

Cousin. "Why are you mean to us?..."

Ponette. "Because you are mean to me..."

Cousin. "No, we're nice..."

Ponette. "Not about my mommy..."

Cousin. "You didn't play with your mommy..."

Ponette. "Ask Yoyott she was there"

Cousin. "So Yoyotte can talk now?"

Ponette. "You can talk to Yoyotte if she wants to"

Cousin. "Play with Yoyotte then and with your mother too!" (1997, Canal
Production)

Mathias and Delphine represent the unforgivable sin of blasphemy. They speak against Ponette's God given good and innocent fundamental, individual nature and against the Christ like resurrection of it, in Ponette's mourning of that which symbolizes the Christ like resurrection her mother.

Ironically and similarly, Exupéry's pilot, whose fundamental, individual nature has come back to him in the form of the Little Prince, exists in this same manner as the cousins at the beginning of Exupéry's novel. When the pilot is confronted by the little prince, or what he used to be, innocent and fundamental, he doesn't even recognize the little man as part of himself.

This is also the first inkling we get of the theme of Christ in the Little Prince. The Little Prince is

the fundamental, individually, unique Christ figure and even asks the pilot to draw him a lamb, a Biblical symbol of Christ. Unfortunately, the little prince's nature needs to be confirmed in the necessity of his existence through the pilot's drawing of the lamb. Like Ponette, it is suffering that has begun the resurrection process of the Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature of the pilot manifested in the form of the little prince, and that has established the need for it in the pilot's life. The Little Prince has been resurrected through the suffering of the pilot's metaphorical and literal crash in the middle of the Sahara desert or his barren life.

This theme of suffering, resurrection, and Christ is further expounded upon in, "Ponette", in her need for the use of her imagination. Ponette's imaginative and ironically ritualistic way of dealing with the abrupt death of her mother allows her to cope with the death, try to understand it, and to find a solution to her sad state of being. However, in her ironic Rousseauian existence of civil ritual, contractually inclusive of her fundamental imagination, Ponette survives and overcomes the stress of her mother's death and the abuse she takes from her lost father and her mean cousins. It is the imagination within her fundamental, individual nature that is lacking in her father and cousins which allows her to survive and continue. The civil rituals given to her by others so that she can try and survive or become a child of God do her no good alone and compared to the association they have to her individual imagination. This ritualistic attempt at survival with an association to the fundamental individual imagination is replayed out in a later scene on the playground at school when Ponette, following rituals given to her by a Jewish girl whom everyone calls child of God instructs Ponette to go through specific trials. One of these metaphorically adult-like but ironically childlike playground rituals is Ponette's digging up of the ground as if resurrecting Jesus himself from a tomb. This is Doillon's rebutting the idea that the sole enactment of a ritual suffices. Her ritualistic behavior is literally grounded. Thus

Doillon reminds the viewer of the need for resurrecting the fundamental, individual nature through the image of the earth's dirt in the scene. Ironically, it is nature that allows her to unearth the tomb that was created from it. It is as if she is at the point of man's creation reverting back to the fundamental earth that formed a good man, Adam, and thereby releasing her mother from death. After all, the tomb Ponette digs is empty and Adam was not sentenced to death in his perfect form. Doillon's move is analogous to the one Rousseau makes to validate his resurrection of an earlier social structure and bespeaks the same belief in an earlier and superior state:

By going back to the earliest periods of Nations, it would be found that most of the ancient governments, even the monarchical ones like the Macedonians and the Franks, had similar Councils. In any case, this one incontestable fact resolves the entire difficulty: the inference from the existent to the possible seems solid to me.

(Contract 189-190)

The pilot crash at the beginning of Exupéry's novel is like Ponette's ritualistic efforts and trials that Ada the Jewish child of God puts her through on the playground. The pilot's crash resurrects his little prince or his fundamental individual nature. The trial and ritual part of the crash is represented by his attempt to work on the plane. He is working to resurrect life, resurrect motion/progress, and resurrect the fundamental prince that he, "once upon a time" embraced. The pilot is regretful that he did not become earlier in his life "child of God" (like Ponette) or the fundamental artist that he could have been when he created his drawings as a young boy.

The grown-ups' response, this time, was to advise me to lay aside my drawings of boa constrictors, whether from the inside or the outside, and devote myself instead

to geography, history, arithmetic and grammar. That is why, at the age of six, I gave up what might have been a magnificent career as a painter. I had been disheartened by the failure of my Drawing Number One and my Drawing Number Two. Grown-ups never understand anything by themselves, and it is tiresome for children to be always and forever explaining things to them. So then I chose another profession, and learned to pilot airplanes. I have flown a little over all parts of the world; and it is true that geography has been very useful to me. At a glance I can distinguish China from Arizona. If one gets lost in the night, such knowledge is valuable. (*The Little Prince* 6)

Instead, due to his lack of fundamental nature, he exists in his current state of purgatory or isolation in the lifeless desert. He was placed in this desert by having taken on the occupation of pilot rather than that of the artist. Similarly, Sylvie and Ponette's fathers imposed upon the little girls and corrupted their imagination. Parallel to this are the many oppressive hats, like the hat seen by the adults when viewing the little pilot's serpent and elephant drawing. The overly civilized adult society, like the one judging the young pilot's fundamental imaginative drawing, causes the artist turned pilot to wander around lost in the world. The tragedy in being lost in such a way is that the artist becomes fooled into believing that his lost state has reason. This reason is not based on experience but on the facts that are taught to him. The pilot relied too much on the geographical facts he had fixed/attached his imagination and instinct to. Rather than all three children, Ponette, Sylvie, and the young Pilot/The Little Prince, receiving education based on a more appropriate childlike imaginative and nature nurturing view, they receive an education through the arbitrary boundaries of a lost adult's false perception of the

child they no longer know is real. The fundamental individual child becomes a hallucination seen in a desert. Rousseau both explains this process and offers a remedy in *Emile*:

Childhood is unknown. Starting from the false idea one has of it, the farther one goes, the more one loses one's way. The wisest men concentrate on what it is important for men to know without considering what children are in a condition to learn. They are always seeking the man in the child without thinking of what he is before being a man. This is the study to which I have most applied myself, so that even though my entire method were chimerical and false, my observations could still be of profit. My vision of what must be done may have been very poor, but I believe I have seen clearly the subject on which one must work. Begin, then, by studying your pupils better. For most assuredly you do not know them at all. Now if you read this book with this in view, I believe it will not be without utility for you. (157-158)

The adults judging the pilot's drawing do not understand or even trying to resurrect understanding of that which the child pilot had essentially drawn, a boa constrictor swallowing an elephant or an explanation. The child is also trying to teach the adults the importance of his own fundamental imagination. The adults need to consider the drawing based on what they had done as children and based not on their overall assumptions of what a child should be according the adult world.

These adults were incapable of this resurrection of the fundamental. The adults perceive the drawing to be what the adults had become, a hat or closed minded non-imaginative being. The adult world perceives Ponette in the same manner. Her father is not capable of resurrecting any fundamental understanding within and of himself due to his immense grief and therefore,

just as the little prince had been cut off at the point of corruption or evil, “six” years old, Ponette’s dad calls her imaginative existence crazy and cuts her off. The number six is often associated with the occult. This Rousseauian portrait of a corrupt microcosm to macrocosm society is reinforced again at the moment when Ponette’s father hands her a watch and tells her that when she is sad she should listen to the hypnotic perpetual tick-tock. He then asks for her teddy bear which she imaginatively plays with in exchange for the watch. The exchange of Ponette’s fundamental, individual nature for her father’s purgatorial state of being takes place in the machine, the car that took the life of her mother. Ponette wants to resurrect her mother throughout the film. In the macrocosm the same exchange gets played out in similar moments of suspension:

These intervals of suspension, during which the Prince recognizes or ought to recognize an actual superior, have always terrified it; and these assemblies of the people, which are the aegis of the body politic and the restraint on Government, have been viewed with horror by the leaders of all times. Thus, they never spare efforts, nor objections, nor obstacles, nor promises to discourage the Citizens from holding them. When the latter are greedy, cowardly, pusillanimous, fonder of repose than of freedom, they don’t hold out long against the redoubled efforts of the Government. So it is that with the force of resistance constantly increasing, the Sovereign authority finally vanishes, and most cities fall and perish prematurely. (191)

Ponette’s mother is a Christ figure and representative of Ponette’s innocent fundamental, individual nature and life. Her life, in a manner depicted by Rousseau’s statue of Glaucus, is being stolen from her by outside forces. Essentially, her struggle of resurrection is also like the

pilot's struggle. Over time, if she does not resurrect her mother, she will become disfigured. If the pilot does not resurrect his plane he will die in the desert. However, Ponette does indeed somewhat succeed in her imaginative ritualistic trials like the pilot and resurrects her mother, and through her mother, Ponette preserves the bond she has between her imaginative- fundamental existence and the structure of the rituals.

In *Small Change*, two teachers confront each other in an intense conversation. Mlle Petit gives away her character and the method of education supported by her character throughout this conversation with the words she used such as exhibitionist, behavior, clothes, self conscious. These words reek of an educational method of image and perceived existence a movement away from the fundamental individual nature to an amour proper. This is the method of education Rousseau opposes with his Emile. In contrast, Mr. Richet's dialogue includes words such as: history, share, process, open, problem, old school tradition.

Just as Exupéry uses technical aspects of his novel like word choices to reflect Rousseauian philosophy, Doillon uses technical elements of his film to do the same. Doillon's, "Ponette" randomly begins with a combination of the violin playing of soft melancholy music and children's innocent laughter. The sadness of the violin hints at the forthcoming loss of this laughter and is characteristic of the Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature of man. Tied into the sadness that will steal away the laughter is a close up of the back of a man's head, the father of Ponette.

Coming into the film, Ponette has just lost her mother, but has not yet been told by her father who is devastated by the loss of his wife. The camera focuses on the back of his head, while Ponette is clearly seen lying in a hospital bed, wearing a white cast, and sucking her thumb. Her father is facing her. The cast is strategically pure white like the innocence of

Ponette before the sadness and corruption about to be placed on her by life and her father. At this point she still possesses that Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature which is reinforced by her baby like thumb-sucking.

The nonconformist quality of Ponette's still intact fundamental, individual nature is revealed through her fidgeting with her cast. As she fidgets, her father strokes her hair. Then he tells her he will draw a dog on her cast, because as he doesn't accept or respect her childlike innocence. He doesn't like it when they are white so wants to do the first drawing on it. The drawing doesn't look like a dog but a lion, a predatory animal. While he is drawing, the light with shadows of window bars from the window shines on his face. It is clear from this that her father is not as free as she is and that he is in an almost prisonlike state. Then a close up of the back of his right ear is on screen with Ponette facing the camera. The light is to the left of her face with the rest of it in the shadow. She is looking at her daddy with a little bit of a sad look of her face as if the fundamental individual wisdom she possesses is enabling her to mourn the loss of her father's. He tries to soften the truth while telling her that mommy is in pretty bad shape. She puts her head back as his face leaves the frame, and he tells her the doctor's think that she may die. As if calling on God, knowing he is the only one who understands what she feels, she looks up to the ceiling. Her father's face appears again, and there is a moment of silence. To show the way in which Ponette's loss of innocence and individuality has been set in motion by her father's news, Doillon uses the car. The car is symbolically parallel to Éxupéry's pilot. In a close up, after Ponette has left the hospital, she is in the front car seat of her father's car. The seat is blocking part of her face and all that is seen are her eyelashes, nose, and mouth. She is wearing clothing symbolic of the forthcoming death of her childhood. In her grey sweater, she has her arms in the air making them fly around as road noise is played. Her childhood

imaginative play with her doll is overshadowed by the modern noise of the car, also the object that killed her mother. Seemingly trying to capture the fundamental innocence that she is moving further away from, her profile appears on screen as she asks if they are going home.

Then, the camera switches to her father's right side, shoulders up, who responds that they are going to Claire's. It is later revealed that this is the house where her already corrupt little cousins reside. Her cousins are a part of her family unit but opposite to Ponette's fundamental, individual nature. The journey and the car also create a very Rousseauian juxtaposition of innocence heading towards corruption due to "progress". As her father is driving, sunlight is shining on his forehead and the right side of Ponette's face is lit up as she asks if her cousins will be at home. He answers truthfully of course. Enforcing, the idea that her cousins are not only corrupt but the fact that they will consume like predators her fundamental, individual nature, she randomly asks her father if there will be lions there. The top of her father's head is covered in sunlight, and he responds, in his narrowed minded way he tells her again in truth and light that Mathias and Delphine are her cousins not wild animals. He is not looking at his daughter when she asks this but at the road. He then decides to glance only once at her. Ponette is not satisfied with his answer, and with her whole face lit except her left ear she asks her father again if lions will be there. Unlike her father's, the top of her head is cut out of the frame. She covers her right eye as he, true to his unnatural state of being throughout the film responds, "if there are your Russian dog will protect you" (1997, Canal Production). In a Nazi fashion she salutes while shading her right eye from the sun shining down in it. She is afraid of too much light or, knowledge, so she brings her casted arm meeting to the one shading her eye in an almost Christ-like cross formation against the knowledge, and the image of the lion - dog is visible. Her left eye is not visible, because it is blocked from the car seat as her father asks her what she is

doing.³³ She puts her arms down. The light has left her face, and she turns the back of her head to the camera and randomly but in a purposeful manner rolls down the car window. She looks back at her father and says she wants to put her head outside. She knows she needs to exit the condemnation of the structure moving her away from her mommy they left behind and the fundamental. Her father tells her no and the back of her head faces the camera again. She turns back around the camera shifts once from him to her, and her face is, then, in the light. She is looking at her daddy with part of her face blocked by the grey death color of the car seat. What is now behind Ponette that she wants to capture in her attempt to exit out the window is visible through the full view of the review mirror, which is seen through the now open window. This is a Rousseauian allusion to his philosophy on returning to the fundamental or essential nature of what once was before being developed into a state.³⁴ Now the light is on her head. She is

33. Ponette was dealing with, in her own manner, what she saw as a shocking truth, and her father could not comprehend her method of coping. It is an incapacity Rousseau understood well. As Müller writes: “Rousseau constructed childhood as a space of freedom in which a child learned to react to unspecified and unpredictable challenges and opportunities and was prepared and able to identify one day with highly specific social purposes as an individual. Children should be allowed to develop free from adults’ interventions with nature’s ways. The root of all difficulties with child rearing and the subsequent problems lay in adult behavior” (81).

34. “Let us consider what can be done on the basis of what has been done. I shall not speak of the ancient republics of Greece; but the Roman Republic, it seems to me, was a large State, and the town of Rome a large town. The last Census gave Rome four hundred thousand Citizens bearing arms, and the last count of the Empire showed more than four million Citizens, not counting subjects, foreigners, women, children, slaves” (*Contract* 189).

wearing a black head band. She has moved quickly away from her totally innocent individual past and her head is wrapped in the void of it. She brings her baby doll to her mouth as she goes into the shadow, although her head is slightly lit. She tells her father, “If you went slower, I could do it”. She puts her head out the window in order to capture her innocence. Her face begins to light up. Her father responds with no regard to her feelings, “I could go even faster but I’m careful”. Searching for childhood comfort, she looks down and rubs her baby doll against her nose. Her profile is lit. Her father says, “I didn’t buckle you in so you see what it means to be careful”. Her face goes into the shadow, and she looks down as her father says, “not like your stupid mother”. He has insulted the bond/contract Ponette has to her individual nature by insulting her mom. Her face goes back into the light as she looks up at her father again. Her left profile and only the top of her head is in the light and the top of her shoulders are visible. She defends her mom by saying, “she is not stupid”. This is also the way Ponette feels her father views her individuality, so in defending her mom she is defending herself. The camera is back on her father and the right side of Ponette’s face. He glances at her and says, “Was I driving?”. He doesn’t consider how he is driving his daughter from the fundamental, individual nature that will allow her to cope with the tragedy of her mom’s death, nor is he considering how he is violating her innocence with his insults. He looks back to the road. The camera shifts back to Ponette, left profile and the right side of her face lit. The windshield is white with a heavenly light behind her, a metaphor for the loss of her individual, fundamental, God- given nature, and she is looking up to her father. We see her shoulders as her father explains that her mom, “... wasn’t drunk”. The camera shifts back to him. He is looking left and the light is on the back of his head.

All three works, with their child-adult themes, support a Rousseauian philosophy of resurrecting and maintaining man's fundamental, individual nature in a developing Civil State. The child was chosen to symbolize said nature due to it being the least removed from the creator's mold. The above works all serve the purpose of teaching an undeveloped Civil State to develop and grow up through embracing and continually resurrecting said fundamental nature. If the opposite occurs, the Civil State will improperly develop and fail.

CHAPTER 5

SELF TYRANNY

France's decadent and aesthetic movement of the 1900's introduced two prominent writers, J.K. Huysmans and Marcel Proust, whose novels influenced modern day cinema.³⁵ Huysmans and Proust seemed to be fatalistic, and this fatalistic view was evident through the development of their characters, Swann and Des Esseintes. The two authors seemed to promote a perversion of Rousseauian philosophy on man's fundamental individual nature. This legacy of perversion in Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu*, and Huysmans', *À Rebours*, is reflected in the film adaptation, *Swann in Love*, directed by Volker Schlöndorff, an interpretation of the Proust's work of fiction. The fatalistic view is one of extremity where man's existence relies too

35. Landy offers an insightful description of the Proustian fracturing of the self which would become a key theme in film: "In his monumental novel, Marcel Proust sets himself an equally monumental task: to extract unity from a Self which is not multiple but, so to speak, doubly multiple. Bringing together two strands of philosophical – psychological inquiry, Proust suggests that each individual is fractured both synchronically, into a set of faculties or drives, and diachronically, into a series of distinct organizations and orientations of those faculties or drives, varying according to the phase of life (or even the time of day). He thus places his narrator, and indeed his reader, in a dual predicament. Not only do we change over time, he implies, so that it is difficult to pinpoint a common factor which would grant us the "personal identity" we seek (a term made popular by Locke, Hume, and their followers), but we cannot achieve unanimity within ourselves at any given moment" (91).

much on either the perversion of a Rousseauian fundamental individual nature-based state of being, thereby becoming, “self” obsession, or on man’s extreme reliance on conformity to a social state of being. The character Swann’s decadent, self-comforting lifestyle and his extreme individual, self-obsession resemble that of Des Esseintes, a decadent character in the novel Huysmans novel, *A Rebours*. Des Esseintes isolates himself totally from society, as Swann does. He sets his life, like Swann, as an experiment with a perverted, *amour propre* hypothesis of completely capturing his fundamental individual nature and self identity through the obsession to possess and methodically control his, “self”. The character of Swann is parallel to Des Esseintes in the mad rage and illness produced as consequence of their extreme attempts to preserve their perversion of the Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature. The illness is described in the Huysmans novel as follows:

In a state of irritable unease, filled with indignation by the triviality of the ideas he heard exchanged and accepted, he became like those people described by Nicole, who hurt all over; he began incessantly excoriating his too-thin skin, he began to suffer from the jingoistic and social nonsense asseverated each morning in the newspapers, and to exaggerate, in his own mind, the extent of the success that an all-powerful public invariably and inevitably accords works written without either ideas or style. Already he was dreaming of a peaceful, civilized retreat, a comfortable desert, a snug, immovable ark where he could take refuge, far from the incessant deluge of human folly. (7)

Proust, Rousseau, and Huysmans all portray two extreme examples of death and destruction. Portrayed are man’s fundamental, individual nature turned to self obsession and self consumed by social/civil states of being. Rousseau contested that the two states of being,

existing solely and extremely, are unstable, uncertain, and fatal, and only act in a productive manner when combined into an equal and just union. Proust's characters, within the film, never find the happy and equally balanced union that Rousseau believed possible. The Proustian film's characters portray the extreme consequence of the two states living as separate and unnatural entities. Swann is extremely driven by his view of what man's fundamental individual nature should be, while those around him are too driven by their society-filtered judgment of the person Swann truly is. Swann wishes to obtain a balance between the two states, but is solely driven to the extreme by his unnatural obsession to possess his self and his inability to truly capture and coexist within a state of both individuality and social conformity. Like Proust's novel, Rousseau's *The Social Contract* presents the entities and consequences of the unequally yoked, failed, marriage of man's fundamental individual nature to various civil states of being. Rousseau explains that the extreme fatal consequence, of humans perpetually being born into chains, is due to their incapacity to maintain a non-extremist balance between the two aforementioned states of being.

In the film and novel, Swann suffers from madness. Again, this madness is due to his extreme focus and desire to preserve/posses a fundamental individual nature that he has perverted. The characters, surrounding Swann simultaneously suffer madness due their extreme bond to civil conformity. Rousseau speaks out against the extreme isolation and perversion of the two opposing states of being, both civil and fundamental. The extreme Swann is an ethnically Jewish, French-Catholic, aristocrat who struggles within his unbalanced existence. The isolation and perversion of Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature stems from his effort to survive in a world rejecting it, a world of solely aristocratic existence and prejudice. Swann's fundamental individual nature and Jewish identity are forcefully taken from him by societal

acceptance of an unbalance between self and civility. Driving him to further perversion and madness are the mere enlightening glimpses he receives of his fundamental, individual nature and the potential of the freedom within it. The uncertainty, in trying to make certain of the preservation and possession of his fundamental, individual nature, adds to the aforementioned constant perversion of said nature and drains the life from him. The perverted, “relation” Swann has to his fundamental individual nature and the aforementioned ironic need to rid himself of it, for society’s sake, are exemplified by his obsessive and mad effort to possess and rid himself of the woman prostitute, Odette. Each time she is in his presence and about to submit to his whims, he obsessively questions her past and takes hold of what he imagines her identity to have been and to presently be. He accuses her, in his enraged, imaginative, and extreme state of being to be a liar. He is correct in his accusations only due to the fact that she sells herself to everyone she has, “prostituted” to. His extreme enragement over what he imagines her nature to be and his desire to possess and control what he imagines in relation to her true and questionable fundamental nature, causes him to push away her offers of what could potentially become a productive union. Swann once again parallels Des Esseintes, whose efforts also fail:

One passion only, the passion for women, might have restrained him in this universal contempt that was gnawing at him, but that passion was too spent. He had tasted the feasts of the flesh, with the appetite of a capricious man who suffers from malaria, who is beset by pangs of desire yet whose palate rapidly grows dull and surfeited; in the days when he consorted with so-called country gentlemen, he had attended those long-drawn-out suppers where, at the dessert stage, drunken women unhook their gowns and bang their heads on the table; he had also frequented theatrical dressing-rooms, sampled actresses and singers, and had to

endure, over and above the innate stupidity of woman, the frenzied vanity of third-rate performers; then he had kept women who were already celebrated whores, contributing to the prosperity of those agencies which provide questionable pleasures in exchange for money; in the end, sated and weary of this unvarying profusion, of these identical caresses, he had plunged down in among the dregs of society, hoping to revive his desires by contrast, and thinking to arouse his dormant senses with the provocative squalor of extreme poverty.

(Huysmans 7)

Odette is far too unified with her individual marriage to social conformity to have a successful union to Swann, who is dying at the end of the film when they marry. Like the extravagance of the women mentioned in the above quotation, as well as her own life as a prostitute, Odette conforms by selling her fundamental individual physical human nature, the human body, and her spiritual nature to the client who can best provide the monetary needs and social status she longs for. Swann, due to his unbalanced nature, can never have a successful union with her need for civil extravagance and unbalanced nature, and he calls, in the film *Swann in Love*, the impossible chase for it, “an illness that has reached the stage where it cannot be removed without destroying it” (Gaumont, 1984). Swann also tires of his relationship with Odette and experiences, like Des Esseintes, an incurable, “illness”:

The doctors he consulted frightened him. It was time to call a halt to this life-style, to give up these practices which were exhausting his vitality. For a while he lived quietly, but before long inflammation of the cerebellum set it and once again goaded him to action. In the same way that pubescent girls hanker after tainted or revolting food, he began to dream of, then to indulge in, bizarre sexual practices

and deviant pleasures; this marked the end; as though satisfied at having exhausted every possibility, as though worn out with the strain, his senses were overpowered by inertia, and impotence was close at hand. (Huysmans 8)

Swann and Odette are slaves to their extreme states of being, like Des Esseintes in the passage quoted above. Swann's extreme failure but perpetual quest to possess and enslave Odette's and his own fundamental individual nature and the weakness it causes can be illuminated by the following Rousseau quotation:

With regard to the right of conquest, it has no basis other than the law of the strongest. If war does not give the victor the right to massacre the vanquished peoples, this right he does not have cannot establish the right to enslave them. One only has the right to kill the enemy when he cannot be made a slave. The right to make him a slave does not come, then, from the right to kill him. It is therefore an iniquitous exchange to make him buy his life, over which one has no right, at the cost of his freedom. By establishing the right of life and death on the right of slavery, and the right of slavery on the right of life and death, isn't it clear that one falls into a vicious circle? (*Contract* 136)

The extreme isolation of his perverted fundamental, individual nature begins to kill Swann at the end of the novel. This isolation is demonstrated in Des Esseintes' extremely self structured home. The obsessive connection he has to the precise color of objects, reflecting the spectrum of his individual self, is the same connection Swann has to the placement of self reflective objects in his house, objects he caresses and touches. Odette comments at one point on his non conformist choice in furniture which reflects Swann's unique taste. This extreme existence and

perversion of man's fundamental, individual nature for both characters is exactly portrayed in the following excerpt from Huysmans' novel:

And yet how thorough had been the researches he had undertaken, how deeply had he reflected, before entrusting his home to the decorators!

He had long been expert in distinguishing between genuine and deceptive shades of color. In the past, in the days when he received women in his apartments, he had designed a bedroom, where, amid the small pieces of furniture, carved in pale Japanese camphor wood, beneath a sort of canopy of pink Indian satin, women's bodies took on a soft blush under the artfully prepared lighting that filtered through the lighting.

This bedroom, where mirrors mirrored one another and reflected an infinite number of pink boudoirs on the walls, had been celebrated among the prostitutes, who loved to soak their nakedness in this bath of rosy warmth, perfumed by the minty aroma coming from the wood of the furniture.

But, even aside from the benefits of that artificial atmosphere, which seemed to transfuse fresh blood into complexions faded and worn from constant use of makeup and from misspent nights, he felt, in that languorous environment, special pleasures on his own account, pleasures made keener and in a sense energized by memories of past afflictions, of vanished troubles. (10)

Indicative of the sleep or hypnotic state of perverted extreme self isolation Swann has entered into, Swann does his writing while in his uniquely chosen bed. Swann's unique choice of an antique bed reflects his individual taste. This isolated, hypnotic, behavior of writing is juxtaposed, in the film, to his servant's behavior of simultaneously opening the window beside

Swann's bed. The freedom connected to the window is juxtaposed to the static nature of the bed. This is evidence of Swann's desperation but doomed effort to preserve man's fundamental individual nature. Like Huysmans, Swann has perverted his fundamental essence by unnaturally transforming it. Swann's "bed ridden", *mal à l'aise* writings speak of his obsessive chasing after Odette which also alludes to his own extreme obsession to possess his own fundamental, individual nature. In the bed ridden or static state of self expression, his unbalanced devotion to the perversion of the fundamental is clear when he states in the film *Swann in Love*, "I sacrifice my work, my pleasures, my friends, my whole life to waiting for a daily rendezvous with Odette" (1984, Gaumont). In his "death" bed, Swann writes a book, meant to enlighten others, but has a total focus on his own personal woes in reference to his possessive chase. Once he starts to prepare himself to go out and face the public eye, he works to make certain his defenses are up and his self is meticulously preserved.

Des Esseintes have the same meticulous methods of self preservation. Swann looks through three mirrors resembling the portal windows of a boat. He first looks to the center window, confirming his *amour propre*, perverted sense of fundamental, individual nature as the center of the, "boat" known as life. Des Esseintes has an entire room made to look like a boat, "This dining-room resembled a ship's cabin with its vaulted ceiling its semicircular beams, its bulk heads and floorboards of pitch-pine, its tiny casement cut into the paneling like a porthole." (Huysmans 17). Swann glances to the right portal. It is as if, in the portal, the image of his individual "self" gives him the total gratification, security and certainty. He meticulously grooms himself in front of the mirror, putting all hairs in place and overly admiring his perfected self experiment. The perverted control he has over his fundamental individual nature enables his

rage and his obsession with Odette along with Swann's illusion in society's acceptance of his Jewish race.

Swann has no true control, nor possession, over societal and cultural thought no matter how extreme the focus on his individual nature becomes. Despite his false certainty, Swann cannot possess, like his desire to possess Odette, societal thought. In the extreme despair of the impotence he experiences, due to his extreme self obsession and desire for possession, Swann is aware that he is ill and says in *Swann in Love* that, "as surgeons say it's inoperable" (Gaumont, 1984). The desire for the extreme maintenance of his fundamental, individual nature and the servitude it places others under is evident when his servant brushes off his suit while Swann stands in a very austere and statuesque fashion. Swann does not wish any outside force to disturb his scientifically and methodically orchestrated individual appearance nor does he wish any outside force to inhibit the security he finds within. Swann feels his suit or individual nature must not be disturbed just as Proust's Marcel didn't want the rays of a magic lantern disrupting the familiarity and security of his bedroom:

But my sorrows were only increased thereby, because this mere change of lighting was enough to destroy the familiar impression I had of my room, thanks to which, save for the torture of going to bed, it had become quite endurable. Now I no longer recognized it, and felt uneasy in it, as in a room in some hotel or chalet, in a place where I had just arrived by train for the first time. (Proust 8)

As previously mentioned, as Swann methodically dresses himself, every hair of his brow and mustache are put into a, "certain" place. Again, this certainty serves as a form of extreme self preservation. In the midst of societal insecurity due to the anti- Semitic sentiment of the period, Swann feels an urge to fight and preserve what he feared losing to societal prejudice which stood

in the way of how he felt he wanted to live and to openly express his fundamental individual nature. While Swann's servant catered to his extremely methodical dressing ritual, Swann has his servant carefully and without disrupting a perfected hair on his head pull a crisply ironed white shirt over his master's head. Des Esseintes methodical behavior was parallel to Swann's:

He acquired a reputation for eccentricity, to which he gave the crowning touch by dressing in suits of white velvet and gold embroidered waistcoats, with, in place of a cravat, a bunch of Parma violets set low in the open neck of the shirt. He used also to host dinners for writers which caused quite a stir, one in particular, a copy of an eighteenth-century feast when, to celebrate the most trifling of misadventures, he organized a funerary collation. (Huysmans 11)

As Swann lifts his arms, one of them taps the chandelier hanging above his head as if to signal the knowledge or momentary enlightenment of the extreme constraints he has put on his own potentially pure and free existence of fundamental, individual self. Proust often writes on these momentary glimpses of self in terms of light projecting on familiar objects. However, the light's projection causes uncertainty in its disturbance of the methodically created certainty and static nature. Both young Marcel, through his room, and Swann, through his methodical habits, experience this uncertainty. Projections of light also serve to reveal the extreme nature of a self wishing to exist alone and disturb the purity of the essential self or fundamental individuality wishing to be supported. The teasing glimpses of an unattainable free self and the revelation of self extremity create unsettling and uncertain sentiments or as Proust describes them below as "gusts":

These shifting and confused gusts of memory never lasted for more than a few seconds; it often happened that, in my brief spell of uncertainty as to where I was,

I did not distinguish the various suppositions of which it was composed any more than, when we watch a horse running, we isolate the successive positions of its body as they appear upon a bioscope. But I had seen first one and then another of the rooms in which I had slept during my life, and in the end I would revisit them all in the long course of my waking dream: rooms in winter, where on going to bed I would at once bury my head in a nest woven out of the most diverse materials. (6)

Throughout the film and in the midst of the continual contrasting to a fundamental, individual nature at war with the extreme societal prison, Swann is often cathartically reminded by music of the fundamental, individual nature, that indeed he is losing in his perversion of it and that he is fearing to lose. In this extreme cathartic state, he acts under public eye and scrutiny, extremely disturbed. This perpetuates the extreme separation between his fundamental individual nature and society. Swann's noticeably disturbed behavior makes him the topic of other's gossip, the gossip, itself, existing as a sort of prison. Societal obstacles, such as the gossipy, presumptuously dressed women, perpetuate Swann's extreme self preservation and disturbed behavior. The same is true for Des Esseintes, "Des Esseintes was filled with an immense weariness by their excesses, which struck him as petty and facile, pursued with no discrimination, with no feverish involvement, with no genuine, intense excitement of blood and nerves" (Huysmans 7). The superficiality of the social circle engulfing and perpetuating Swann's extreme measures of preserving his fundamental individual nature is also made evident by the loud announcement of each individual aristocrat entering the concerto hall where he visits with Swann's Marquis, aristocratic, French-Catholic friend. As each aristocrat is called and makes their royal presence clear by a nod of the head or smug smile, it is clear that the aristocrats

live according to the societal standards expected of them and of their royal titles. Swann is enraged and further works to preserve his fundamental individual nature due to the aristocratic arrogant attitude, an attitude that as a high societal class the aristocrats somehow exist in a state above better than their own said natures. Enforcing the arrogance place on Swann as he is in the public eye, an attendant, at the concerto hall where Swann and Meme are about to enter, tells them they must wait until the concerto is finished. Meme pokes the attendant's nose and says in *Swann in Love* "that nose", as if telling the attendant that he needs to get his nose out of the air and become a bit more individually grounded (Gaumont, 1984). Meme's commentary on women's presumptuous and flowery attire also paints a clearer portrait of their societal superficial existence that has moved and is moving away from their fundamental, individual human nature, "do women wear flowers these days?" In relation to this, Rousseau represents the transition as necessary and inevitable:

I assume that men have reached the point where obstacles to their self-preservation in the state of nature prevail by their resistance over the forces each individual can use to maintain himself in the state. Then that primitive state can no longer subsist and the human race would perish if it did not change its manner of living. (*Contract* 138)

Swann is aware of the extremity of his perverted fundamental, individual self obsession and the effects it is having on his being. He has the false hope that somehow he can rid himself of it. This is clear within the context of his relationship with Odette. He indicates to Meme that he is already tiring of his time in bed with Odette. Swann is pushing closer to his mortal demise and tries to fight it with false hope. The outward illusion of hope is attached to the word, in the film *Swann in Love*, "ravishing", used by Meme. This aesthetic word, ravishing, is juxtaposed to

the, “ugly” reality of Swann’s obsession. Swann states, “I am becoming less attached to her... I am making progress... It’s strange sometimes I even find her ugly”. Meme responds, “but last night she was ravishing” (Gaumont, 1984). Confirming the contrast between Odette’s obsession with conformity and Swann’s obsession with individuality along with Odette’s total denial of fundamental individual identity and nature, Swann asks Meme if Meme has slept with Odette. Meme states, “not that I know of”. His statement has ironic validity. Who is Odette, other than one who has conformed to everyone else? She has slept with thereby becoming what the aristocrats wish her to be? The idea of her sleeping with various people, including Swann’s friend and conforming to them demonstrates the prostitution between her fundamental individual nature and a pretentious civil society and state of being. Swann had at first thought that his, “being” with Odette would lead to her loving only him, as he loves himself. But the perversion of their contractual sexual relationship reflects the impossibility of their unified coexistence. Rousseau’s description of the contract is illuminated in this context:

The clauses of this contract are so completely determined by the nature of the act that the slightest modification would render them null and void. So that although they may never have been formally pronounced, they are everywhere the same, everywhere tacitly accepted and recognized, until the social compact is violated, at which point each man recovers his original rights and resumes his natural freedom, thereby losing the conventional freedom for which he renounced it.

(*Contract* 138)

Swann’s aristocratic social acquaintance, Oriane, in the film *Swann in love*, seems to scoff at Swann’s hint of desire for an existence independent of the social context. She seems to hold the view that fundamental individuality makes one weak. She tells Swann, “If you were 20

years older and had a weak bladder I'd understand" (Gaumont, 1984). She views his extreme perpetuated self-suffering as a needless weakness easily avoided if one becomes subservient to civil custom. Her happiness is found in her extreme servitude and subjection; however her character ends up being abused and exploited by the one who ultimately turns her into his subject, Bazin her future husband. In expressing her supposed need for servitude and subjection to the customary and constant civil state of being, opposite to Swann's subjection to his own extreme emotional fluctuation due to an obsession with his fundamental individual nature, Oriane states, as Swann goes to pull a chair out for her at the music recital that they are about to witness, "The footstool is just what I need It'll make me sit up straight". Oriane rebels against the emotional uncertainty and instability which comes from an existence relying solely on the obsessed caused perversion of the fundamental individual nature of man. It is for this reason that Rousseau promotes a balance between the social and self centered states and not complete subjectivity to either. As Oriane and Swann are listening to the music playing, Oriane scoffingly comments on a spectator's body movement which coincides with the music. This proves that Oriane views all individuality as disturbing her false sense of peace which her customary behavior affords her and upon which she rests. In contrast, Swann points out, in the film's original French dialogue, that the emotionally moved woman has soul in her. His words are as follows, "She has music in her".

Swann in Love, the film interpretation, of the Huysmans and Proust decadent works demonstrates the need for a Rousseauian balance between man's fundamental individual nature and the Civil State. The film's characters like the decadent novel's characters progressively

digress through what becomes their own self preservation and isolation. Man's fundamental individual nature or self becomes tyrannical in the unbalanced relationship it has within its resistance to the Civil State.

CHAPTER 6

THE IRONIC INDIVIDUAL POET/ CIVIL ARTIST

Rousseau relates the human at the time of and thereafter its point of Godly creation, as becoming corrupted by the secular and unnatural world which exists outside it and consumes it. Jean Cocteau defines the secular and unnatural as untruthful forms of expression. Cocteau reflects the above Rousseauian philosophy in his *Orphic Trilogy* and principally in the series' film *The Blood of a Poet*. Each of Cocteau's Orphic films, in the way he chooses to portray the above idea through varying predominant elements, reflects a wayward journey of corruption along with an alternative path to redemption.

The predominant element in *The Blood of a Poet* is imagery.³⁶ It is very similar in its construction to Cocteau's three plays: *Antigone*, *Les Mariées de la tour Eiffel*, and *Les Chevaliers de la table ronde*. Cocteau's principal character in *The Blood of a Poet* is the poet/artist. The poet/ artist starts to transform into and eventually becomes the untruthful image, of what he is drawing at the beginning of the film. It is an untruthful, secular image of man set

36. Cocteau's film narrative takes on the following deconstructive approach, "The really crucial questions arise from the unique symbiosis that determines the very nature of the genre itself: "compenetration" of two otherwise distinct media of artistic expression. Where and how does the verbal component intersect and interact with the musical component? How do the formerly independent parts relate to the integral whole? And how does the act of conjoining word and tone affect the subsequent fate of poetry and music as independent art forms?" (Hoffenmeister 129)

in stone, a statue. The created image of a statuesque human takes on an existence separate from the human poet/artist who created it. In creating the statuesque human on the path to becoming a statue, the poet/artist sacrifices his human blood. His statuesque image consumes his human blood thereby eternally wounding and scarring his being. The process of wounding and scarring furthered despair in the poet/ artist until he was unaware of human mortality. Cocteau states, at the beginning of the film:

Every poem is a coat of arms it must be deciphered how much blood, how many tears in exchange for these axes, these muzzles, these unicorns, these torches, these towers, these martlets, these seedlings of stars, and these fields of blue. [the door knob turns] free to choose the faces, the shapes, the gesture, the tones, the acts, the places that please him. He composes with them a realistic documentary of unreal events. The musician will underline the noises and the silences. (Charles de Noailles 1930)

The breaking of the coat of arms that protected the poet/artist from complete self individual sacrifice, furthered the image's separate existence from the truth of what the poet artist, once was. The break took him from his own individuality, or fundamental, individual nature, and from God himself. This Cocteauian state of existence represents the antithesis of the existence that God truly intended for man. Cocteau's film unveils an untruthful expression and representation of man's Godly fundamental nature. He does so as to protest artistic and poetic untruthful expression. In *The Blood of a Poet*, Cocteau's human poet/artist creates and therefore becomes a statue, a truth- perverted form of expression which contradicts man's God given

fundamental, individual nature. In this film, Cocteau, therefore alludes to Rousseau and the tragic existence and non-existence of the statue of Glaucus.³⁷

At the beginning of the film, a door knob turns and a smoke stack falls. The poet/ artist is looking at a wire bust made to resemble a cage. He is standing behind a transparent canvas and actively and freely draws. The poet/artist is wearing a powdered wig. His back is visible. Imprinted on his back is the Star of David, a symbol of existing as one of God's people. An image of a falling smoke stack appears on screen. The falling smoke stack acts as an explanation of consequence. It represents a fallen man. It is a tumbling man-made structure, burning the fundamental, and emitting, in its hellish destruction, a smoky cloud of what it once contained. Emission becomes omission, the poetic and artistic quality of man protested by Cocteau. The vain worship of the tower's power to emit makes the structure appear strong. This illusionary worship becomes, "habit", it being easier to except the powerful appearance of the stacked structure, rather than attempt to dismantle it in order to reach the truth burning inside. The truth and purpose giving fundamental, inside the stack, is forgotten, and the now worthless structure tumbles. Rousseau stated that the fundamental, which gives truth and purpose, becomes subject to its structure:

The Philosophers who have examined the foundations of society have all felt the necessity of going back to the state of Nature, but none of them has reached it.

Some have not hesitated to attribute to Man in that state the notion of the Just and

Unjust, without troubling themselves to show that he had to have that notion or

37. "Like the statue of Glaucus, which time, sea, and storms had so disfigured that it looked less like a God than a wild Beast, the human soul, altered in the bosom of society by a thousand continually renewed causes..." (*Discourse* 12).

even that it was useful to him. Others have spoken of the Natural Right that everyone has to preserve what belongs to him, without explaining what they meant by belong. Still others, giving the stronger authority over the weaker from the first, have forthwith made Government arise, without thinking of the time that must have elapsed before the meaning of the words “authority” and “government” could exist among Men. All of them, finally, speaking continually of need, avarice, oppression, desires, and pride, have carried over to the state of Nature ideas they had acquired in society. (*Discourse* 18-19)

The poet/artist looks to a cage- like bust, hung at his right. The caged bust models the image being drawn on his canvas. The artist’s right hand begins to form the unnatural lines of the image, the lines of a man. As the poet/artist creates the cage-like image on his canvas, the image begins to engross and encage him. The cage model is representative of what the poet/artist will become in the vain embodiment of his creation. He becomes prisoner to his glorification of the image and in doing so gives power to the image. His gloved right hand, furthering the human disconnect to his work, is sacrificed to the creation of the image, and his body will become its subject as well. The poet/artist is an aristocratic subject, wearing a powdered wig. His entire human, having been wounded, and his God-given fundamental, individual nature have been given up to an image. Consequently, a visible scar along with the star of David is imprinted on his back. The star is wounded, a bullet hole through its center, by the poet’s self sacrifice to the image. The star, before its secular scarring, was God’s fundamental imprint on the poet/artist. However, also occurring in war, the poet/artist’s engrossment in the glory of his creation and in his self destruction separated his being from the fundamental. Soon to be imprinted with his

image, the poet/artist no longer belonged to a family of mankind, a family created by God not by idolatry. Rousseau mentions this idea of family in his *Social Contract*:

The family is therefore, if you wish, the first model of political societies. The leader is the image of the father, the people are the image of the children; and since all are born equal and free, they only alienate their freedom for their utility. The entire difference is that in the family, the father's love for his children rewards him for the care he provides; whereas in the state, the pleasure of commanding substitutes for this love, which the leader does not have for his people. (132)

Due to the poet/artist's disconnect to his fundamental individual human nature, God's imprint of the Star of David is replaced by its antithesis, the communist symbol of a star worn on his belt. Rousseau protested, through Grotius' denial of the benefit government should have upon the individual, the idea of a solely communal existence in the following passage:

Grotius denies that all human power is established for the benefit of those who are governed. He cites slavery as an example. His most persistent mode of reasoning is always to establish right by fact. One could use a more consistent method, but not one more favorable to Tyrants. (132)

As the poet/artist continues his creation, he removes the glove from his right hand. In doing so, the mouth of the image he has drawn begins to speak. In his self sacrifice to the image, he has given it life. He frantically attempts to erase the mouth, using his ungloved right hand. Having heard knocking on his door, he allows an aristocratic, 17th century, man to enter his room. In an almost Proustian allusion to the room as self, the poet/artist permitted the bombardment of this sacred space by that which is fundamentally foreign and secular to it. The aristocratic man

makes an appearance and impression on the sacred individual space of the poet/artist, and then runs away. His impression on the poet/artist causes the caged bust to spin rapidly, as if out of control, against an abyss of ominous darkness. The ominous becomes reality as the poet/artist's human fundamental, individual right hand transforms into the image's commanding mouth. Trying to wash himself clean of the image's fatal secular imprint, the poet places his hands in a bath of water, but the mouth only swallows the water it will later spit out, and the poet/artist is condemned by the image he created.

The image has now imprinted and mortally wounded the poet/artist. The Pilot's right hand has been crucified by the sinful secular image he created. The crucifixion seems to allude to Christ's crucifixion carried out by the secular Roman State's leader Pontius Pilot. Having removed his hands from the water, he stares horridly at his right hand, no longer his own. He attempts escape by turning the door knob with his left hand. The door won't open, and he is condemned to his possessed room and state of being. These words appear on screen, in The Blood of a Poet, enforcing the condemning path yet to come for the poet/artist, "Taken out of a portrait where the naked hand had contracted it like leprosy, the drowned mouth seemed to fade in a small pool of white light" (Charles de Noailles, 1930).³⁸ This is an allusion to the

38. The naked hand seems to represent the natural equality that is lost in the following explanation of Rousseauian philosophy, "Rousseau presents hypocritical behavior, though not itself the source of all evil, as the first effect of that inequality which is the source of all evil in human affairs. Where there is hypocrisy, human beings have been corrupted. Much of Rousseau's writing is devoted to developing portraits of innocence, virtue, and integrity that form the counterpoints to his scathing critique of the corruption, flattery, and hypocrisy that infected the social and political life of his age" (Grant 57).

Rousseauian philosophy that knowledge, light, corrupts by imprinting itself upon the fundamental. A powdered white statue appears in the room, a cultural monument to the poet/artist's glorious achievement and condemnation of the fundamental. An illuminated right hand against a black abyss appears on screen. A halo of light encircles the mouth imprinted upon the hand. The light signifies the corrupting knowledge to be imparted upon the poet/artist. The mouth opens and spits out the water that had entered the wounded hand. The poet/artist poses his body in order to emulate the monumental statue, as light from a window behind illuminates his being. His being is subject to the monument, the monument having been erected like the smoke stack upon his fundamental being. The poet/artist sits at a table obsessed with the mouth imprinted upon his hand. Being subject to the loss of his individual freedom, as symbolized by the communist star now visible on his belt, he gets up and violently tries to shake the mouth off his right hand. He shakes his hand in a military, marching fashion. His entire fundamental being is now under the complete and ever worsening control of the monumental image he has created. It subjects his fundamental, individual being to its antithesis, a communistic control and command. The once individually free poet/artist has become an obedient subject. Rousseau explains the concept of the above by the use of the words mass, obey, force, and effect. As the poet/artist obeys the mouth imprinted upon his right hand, by force, the force becomes stronger and the effect on his fundamental being is apparent in his violent actions. The poet/artist acts out trying to overcome the force upon him. He tries, in the words of Rousseau, "Yielding to force as an act of necessity" (*Contract* 133). However, the poet/artist is subject by his drive, by force to obey, "If it is necessary to obey by force, one need not obey by duty..." (133). The arbitrary nature of the mouth's command over the poet/artist abolishes fundamental truth. The poet's natural human right becomes subject to that which wrongs it. In *The Blood of a Poet*, the

abolishment, of being subject to fundamental truth, and becoming obedient to the monument of truth's image is evident through the command the monument subjects the poet to, "de l'air" (Charles Noailles, 1930). Air is transparent, it moves with force but one can see no alleged "right" through it. Rousseau states:

Let us suppose this alleged right for a moment. I say that what comes of it is nothing but inexplicable confusion. For as soon as force makes right, the effect changes along with the cause. Any force that overcomes the first one succeeds to its right. As soon as one can disobey without punishment, one can do so legitimately, and since the strongest is always right, the only thing to do is to make oneself the strongest. But what is a right that perishes when force ceases? If it is necessary to obey by force, one need not obey by duty, and if one is no longer forced obey, one is no longer obligated to do so. It is apparent, then, that this word right adds nothing to force. Here it signifies nothing at all. (*Contract* 133-134)

The poet/artist of *Blood of a Poet*, once able to create from a subject is now a subject model to the creation of arbitrary command and existence, "de l'air" (Charles Noailles, 1930). He ceases to exist, led on a right-handed path to find more air and emptiness. This emptiness is depicted, in the above Rousseau quotation, through the word nothing, "It is apparent, then, that this word right adds nothing to force. Here it signifies nothing at all" (*Contract* 134). The poet/artist begins his journey on the perverted right path, moving from the table to the bedroom. He sits on the bed. With its continual command for air the mouth imprints upon the poet/artist's right hand begins to push him forward on the perverted path to non fundamental existence. The poet artist stands up and brings the mouth to his ear. As he puts the mouth to his ear, his monumental lack

of fundamental existence manifests itself in the form of a statue commemorating his desire to but inability to disobey the arbitrary commands of the mouth. The monumental stone image of the poet/artist is posed, right hand turned with the imprinted mouth away from his ear. Despite the monumental fundamental self sacrifice of the poet the mouth continues to command for air. On the path to the window, he attempts, with his available left hand, to turn the knob. He can't open it. Without the fundamental individual control of his right side he is incapacitated. Rousseau demonstrates the way the poet/artist's natural ability has been lost through his conformity to the image. Rousseau uses the domestication of animals to demonstrate this:

The horse, the Cat, the Bull, even the ass, are mostly taller and all have a more robust constitution, more vigor, more strength and courage in the forest than in our houses. They lose half of these advantages in becoming domesticated, and it might be said that all our cares to treat and feed these animals well end only in their degeneration. It is the same even for a man. In becoming sociable and a Slave he becomes weak, fearful, servile; and his soft effeminate way of life completes the enervation of both his strength and his courage. Let us add that between Savage and Domesticated conditions the difference from man to man must be still greater than that from beast to beast; for animal and man having been treated equally by Nature, all the commodities of which man gives himself more than the animals he tames are so many particular causes that make him degenerate more noticeably. (*Discourse 24*)

The incapacitating effect on the poet/artist's fundamental, individual capacity produces an unreal strength and ironically weak state of forced violence and anger. He kicks the window open with his right foot. But the arbitrary force of the image controls him. The poet/artist has become the

antithesis of the Rousseauian view on true strength rather than force in that only the fundamental, nature [of being] gives each man absolute power over all his members” (“Contract” 148). He places his right hand, mouth imprinted, out the window to give it air. Now made fearful by the arbitrary force of the image, he is paranoid and looks around suspiciously. Feeling suffocated by its force and in need of air, he embraces the mouth passionately furthering his reliance upon it. The poet/artist makes a fatal “compact” with the image crushing his will/desire to detach from it:

By the social compact we have given the body politic existence and life; the issue now is to give it movement and will through legislation. For the original act which forms and unites this body does not thereby determine anything about what it should do to preserve itself. (*Contract* 152)

After the embrace, the poet/artist looks now in a romantic drunken state. In this state he further suffocates his fundamental by grabbing his throat with his right hand and strangling his air way. His possessed hand then moves to his possessed heart. He consciously moves his right hand off his heart and to the right side of his empty hearted chest. The force of the image has rid the poet of his human heart and fundamental right. Rousseau states in relation to this forceful condition, “no man has a natural authority over his fellow, and force creates no right” (134). The poet/artist lies down, eyes closed. An image of human eyes is imprinted upon his eyelids. He has lost the natural capacity of his eyes, under the imprint, to see fundamental truth. The fundamental will now be perverted under the perception of the false eyes. Fundamental truth will remain unseen in its realistic form made secular by the false eyes perception. The poet/artist can be likened to the child in the Rousseauian narrative on adult perception and judgment that

condemn a child's natural response to external stimulus when he takes a bite of cold ice cream³⁹
Original/ fundamental existence of being manifests itself into a secular from that of a dark spinning mask. The dark mask mourns the loss of its fundamental objectivity, crying white thick tears. The star of David is painted on its forehead but appears against a dark abyss. The dark abyss is that of evil. The mask's once unblemished, white, fundamental interior is imprinted with the dark unnatural lined image drawn by the poet/artist. The fundamental Supreme perfection or, "innate"/ free will of man is now made into a mask, taken over by darkness:

The Supreme perfection of man is that he acts freely or voluntarily... The fact that we fall into error is a defect in the way we act, not a defect in our nature. The faults of subordinates may often be attributed to their masters, but never to God... God could have endowed our intellect with discernment so acute as to prevent our ever going wrong, we have no right to demand this of him... That there is freedom in our will, and that we have power in many cases to give or withhold our assent at will, is so evident that it must be counted among the first and most common notions that are innate in us. (Descartes 205-206)

Wearing the communist star on his belt, the poet/artist falls asleep, hand open, at the table. Next to him is his only source of light in the darkness, a lamp, filled with water. A statuesque right foot has been placed the poet/artist, signifying the, "force makes no right" path the poet/artist has embarked upon.⁴⁰ The forced perpetual embarking, of the poet/artist in The Blood of a Poet, into the abyss of no right, traps the need for him to exist "The sleeper seen from up close or the

39. See Rousseau's example of the child's reaction to the taste of cold ice cream on page 354 in *Emile*.

40. See Rousseau's *The Social Contract* 133-134.

surprises of photography or how I got caught in a trap by my own film” (Charles Noailles, 1930). A statue of the poet/artist appears. The right profile of the statue’s head is visible along with its arms. The arms are posed in the shape of a cross. The right hand is turned open, bearing the imprinted wound of secular imagery, that of the mouth that renounced the fundamental, individual freedom once in his possession. Rousseau speaks of this type of renunciation:

To renounce one’s freedom is to renounce one’s status as a man, the rights of humanity and even its duties. There is no possible compensation for anyone who renounces everything. Such a renunciation is incompatible with nature of man, and taking away all his freedom of will is taking away all morality from his actions. Finally, it is vain and contradictory convention to stipulate absolute authority on one side and on the other unlimited obedience. Isn’t it clear that one is in no way engaged toward a person from whom one has the right to demand everything, and doesn’t this condition alone- without equivalent and without exchange – entail the nullification of the act? For what right would my slave have against me, since all he has belongs to me, and his right being mine, my right against myself is a meaningless word? (*Contract* 135)

The statuesque head is sleeping. The mouth begins its renouncement as black eyes, that look like a dark abyss, open with a gaze frozen to the mouth. The poet/artist is sitting down. He is wounded. The scar of his renouncement is visible on his back. He stands, holding up his right hand. He remains in his dark bed chamber with the water filled lamp to his left. As he stands, an armless Venus- like white statue appears in front of him. She appears as he turns to the side. As a gesture of protection, he has posed his arms into the shape of a cross and has turned them toward her. He first examines his open right hand and then the lamp. He turns and faces the

statue. His arms still crossed, he ducks down, as if avoiding the bullet that had pierced his Star of David. He regards her, looking up at her while peering at the imprinted mouth on his right hand. The statue has taken possession of his arms, and he puts the imprinted mouth, on his right hand, forcefully to her mouth. Little by little his being is consumed by the idolatrous monumental nature of what he created. The poet/artist had attempted to be God. In his idolatrous creation he was unable to retain the sacred fundamental protection he desired. By, “force with no right” the poet/artists hand remains on the monument’s mouth, donating his human, life- blood to her (134). She awakens as the poet/artist’s, of The Blood of a Poet, veins are visible through his arms, “It has already proved dangerous... Is it not crazy to wake up statues so suddenly from their secular sleep?” (Charles Noailles, 1930). The poet/ artist human blood and fundamental nature have been consumed. He is sacrificed like a beast to the goddess-like monumental statue. Rousseau describes idolaters’ inhumane treatment of mankind, the people being treated as beasts:

As a herdsman’s nature is superior to that of his herd, so the shepherds of men, who are their leaders, are also superior in nature to their peoples The emperor Caligula reasoned thus, according to Philo, concluding rather well from this analogy that the kings were gods or that people were beasts. Caligula’s reasoning amounts to the same thing as that of Hobbes and Grotius. Before any of them, Aristotle too had said that men are naturally equal, but that some are born for slavery and others for domination. (*Contract* 133)

It is for this reason that the film bears the title: *The Blood of a Poet*. The human blood of the poet/artist no longer freely flows. Man was created for freedom but made/”born” a slave to secular knowledge and to a monumental world:

Aristotle was right, but he mistook the effect for the cause. Every man born slavery is born for slavery; nothing could be more certain. Slaves lose everything in their chains, even the desire to be rid of them. They love their servitude as the companions of Ulysses loved their brutishness. If they are slaves by nature, therefore, it is because there have been slaves contrary to nature. Force made the first slaves; their cowardice perpetuated them. (*Contract* 133)

Earlier he had written: “Man was/is born free and everywhere he is in chains” (131). In Rousseauian fashion, the monumental statue of *The Blood of a Poet*, states to the poet/artist, “Do you think that is simple to get rid of a wound to close the mouth of a wound” (Charles Noailles, 1930). She enforces the idea that secular creation breeds imprisonment of the fundamental. Looking into a mirror, one of the two objects in the dark chamber, the poet/artist realizes the impossibility of viewing his fundamental, individual reality. It is made impossible by the existence of the image reflecting back at him from the mirror. In his despair to see his fundamental reality, he grabs the mirror and looks into it. Standing in front of it, he turns around. Rather than the immersion of his fundamental being from the mirror’s possession, he plunges himself upon the monumental statue’s command, into the mirror. The monumental statue states: “there is only one way left you must go into the mirror and walk around”. She turns a blind eye to his actual being, keeping her eyes closed as she speaks, and affirming his secular enchainment: “I congratulate you ... you wrote that one could go into mirrors, and you didn’t believe it... try ...may as well try.” The poet/ artist’s entire body, except for his feet, is positioned away from the mirror. His right side is captured by the mirror’s reflection. His tight fisted right arm is posed as if in a cast. A chair appears to his right. He examines the chair, to the left of the mirror. He mounts the chair, right leg first. He postures himself as if he were an

ape in a marionette fashion and glances at the monumental statue. Under her control, he has become the sacrifice she consumed, that of a savage beast. As if blind, he turns from the mirror, able only to feel its surface with his left hand. In an allusion to the antithesis of Christ as man's shepherd and protector and to the movement away from fundamental shepherding, Rousseau contested that man's fundamental individual nature conforms to the manner in which it is shepherded.⁴¹ The monumental, statue goddess commands the poet/artist to, "try" and break through the image reflecting back at him. He stands on the ledge of the mirror, right leg first, face to face with the reflection of what he used to be. Face turned away from this reflection, he grasps the mirror's two sides, examining them. In appearance the mirror resembles a swimming pool. Sadly, rather than having the capacity to break the mirror thereby releasing its hold on his being, he is only able to dive in. With the chair beside the mirror, he splashes into the pool and further into his condemnation. Having submerged the poet/artist, the pool suddenly returns to its mirrored state. He is in the mirror's darkness. His torso is visibly lit. The camera moves away from his being as if he is swimming further and further into the dark abyss. He is now facing the camera, his body lit except for his feet. His arms are shielding his face. His fundamental, individual nature is now on the path to its ultimate death, and, therefore, his feet are in blackness. He removes his hands from his face, keeping his right hand open. The imprinted, secular image on his right hand is wounded, scarred and left as a hole of, "nothing" where his flesh once existed.

As we have seen, in the terms of Rousseau's work *The Social Contract*, the "right" creation of a State should have constituted a coexistence or compact between God's fundamental individual truth and man. Unity between the two, in turn, would have produced life.

41. See Rousseau's statement in *The Social Contract* (133) on herdsmen and their herd.

Experiencing the result of opposition to the above, the poet has condemned himself through his previous creation, the creation of a State which constituted a coexistence or compact between the secular and man. In consequence, this union, of the human poet/artist and non fundamental truth, produced and continues to produce, “nothing” but a mirror image of existence, the mirror image of man, all that remains standing, a mirror image that perpetually draws the poet/artist inside, engulfing and consuming his human flesh. Cocteau stated, “The inside of the mirror ended up” (Charles Noailles, 1930).

Dramatically reacting to his loss, the poet/artist is horrified, and the poet/artist’s state becomes one of folly. On his path of “no right” (*Contract* 134) he now approaches the *Hotel des folies dramatiques*. There is a corridor of four visible doors on the left wall. A black pair of shoes to the right of the first door is visible. In a scene reminiscent of Rousseau’s representation in *Emile* of the ills of an entirely secular and societal education, a young boy walks out from behind the wall at the end of the corridor. The young boy is wearing an adult man’s suit and hat. He looks to his right and then to his left. His child-like frame and, therefore, his fundamental individual nature have already taken on the society-driven appearance/image of a man. The boy knocks, on the second door, with his right hand and listens in, ear to the door. He holds a news paper, his secular education, under his left arm. He begins to speak an unrecognizable, semantically foreign language. This child has acquired language common to foreign trade, an Asian language. His child-like fundamental, individual being has become a commodity of the world market. He reads the paper looking down as he is walking. His entire being is engrossed in his reading, and like the poet’s flesh, the boy disappears after passing the black shoes the door’s threshold. The poet/artist’s back is now facing the camera. His body is scaling the wall.

This movement, from the fundamental to its antithesis, alludes to the Biblical narration of events surrounding the construction of the tower at Babel. Upon the secular, idolatrous nature of its creation and construction, the fundamental language of man is transformed. The God-given fundamental language, which once unified mankind and made recognition of the human individual possible, was lost due to man's towering secular incapacitation of it. Construction and expression of fundamental truth was lost to man's own selfish desire to monumentally commemorate this selfishness as power for the sake of his own glory, or as Rousseau would have it, *amour propre*. Condemned to the monumental tower he has created, the human poet/artist is forced to scale the corridor of his towering creation. Making a left full turn, with his body, he grasps the frame of the second door. Kneeling on his right knee, he peers into the keyhole. His left eye is covered by its white door knob. Knelt, he opens and closes his right hand, realizing his incapacity to hold the door knob. The consuming tower or corridor the poet/artist has built himself has a stronghold over him, and he bows down and is forced to submit to the idolatrous tower he has constructed.

In this perverted state of being, the poet/artist is only capable of glancing at truth, represented by the white door knob. Under the hold of the tower, he is unable to fulfill what he was fundamentally called to be a poet and artist, and, therefore, unable to express and be bothered by the devastating truth he is about to witness. The poet/artist is solely bothered by his inability to express with his own hand in his own manner and to his own glory that which he will witness. The black shoes remain to the left of the door. The poet/artist's right knee is knelt on the toe of the right shoe rendering the untied shoes useless. Powerless, he continues the arbitrary motion of opening and closing his right hand as he peers, through the key hole using his left eye. Furthering the narrowing capacity of his perception, he shifts his glance back to his right eye, his

peripheral vision shielded by his own human hands. Through his narrow, keyhole view, the poet/artist perceives a man foreign to himself. The man is wearing a Mexican sombrero. Four gun tips point at a foreign man as he stands, back opposing, an image of the sky. The poet/artist's disconnect to the Mexican's humanity is symbolized by his view of the bullet-hole, littered image of the sky. The poet/artist of *The Blood of a Poet*, glances at the image of the foreign man, blinded to the human about to be shot down. The man's hands are pointing down, clasped as if praying to a God who doesn't exist within the realm of the sky-like secular image. Guns are to his right side, and a tomb, alluding to what should be a Christ-like Resurrection, stands open to his left. Placed on top of the tomb is idolatrous statue, representing a deadly, secular incarnation of man. The guns shoot and bullets strike both the statue and the man in slow motion.

In his death, it is now apparent he is wearing a business suit along with his blanketed human, "right" shoulder. His is a human death turned, business transaction, "at dawn Mexico the trenches... [and] the boulevard Arago and a hotel room are all the same" (Charles de Noailles, 1930). The scene is re-played, enforcing the perpetuity/"declaration" of the secular war waged against a fundamental humanity. The perpetuity of the war scene comes from the fact that its subject, man, is not an enemy, but fundamentally a man that is the foundation block of the Civil State of being, which Rousseau describes in some detail:

This principle even conforms with the established maxims of all ages and with the constant practice of all civilized peoples. Declarations of war are not so much warnings to those in power as to their subjects. The foreigner – whether he be king, private individual, or people – who robs, kills, or imprisons subjects without declaring war on the prince, is not an enemy but brigand. Even in the midst of

war, a just prince may well seize everything in an enemy country that belongs to the public, but he respects the person and goods of private individuals. He respects rights on which his own are based. The end of war being the destruction of the enemy State, one has the right to kill its defenders as long as they are armed. But as soon as they lay down their arms and surrender, since they cease to be enemies or instruments of the enemy, they become simply men once again, and no longer has a right to their lives. (*Contract* 136)

The poet/ artist is forcefully lifted up, like a marionette. He is posed in the ballet position plié standing on his toes. His left hand grasps the door knob, and his body is positioned to the right of the door. In scaling the wall, on his voyage to the next door, the poet/artist is confronted with a framed ancient map. Before he gets to the door, he turns. His right hand, now possessed by force, stabs the ancient map's center where the fundamental Mesopotamian local of a "Pangean" land mass receives the blow. The poet/artist then arrives at the next door. A white cloth blocks the open space between the door and its threshold. The poet/artist peers through the door's key-hole. The words, "the mysteries of China" appear on screen (Charles de Noailles, 1930). Under an almost communistic force and mysterious foreign influence, the fundamental Star of David is no longer visible on his back. He turns to listen with his left ear and removes a plug blocking his key-hole view. He peers in with his right eye. His view consists of a lighted keyhole against a black abyss. Cast on the ceiling are two human hands using lines to place a communal gathering of stars into constellations. It is as if the human hands have taken the place of God's, in room 19 with its, "Celestial ceiling". Under the room's ceiling, God's individual, "stars" forcefully conform at the hands of the human to a secular structure. In this commune of mapped out individual stars, mythical, monumental, secular images/constellations are formed. The

individual Star is lost in the structure of the image. Fundamental man is under lock and key, trapped, like the white cloth under the door, under the celestial illusion that he can escape. In the illusions allusion to freedom, the hands grasp a shadowy door lock, the right hand motioning as if picking the lock. Suddenly, the illusion is complete and the hand disappears in a cloud of smoke.

The poet/artist stands outside listening. He is forcefully moved from door 20 to door 21. A sign, stating, "Lessons de Vol" ("Flying Lessons") has been hung on the door. Knelt at the corner post to the right of the door, on the right knee, rests a pair of ballet shoes. The poet/artist peers into the key hole with his right eye. In an allusion to the hell-like state that man's fundamental individual nature is subject to, a fireplace stands in the center of the room. An exhausted little girl with her head drooping down to her right, is wrapped in chain like court jouter-style bells. The words, written on the door give allusion to the freedom found in flight. Ironically, these words exist as an illusion, and, in consequence, the word's propagandistic nature inhibits the fledgling flight of the child contained within room 21. Seemingly, the poet/artist is fooled into thinking that he is witness, through a keyhole, to a gloriously free dance. However it is a choreographed ballet, every move purposed by a choreographer. However, under an illusion which alludes to freedom, the poet/artist is blinded to the condition of the little child's fundamental being. Her fundamental individual nature is trapped within the dance, her being forcefully dancing around the room made to entertain the world's desires and shake her chain-like bells. Rousseau states, "man is/was born free" ("Contract" 131).

In the right corner, of the room, two bags are placed next to a crumpled newspaper. The newspaper and its propagandistic images act as the catalyst to the little girl's imprisonment. Its perverted educative process imprisons the fundamental individual judgment of its readers. This

representation of propaganda can be likened to Rousseau's views on education as having the possibility of existing as a manipulative tool rather than a truly educative one:

As soon as the faculties of the soul are put in action, imagination, the most active of all, is awakened in its turn and outstrips them. It is imagination which extends the measure of the possible, whether for good or bad, and which consequently excites and nourishes the desires by the hope of satisfying them. (*Emile* 27)

A ladder, alluding to upward movement of society away from its foundation is resting next to the newspaper. A schoolmarm moves towards the little girl. The schoolmarm's right hand is parading a whip, like the arbitrary, propagandistic, educative force behind the little girl's imprisonment. The schoolmarm, or the enforcer of "unnatural lessons", is seemingly, not realistically, hitting the little girl, pointing the whip at the child. In response, the little one shields her face with her right hand, palm facing the schoolmarm. The little girl is emaciated, her fundamental being starved. This Cocteauian portrait alludes to Rousseau's criticism of education, in *Emile*. The child's fundamental individual nature has been drained out of her being and potential she had at birth. The opposition between the two is arbitrary as explained below. The little girl is left a puppet to the teacher's arbitrary power and empty propaganda-like force:

I repeat: the education of man begins at his birth; before speaking, before understanding, he is already learning. Experience anticipates lessons. The moment he knows his nurse, he has already acquired a great deal. One would be surprised at the knowledge of the coarsest man if one followed his progress from the moment of his birth to where he is now. If one divided all of human science into two parts- the one common to all men, the other particular to the learned – the latter would be quite small in comparison with the former. (190)

As the child's enforcer arbitrarily beats the whip on the ground in front of the little girl, the child, unable to escape is standing on the fireplace mantle embracing the misery and hell of the fireplace (an allusion to Rousseau's chains). In perpetual imprisoning dance, the child's pure white clothing and fundamental innocence are subject to an enforcer of untruth similar to the father in this passage, also from Emile:

In the first place, they have, so to speak, a grammar of their age, whose syntax has rules more generic than ours; an if careful attention were paid, one would be surprised by the exactness with which they follow certain analogies, very faulty ones, if you please, but very regular and shocking only by their harshness or because usage does not admit them. I just heard a poor child well scolded by his father for having said to him: "Mon père, irai – je – t – y ?" Now one sees that this child followed the analogy better than do our grammarians. For since one said "Vas-y" to him, why she he not say "Irai-je-t-y?" Note, moreover, with what address he avoided the hiatus of "Irai-je-y?" or "Y Irai-je?" is it the poor child's fault if we have inopportunately removed the determining adverb y from the sentence because we did not know what to do with it? Is it insupportable pedantry and a most superfluous care to concentrate on correcting children for all these little mistakes in usage which they never with time fail to correct themselves. Always speak correctly, arrange that they enjoy themselves with no one as much as with you, and be sure that imperceptibly their language will be purified on the model of yours without your ever having chided them. (201)

The schoolmarm casts the whip to the right of the child, oppressing any effort on the child's part. The schoolmarm picks up the grimacing child and sits the emaciated being on the fireplace

mantle. The child, fearfully, stands up on the mantle as the schoolmarm/tyrant whips the air in front of her. The child is expected to conform/"reiterate" accordingly:

The child who wants to speak should hear only words he can understand and say only those he can articulate. The efforts he makes to do so cause him to reiterate the same syllable as if to give himself practice in pronouncing it more distinctly. When he begins to stammer, do not torment yourself so much to guess what he is saying. To claim that one must always be heard is yet another kind of domination, and the child should exercise none. Let it suffice you that you provide most attentively for what is necessary. It is up to him to endeavor to make you understand what is not. Still less one must be in a hurry to insist that he talk. He will know how to talk well on his own to the extent to sense the utility of it.

(Emile 203)

The tyrant continues, with arbitrary force, whipping into the air as the child stands on the mantle's center. The poet/artist watches, his left hand placed on the Lessons de vol sign. The child is now forcefully held, by air to the wall. She is seemingly dead. The tyrant schoolmarm is to the child's right. Meanwhile, the poet/artist/now a voyeur peers again through the key hole. He is married to his current imprisoning, societal view. This marriage is made evident by the raised pinky finger of his right and the visible wedding band on his left. He props himself on the door and stands by as the schoolmarm waves her black gloved right hand, signaling the now defenseless and limp child to the wall.⁴² Suddenly, realizing the reality of the child's condition, the poet/artist grabs the white door handle in an attempt to release the child's fundamental innocent being. Reminding the poet of his marriage to a left-handed society, the left cornerstone

42. See *Emile* 203

of the bottom of the fireplace is visible. The schoolmarm's turn of the century black- booted feet run by the cornerstone. Her right foot remains visible. She turns to the right, and in going in the right direction, drops her arbitrary whip. Realizing her change in path, she immediately turns left and is forced by her own wrong left path / turn to pick up the whip, once again. With her right hand and her left foot propping her up on the room's societal ladder, chains making music-like sounds play in the back ground. The schoolmarm enacts the nullifying of the contract Rousseau describes:

The clauses of this contract are so completely determined by the nature of the act that the slightest modification would render them null and void. So that although they may never have been formally pronounced, they are everywhere the same, everywhere tacitly accepted and recognized, until the social compact is violated, at which point each man recovers his original rights and resumes his natural freedom, thereby losing the conventional freedom for which he renounced it.

(Contract 138)

Propped on the societal ladder, the tyrant points her right arm at the child, who is violently shaking her arms as she is forcefully held to the ceiling's right corner. In a close up of the little girl's face and the "expressions" she has acquired, she sticks her tongue out, scrunches her face, and sticks her right thumb on her nose fingers waving as if, in rebellion against the tyrant, she has become the bully:

Nursed in the country amidst all the pastoral rusticity, your children will get more sonorous voices, they will not contract be obscure stuttering of city children. Nor will they contract there either the expressions or the tone of the village; or at least they will easily lose them when the master, living with them from their birth, and

doing so more exclusively every day, will by the correctness of his language obviate or efface the impression of the peasants' language. Emile will speak a French just as pure as I know it but he will speak it more distinctly and will articulate much better than I do. (*Emile* 203)

Cocteau's fervent desire, through both his plays and films, was to create a true cathartic experience enabling man to break through the secular prison walls he has built and cyclically builds around himself. Like Rousseau, Cocteau desired that man should return to the fundamentally valuable essence of existence, the human life and blood that has too often been subject to and succumb to forces against its human and God given nature.

CHAPTER 7

A DEADLY TRIANGLE

Claude Berri's film interpretation of Marcel Pagnol's novels, Jean de Florette and Manon of the Spring, develops a triangle of characters related by blood and bound by their God given humanity.⁴³ The complete triangle was once constructed around the fundamental Rousseauian philosophy of a God given, not man given, cleansing, around an individual and natural inheritance, and round a baptismal, life-giving blessing.⁴⁴ This blessing is represented in the film by water. The characters create two deadly opposing sides within the potentially life giving triangle, sides of total savagery and total civility that effectively act as the states Rousseau describes below:

War is not, therefore, a relation between man and man, but between State and State, in which private individuals are enemies only by accident, not as men, nor even as citizens, but as soldiers; not as members of the fatherland but as its defenders. Finally, each State can have only other States, and not men, as

43. Rousseau makes reference to mans' distortion of the Triangle when defining the reality of it on page 32 in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. It is now clear to me that Pagnol must have used the *Discourse* when writing his novels.

44. See Gabriel, Barbara and Suzan Ilcan, eds. *Postmodernism and the Ethical Subject* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004) for a different perspective on what completes the triangle, completion by "grasping" humanity in ourselves and in others.

enemies, since no true relationship can be established between things of different natures. (*Contract* 135)

In their opposition to a godly individual nature, each side or family line is incapable of connecting and completing the triangle and in turn each side propagates death and destruction rather than the growth of life-giving plants and vegetables. The sides can only unite and find equality through a natural, individual God-made foundation that embraces humanity, not an entirely man-built/"meddled with" foundation and conformity to the "product" of his meddling, the product or consequence being to "perish". Rousseau describes this scenario in the following passage:

God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil.

He forces one soil to yield the products of another, one tree to bear another's fruit. He confuses and confounds time, place, and natural conditions. He mutilates his dog, his horse, and his slave. He destroys and defaces all things; he loves all that is deformed and monstrous.

He wants nothing as nature made it, not even man; for him, man must be trained like a school horse; man must be fashioned in keeping with his fancy like a tree in his garden.

Were he not to do this, however, everything would go even worse, and our species does not admit of being formed halfway. In the present state of things a man abandoned to himself in the midst of other men from birth would be the most disfigured of all. Prejudices, authority, necessity, example, all the social institutions in which we find ourselves submerged would stifle nature in him and put nothing in its place. Nature there would be like a shrub that chance had caused

to be born in the middle of a path and that passers-by soon cause to perish by bumping into it from all sides and bending it in every direction (*Emile* 161).

In their denial of this natural Godly individual foundation and their progression and perversion of it, each of the opposing sides fruitlessly chase after what they, in their present ungodly and unnatural state, cannot possess, the blessing of life or water and its, “source” the spring. These sides exist in an exaggerated unnatural, man-made State, which ironically denies the role that their own actions play in their fate. The sides create a romantic and savage state of fate that they falsely call Providence. They quickly blame the consequences of their own tragic, man built state of being and fate on Providence, when in reality it is their movement away from a Providential God that has brought the consequences to fruition. Only when the two sides of opposing yet truly human individuals are bound by a Godly fundamental individual nature can, both civil and savage sides combine. Through finding and embracing their natural, individual, God given individual inheritance and through the education and realization of this Godly not man-made inheritance can the triangular connection be formed. Within a marriage of man to the fundamental Godly individual inheritance, the human triangle becomes life giving in its completion. The triangle’s completion gives worth to the lives of the individual humans that construct it. It is no longer a deadly triangle as it had been, a transition made possible for Rousseau by the successful shift from the state of nature to the civil state:

Find a form of association that defends and protects the person and goods of each associate with all the common force, and by means of which each one, uniting with all, nevertheless obeys only himself and remains as free as before. This is the fundamental problem which is solved by the social contract...This passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces a remarkable change in man, by

substituting justice for instinct in his behavior and giving actions the morality they previously lacked. Only then, when the voice of duty replaces physical impulse and right replaces appetite, does man, who until that time only considered himself, find himself forced to act upon other principles and to consult his reason before heeding his inclinations. Although in this state he deprives himself of several advantages given him by nature, he gains such great ones, his faculties are exercised and developed, his ideas broadened, his feelings ennobled, and his whole soul elevated to such a point that if the abuses of this new condition did not often degrade him beneath the condition he left, he ought ceaselessly to bless the happy moment that tore him away from it forever, and that changed him from a stupid, limited animal into an intelligent being and man. (*Contract* 138 -141)

The triangle of characters, along with personified objects, consists of one side, the Soubeyran Empire, César and his nephew Ugolin, and the opposing side who are those who are married to the descendants of Florette, her son Jean, and his wife and child Manon. Florette in her past was an individual unified with nature and God. Therefore she represented a Rousseauian fundamental, individual God given nature. However, in the failure of she and Cesar Soubeyran's potential union/marriage, and separated by war, the two opposing sides, instead of one inclusive of her nature, were created and a hunchback or thwarted imperfect individual, Jean, was born. The choice of men to battle amongst themselves, as if they were of a different genus dissolved the potential union of Cesar, symbolic of the Civil State, and Florette, symbolic of Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature. This created the incomplete and deadly triangle at the beginning of the film where all characters are in a ludicrous but desperate search for the inheritance that Florette had not directly left them, water or God's blessing.

At the beginning of the film, *Jean de Florette*, Ugolin, the total savage, whose soul is controlled by his emperor uncle, Cesar, is returning from the mandatory military time required by the Civil State. His return invades the Provençal nature and the hometown once belonging to Florette. As Ugolin arrives at the home of his uncle, Cesar states, “It is you Galinette you are back” (MGM, 1986.). One side of the triangle, the Soubeyran Empire is now nearing construction. This deadly union of the two characters brings into being the death that is to come from the triangle being constructed. This is symbolized, in the film, by the red bag, and its contents which Ugolin has brought back with him, and has in his possession upon his arrival from a war that man has waged and will wage upon himself and among mankind. In his military uniform and with his red bag in hand he carries it up the hills as he walks bringing death to the natural Provençal homestead. When he enters his hovel, he lays his red bag down covering it as if to deny the man-made death that he has brought. He opens a suitcase unrolling the death he will grow/propagate his red carnations in his opposition to man’s individual nature and to god. They are not yet red but like the progression of the film they will become red like the blood that will be shed. Ugolin carefully waters the red carnations symbolizing a man- made condemnation rather than a life giving blessing. He perverts God’s blessing or water and propagates death in his disconnect with the importance of God and individual human life. He kills a man in order to retain water for his red carnation. Ugolin carelessly whistles as he is watering his death brood of carnations as if he is in a hypnotic and desensitized state. Ugolin’s soul that is smothered by Cesar’s control is evident at their first meal together when Ugolin thanks the maid for the food she prepared and Cesar speaks to her in an oppressive manner. The enlightenment of Ugolin’s soul’ existence, which is extinguished in his union with Cesar’s opposition towards God and man, is evident by the placement of a lamp in between the two characters as they eat. This

accentuates their initial difference in that Ugolin is the Rousseauian savage who is born with a soulful potential but who loses to its opponent, the civil emperor Cesar, “man is/was born free but everywhere he is in chains” (*Contract* 131). In *Jean de Florette*, Ugolin and Cesar’s creation of the opposing Soubeyran line is evident when Cesar states, “When I die you will live here” (MGM, 1986). The Soubeyran farm will be yours”. At the table they speak of Ugolin’s marriage to a possible village girl and of producing an heir. However Ugolin’s savagery, his lack of human stewardship and his connection to Cesar have already put a halt to life that might have been produced and Ugolin replies in a savage manner:

I have no mule – I’m using yours. I have no hens or goats – they’re too much trouble I don’t wear socks they itch So why should I need a wife? ... for 15 francs a month I can choose any girl.

Ugolin asks Cesar a question that reveals his uncle’s disconnect to God and nature, “Why didn’t you ever marry?” In the same conversation, furthering the un-soulful union of Cesar to Ugolin, Cesar disregards the life plans that Ugolin is about to reveal to him and tells his nephew, “I have an idea for you ... I thought it all out... I figured out everything including the costs”. The true cost of Ugolin uniting in a Soubeyran compact is the opposition to his individual life within the empirical triangle meant to give life. Cesar then constructs the opposing line of the triangle once Ugolin inquires about his uncle’s plan, “To restore the Soubeyran orchard...two hundred fig trees, two hundred plum trees... it’ll be like a cathedral”. With these words Cesar has become God, a man in the place of God and nature bestowing his perverted blessing of death upon his nephew. He reinforces this perversion with this statement, “and every farmer will make the sign of the cross”. Still having a bit of God given soul and nature in his now developing savagery, Ugolin says, “Listen Papet... we already have too many plums, peaches, apricots... we end up

feeding them to the pigs”. The soulful and God given fundamental, individual part of Ugolin had to retreat, under the developing Cesar-made cathedral. This is evident in Ugolin’s response to Cesar’s question, “what is your idea?” Ugolin tells him it is Ugolin’s (individual) secret and in the dark of the night goes to admire what has now become a turned deadly propagation of flowers. In the hiding of his soul and fundamental, individual nature, Ugolin has now become a total savage servant able to do all the foot work for Cesar. Cesar even comments on the new savagery enforcing the aesthetic wealth of the developing Soubeyran line. He awakens his nephew who is asleep in his hovel of a house and says, “You can’t keep living like this ... your holed up like a caveman (*sauvage*)...this house is a pigsty...” Cesar demands to know what his nephew is doing all day. As Ugolin proudly unveils the red carnations he has grown to Cesar, Cesar scoffs at Ugolin’s accomplishment in order to keep him submissive, “This is your big secret?” Ugolin’s soulful fundamental individual secret, to grow red carnations, could have been potentially life giving rather than deadly, like the red blood that flows and fills ones heart. Cesar accompanies Ugolin to town in order to oversee the sale of the flowers. The importance of the monetary and aesthetic within the Soubeyran line of the currently deadly triangle is clear by Ugolin’s inquiry of the vendor, “What will you give me for them?... real beauties... they’re imperials”. The dead, cut, blood-red carnations are consumed, and hence the consumers that will buy them, caught in the triangle that should have been life giving. However they are now out of season and therefore out of life, “If it would have been February I would have given you 50 cents but the season’s almost over” (ibid). Cesar verifies Ugolin’s individual submission to his empire when he inquires, “You’re right Gallinette, you’ll be growing flowers... Why was it such a secret?” Ugolin responds with a submissive answer once they bloomed, “I knew you’d be

impressed”.⁴⁵ The Rousseauian fundamental, individual nature of Ugolin is made servant to the Soubeyran line:

Aristotle was right, but he mistook the effect for the cause. Every man born in slavery is born for slavery; nothing could be more certain. Slaves lose everything in their chains, even the desire to be rid of them. They love their servitude as the companions of Ulysses loved their brutishness. (*Contract* 133)

To return to our analysis, the two men are returning from town on horseback, after the transaction by which Ugolin handed over his fundamental rights to Cesar, his uncle agrees to fund the growth of the red carnations (death):

Ugolin. “What’ll it cost?”

Cesar. “15,000”...you’ve got it”

Ugolin. “ you’re too generous”

Cesar. “not really... it is not for you...It’s for all Soubeyran’s buried ones and future ones” (1986, MGM.).

Ugolin now has a sense of the separation from the fundamental, individual foundation and blessing of God and nature in his sacrifice to the Soubeyran line, but his savage state permits him to exploit, along with Cesar, the life blessing of nature that he has been given.

45. Ugolin had the individual freedom to deny submission to César’s empire, a freedom Cladis explains as follows: “I will argue that ... held ... Lodged within the human heart is a fallen condition that makes our failures empirically inevitable, yet not ontologically necessary” (79).

Something's bothering me ... what?...the water...what water?...a carnation plant drinks like a fish ["se boit comme un homme"]...install a cistern with a pump... it'll be empty in four days ... that is a problem...

The exploitation, perversion and separation from the true meaning of a Rousseauian God and nature are evident when Cesar says, "we must find land near a natural water source." Rousseau contradicts and reveals Cesar and the Soubeyran line's perversion of the natural and Godly, individual, fundamental nature. The two men discuss a spring on the property of Florette now owned by Pique Bouffigue, a spring that had created a lovely spring during Cesar's youth prior to his Soubeyran empirical tyranny. The freely running stream coming from the spring that they now have claimed as having dried up reflects Rousseauian philosophy found in *Emile*, the young plant being like the stream.

You...are capable of keeping the nascent shrub away from the highway and securing it from the impact of human opinions! Cultivate and water the young plant before it dies. Its fruits will one day be your delights. Form an enclosure around your child's soul at an early date. Someone else can draw its circumference, but you alone must build the fence. (162)

Cesar explains that the ancient Camions grew vegetables near the stream. In other words plants would grow because they had the water or God's natural fundamental blessing. The water that freely flowed in Cesar's youth completed the triangle of life:

Plants are shaped by cultivation and men by education. If man were born big and strong, his size and strength would be useless to him until he had learned to make use of them. They would be detrimental to him in that they would keep others from thinking of aiding him. And, abandoned to himself, he would die of

want before knowing his needs. And childhood is taken to be a pitiable stale [state]! It is not seen that the human race would have perished if man had not begun as a child. (*Emile* 162)

In *Jean de Florette*, Cesar was no longer the man of his youth. He has become a brute whose brutality was due to his lack of connection to a Godly, natural, fundamental, individual nature and due to his union with the Soubeyran family line (predestination or providence as expressed in the film. His brutality is evident in the following line when he is describing how he will unblock the spring, “I bet we could unblock it with a pick ax” (MGM, 1986). This parallels the Rousseauian quotation that states force does not make right.⁴⁶

The now deadly incomplete triangle begins its consumption of human life with the murder of Florette’s brother, Marius, known as Pique Bouffigue. Cesar and Ugolin visit Marius under the guise of concern for him as an individual, but the somewhat savage Marius knows better and states that they must be after something. Under their false and perverted pretense they have come to exploit the fundamental, individual nature of Marius, to buy it from him and kill

46. “Let us suppose this alleged right for a moment. I say that what comes of it is nothing but inexplicable confusion. For as soon as force makes right, the effect changes along with the cause. Any force that overcomes the first one succeeds to its right. As soon as one can disobey without punishment, one can do so legitimately, and since the strongest is always right, the only thing to do is to make oneself the strongest. But what is a right that perishes when force ceases? If it is necessary to obey by force, one need not obey by duty, and if one is no longer forced to obey, one is no longer obligated to do so. It is apparent, then, that this word right adds nothing to force. Here it signifies nothing at all” (*Contract* 133-134).

him. Rousseau states the following in relation to the type of tyranny Cesar Soubeyran demonstrates:

It is therefore doubtful, according to Grotius, whether the human race belongs to a hundred men, or whether these hundred men belong to the human race; and throughout his book he appears to lean toward the former view. This is Hobbes's sentiment as well. Thus the human species is divided into herds of livestock, each with its leader, who tends it in order to devour it. (*Contract* 132)

Cesar states "Listen Marius, if you sell me your property, not the house just the field and hill, just name your price...! Marius replies, "What nerve! You think I'd sell my property! Cesar holds up his money thinking himself capable of owning the entire human race, "Look, Thousand bill francs" (MGM, 1986). This confirms the disconnect that the two Soubeyrans have to the individual, Marius, and to the human race. Before Marius' murder, he calls them bastards. Marius becomes a sacrifice to the Soubeyran line when he dies at the hands of Cesar, exhibiting therefore, the abusive and unjust sacrifices Rousseau describes as a kind of tyranny:

Therefore, in order for the social compact not to be an ineffectual formula, it tacitly includes the following engagement, which alone can give force to the others: that whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be constrained to do so by the entire body; which means only that he is forced to be free. For this condition that, by giving each Citizen to the fatherland, guarantees him against all personal dependence; a condition that creates the ingenuity and functioning of the political machine, and alone gives legitimacy to civil engagements which without it would be absurd, tyrannical, and subject to the most enormous abuses.

(*Contract* 141)

During Marius' funeral he was buried with his gun, with its safety catch not on. He already foresaw the potential theft of his inherited natural land, indicating that state of transition that precedes the formation of the contract:

I assume that men have reached the point where obstacles to their self-preservation in the state of nature prevail by their resistance over the forces each individual can use to maintain himself in that state. Then that primitive state can no longer subsist and the human race would perish if it did not change its manner of living (*Contract* 138).

Marius' death, in *Jean de Florette*, furthered the disconnect that the triangle of life had to the fundamental foundation it had been built upon. The lack of a natural solid foundation for the triangle is evident when Cesar and Ugolin find the ground around the spring that they had murdered Marius for. The ground around the spring or the soon to be perverted spring is soggy. Cesar and Ugolin find it while wandering off during the funeral. Cesar's feet sink due to the infirm foundation, and he says the following about the natural wet earth that they will soon turn into a man-made State or cement block, "See the soggy ground around my foot" (MGM, 1986) Death creates an un-firm foundation and becomes that which constructs the perverted life triangle. A man-made, unnatural, cemented, State begins building itself upon the death of a man, first with Marius, rather than upon a life-giving natural fundamental foundation or the original human spring. Cesar's callus/heart-hardened, cemented existence is clear when he mentions the wealth he could attain from brutally unblocking the spring with a pick, "the water's blocked but it is there. To think he threw away this gold mine."

In his past, Cesar had been in love with and was going to marry Florette but he was forced to go fight a war that was foreign in location and in principle in that it was a war that took

many human lives. It forever changed Cesar. Cesar carried on the war against man, that he had been forced to conform to and fight in, into the rest of his life, and every man became like a “foreigner/enemy” to be conquered. He no longer saw “private individuals” but only what he thought needed to be conquered. The African, foreign war separated Cesar from his first fundamental love, Florette, and kept him from marrying her, thereby keeping him conformed to the “establishment” of a Soubeyran line and turning him into a tyrant. Before the foreign war that Cesar had been exposed to, the triangle was complete and produced life. Rousseau clarifies Cesar’s plight:

This principle even conforms with the established maxims of all ages and with the constant practice of all civilized peoples. Declarations of war are not so much warnings to those in power as to their subjects. The foreigner – whether he be king, private or individual, or people – who robs, kills, or imprisons subjects without declaring war on the prince, is not an enemy, but a brigand. Even in the midst of war, a just prince may well seize everything in an enemy country that belongs to the public, but he respects the person and goods of private individuals. He respects rights on which his own are based. The end of war being the destruction of the enemy State, one has the right to kill its defenders as long as they are armed. But as soon as they lay down their arms and surrender, since they cease to be enemies or instruments of the enemy, they become simply men once again, and one no longer has a right to their lives. Sometimes it is possible to kill the State without killing a single one of its members. War confers no right that is not necessary to its end. The principles are not those of Grotius; they are not

based on the authority of poets, but are derived from the nature of things, and are based on reason. (*Contract* 136)

Prior to the war against what was thought by the imperialists at the time to be a savage land, and prior to the Soubeyran line, when the spring ran freely under the hand of the ancient Camions and when it had a natural Godly fundamental foundation, the land was productive and blessed with olive trees. The villagers claimed there were, “plus fifty olive trees from before the war” (1986, MGM.). However, the Soubeyran line caused the triangle to disconnect and caused the spring to plug up. The triangle began its deadly perversion of providence and fated those within it to death. The villagers claim that now it “Never rains on that land. You hear the storms you see the storms, but before the clouds get There they split up and it pours on the other side” (1986, MGM.). The perversion of the once Godly or truly providential truth is evident in Cesar and Ugolin’s defense of the villager’s claims about the spring they indeed had found on Pique Bouffigue’s land:

You may not know Bouffigue’s land has a spring... It had a tiny spring... [the villager]... no it was a real beauty... when I was a kid my dad showed it to me... It seemed like a river to me... Could a spring like that disappear... I know all springs... Last year I saw a fig trees there... That proves there’s water... There was water, but there are new shoots... [Cesar retorts]... I say this one is dry I say the olive trees are dead and the soil is rotten ... [Ugolin lies]... I wouldn’t take that land if you gave it to me.

The opposite and perverted nature of the Soubeyran line in contrast with Florette’s fundamental, individual, Godly, nature is evident when the two men discuss asking her about purchasing her dead brother Bouffigue’s land, “and if she knows it is for us she’ll refuse... Why

that's the way she is... What can we do... nothing..." As they write to their old friend with the intention of asking about the land, they receive news back that Florette has died. Her death marks the land as being cursed a land that no longer has any association to a fundamental foundation or Godly blessings of life.

The deadly perverted providence of the triangle is foreshadowed by this conversation between Ugolin and Cesar, "... A stranger might buy it [land]... What the hell for... to grow vegetables... Without water [Florette or God's blessing] ...There's the spring what if there was no spring, but there is one..." The triangle where God's blessings flowed freely, like old Camions water, is now being halted by the empirical Soubeyran man-made state of being. This is symbolized by the cement they use to block the, "source" as the spring is called in French:

You'll never learn. Here's my plan [Cesar plan to build an Empire]... It's already half stopped up.... An accident could shut it completely... What accident... Suppose you walk by with a load of cement. You trip. You fall and bang your cement plugs up the opening.

The Hell is released when they find the already partially blocked spring or Godly source of blessing and unblock it with a pick ax, "Good God its icy". Rather than inheriting the free flowing Blessing or Godly, "source, Florette's son inherits the hell created by the Soubeyrans and further begun by César relationship with Florette which created her son, Jean. The two together created a fated being, a hunchback, who could have succeeded but who becomes the opposing side of the triangle due to César's empirical state of being:

and he must be about 35 he's a tax collector but I don't know where he's married but unfortunately by God's will he's a hunchback he'll sell a pen makes less blisters than a pick ax a farmer may grow a hump but a hunchback rarely becomes

a farmer. Who would have thought that Florette would have given birth to a hunchback?

Jean Cadoret, Cesar Soubeyran's son, therefore, has a deadly inheritance and makes the non-inheritance of an individual Godly fundamental nature and foundation clear when he states his name to Ugolin, "My name is Jean Cadoret".⁴⁷ He is not Jean de Florette as he should be. The disconnect he has with his mother, Florette's, nature is evident and perpetuated by his city attire. He arrives on the inherited farm dressed in a suit wearing a hat and black gloves. The black color of the gloves is symbolic of the death and the disconnection between him and nature. Upon Jean's arrival, Ugolin hides behind a bush watching Jean. This demonstrates the opposition between Ugolin and his, "almost neighbor", Jean. Jean's disconnect with the reality of his mother's nature and his romantic ideals add to what will be his demise, to his own perversion of fundamental truth, and to the battle lines of life's triangle between him and Ugolin. Romantically Jean cries out, "Its ancient Provence Zola's Paradise...It's even lovelier than paradise". The opposition between the two Rousseauian States or men, one the total savage and

47. The deadly inheritance is the contract of "disunity" between the father and son or the soul, "Rousseau's critique compromises two general points. First disunity of soul (or psyche) is the cause of man's misery in society, and unity the key to his health and happiness. Second, loss of unity results from a contradiction between human nature and our particular social institutions. Thus I will first describe what unity of soul is and why it is good. Then, I will isolate the social cause of disunity and shows it to be the heart of the problem of bourgeois society" (Melzer 1018).

the other total civility, is clear as Jean unloads his fancy furniture.⁴⁸ Jean says, “So we are neighbors” and Ugolin replies, “almost... I’m Ugolin Soubeyran”. The disconnected triangular lines are drawn. Ugolin, the savage, is puzzled by the city tools that they unload. Jean needs these tools, unlike Ugolin, because his total civility has rendered his natural abilities useless. It is for this reason later in the film that Jean is only able to rely on books and facts.⁴⁹ This

48. Jean is perhaps naïve in his knowledge of nature but is possibly the opposite when taking into consideration the true innocent naivety explained in the following quotation. He, like his neighbor Ugolin, is perhaps scheming and dishonest with his true intentions and pays for it with his life, “Although conditional cooperation will flourish whenever people can easily read one another’s intentions, its success does not require perfect transparency. It is easy to imagine that the naïve creatures who inhabit Rousseau’s first societies would occasionally make mistakes about one another’s real intentions, even if they were still too innocent to engage in calculated deception. Conditional cooperators are subject to two kinds of error. They can mistake unconditional cooperators, thereby exposing themselves to exploitation (the cooperate/defect outcome). Or, they can mistake one another for unconditional defectors, thereby missing an opportunity to cooperate for mutual advantage” (Hill 16).

49. Jean did not have fundamental, individual wisdom or reason to rely on due to his overly civilized and romantic state. Therefore, he caused his own death and harmed his family, “Of all the follies of men, to reason is the one that harms the human race the least, and one sees even wise people infatuated with that folly sometimes. I do not reason, myself, that is true, but others do reason; what harm comes from it? See such, such, such work; are there anything but

illustrates what can go wrong in the potentially successful transition Rousseau lays out as discussed above (127-8).

Jean unloads a fancy mirror that reflects the savage Ugolin, as Jean carries it. Although on opposite lines of the triangle, both men will come to their demise. Jean, although water/spring -deprived due to the Soubeyrans, exploits the land and water he possesses to meet his romantic ideals. Jean's disconnect with a natural, individual, fundamental foundation is the cause of these ideals and causes his inability to think for himself. He is unable to maneuver without consulting a manual. He is drunk with too many ideals and too much knowledge. He proclaims, "I'll drink to mother nature...to these fragrant hills...tot the blue sky... (1986, MGM.) He ends his proclamation by stating he is on a, "holiday will last until I die" (ibid). It is not the lack of water that ultimately kills him but his drunken and soggy fundamental, individual, nature.

It is only Jean's daughter Manon, who will grow up, under the care of a natural teacher named Baptistine, and who will give birth to the savior. The saving quality of her existence is depicted by her riding a white donkey, as if she were the Virgin Mary. The villagers have named her the virgin shepardess of the hills. She is educated by Baptistine and marries a school teacher. Manon often reads books while she simultaneously learns to hunt. She reveals the perverted behavior of Cesar and Ugolin and brings water to the entire village. In her revelation of truth, Cesar realizes what he has lost, his son, and dies of grief restoring the triangle back to its life giving state of being.

pleasantries in these Books? Myself in the end, if I do not reason, I do better; I make my readers reason..." (Kelly 10).

Both characters, Ugolin under the control of the empirical Cesar Soubeyran line, and Jean, under the control of the Civil State, pervert God's fundamental nature, in their total submission and conformity to the lines of the deadly triangle they create, and in their disconnect from the individual natural foundation, Florette, Jean Cadoret and Ugolin all die.⁵⁰ It is Manon, in seeing the truth of Ugolin and of her father as well, in finding the source of the spring/water, and in allowing herself to be baptized by an fundamental, individual nature, Baptistine, that she is able to marry the educated teacher and give birth to the Rousseauian or her child in the film series.⁵¹

50. Cesar represents the total "self-interest" and "ambition" that deconstructed the fundamentally "stable" triangle turned empirical triangle which consumed the fearful and desperate Jean, and in Pagnol's later film, Ugolin: "Following Jean-Jacques Rousseau...Immanuel Kant recognizes that fear and ambition in themselves are simply forms of self-interest and that the balance between them is inherently unstable. Unless everyone – monarchs and subjects or citizens – is made positively devoted to peace, any international order will degenerate into self seeking...Rulers are tempted to go to war he says, not because they are inherently different from their subjects, but because the personally have much to gain and little to lose. If they had to share the burdens of war with their subjects, they too would seem to be pacific. The difference between ruler and rule depends on political position, not on character. The pacifism often attributed to republican or democratic peoples is as contingent as the aggressiveness of ambitious leaders. (Knippenberg 2-3)

51. Manon's purpose in the film fits the following Gautier explanation of Rousseauian philosophy, "Everything is good as it leaves the hands of the Author of things, everything

degenerates in the hands of man”. In these opening words of *Émile*, Rousseau reminds us of his story of the Fall. Now we must join him in making a new beginning. We shall take an infant, as yet uncorrupted by his fellows and his society, and we shall ask if he may be made a man – not one of the denatured and alienated men of Rousseau’s time, or of today, not a man driven by *amour propre* to take the sentiment of his existence only from the regard of another, but a man who is “born free” (in the opening words of the *Social Contract*) and who lives as he was born” (Gautier 27).

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of eleven years of research in French and Francophone studies, a vague pattern of two juxtaposed sides within the fabric of various works began to arise. The existence of this vague pattern exposed itself not first through a French or Francophone work, but arose from Aristotle's work, *The Poetics*. Aristotle points out what he calls a natural prerequisite to the structured parts of a poem.⁵² He juxtaposes the essential inspired nature of the truth being stated in a poem to its unnatural form. With this in mind and further research, specific French and Francophone works began exhibiting this Aristotelian pattern of juxtaposition. Madame de Lafayette's novel *La Princesse de Clèves* juxtaposed the natural desire of a princess for a lover to her unnatural obligation to the State and to her imposed courtly marriage. The Post-Colonial Francophone novel *Texaco* written by Patrick Chamoiseau also shares the pattern of the natural and unnatural in that it emphasizes the importance of retaining a memory of *Créolité*, the Martiniquais natural "roots" which are quite opposite to the still new and imposed European

52. "The poietic [art] in itself and the various kinds of it, and what [particular] effect each kind has, and how plots should be put together if the making is to prosper; and how many elements it has and of what kind; and likewise everything else that belongs in this area of inquiry – let us discuss all this, beginning in the natural way with first things" (qtd. in Baxter 45).

culture.⁵³ Choderos Laclos' *Dangerous Liaisons* exhibits individual, natural passions expressed through letters written between characters. The passionate letters are hidden behind and juxtaposed to the mask of the novel's structure and to societal established masks and ceremony. Most impressive among the works of this manuscript's preliminary research is the artist Jean Baptiste Greuze who introduced realism to French Genre painting and was connected in this manner to the philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau during the revolutionary period of France's history. Additionally, striking is the work of Félix Leclerc, *Pieds nus dans l'aube*, which juxtaposes an individual, innocent youth growing up in a natural forested area of Quebec to the development encroaching upon this essential existence and reforming its essential and innocent truth. All of the above works deal with tragedy stemming from conflict between the two juxtaposed sides in formation. The conflict often ends in tragedy. After reading these works, questions began to arise such as pinpointing how to define exactly the juxtaposition exhibited in these works, pinpointing the conflict that often arose due to the two apparent sides at odds, specifically what human truth was being juxtaposed to artificial entities, and why the thread of conflict in these works occurs and results in tragedy. Also necessary is the revelation of a solution to the conflict within these works and the importance of the two opposing sides joining

53. The following is an explanation of the concept of that which Creolité encompasses, "A people must face the issue of the perpetuation of its history as well as its values, permitting it to maintain the link with the following generations. As in most of sub-Saharan Africa, the medium of communication and the functioning mechanisms that permitted Ivorians to safeguard and transmit their culture has, until recent times, been the oral tradition. This has served as the vehicle of collective memory, but today, this tradition is rapidly eroding" (Germain 1).

forces. In question as well is the exact truth that the humans beings within these works are separating themselves from to cause a juxtaposition of opposing sides with the ensuing conflict and tragedy. Why does the tragedy increase with the introduction of civilization and with the movement away from youth and innocence? What therefore is the exact problem that the above works are purposed to and why does it seem that the works put the same importance on a parallel purpose? Rousseau's work helps answer the above questions and creates a clear framework and filter through which these works can be analyzed illuminating what they seek.⁵⁴ Three principle Rousseau works, *Émile*, *The Social Contract*, and *The Discourse on the Origin and basis of Inequality among men* bring this purpose to light and emphasize the necessity of resolution between the two juxtaposed sides of that which is natural and that which is artificial.⁵⁵ His three

54. Gérusez points out two sides of a Rousseauian of a Rousseauian framework, « J.-J. Rousseau ... Apôtre de la vertu, dont le sentiment s'était exalté dans son âme par le contact et la pratique du vice... il parla de la dignité de l'âme immatérielle et même de religion à des matérialistes et a des sceptiques, du devoir de conquérir et de faire respecter ses droits de citoyen à des mutins asservis qui se contentaient de railler et de harceler leur maîtres, de la simplicité et des vertus de la nature primitive à des sybarites fiers de leur luxe et infatués de leur corruption » (467,468).

55. The realization that man can be united but not juxtaposed in opposition to his human brother brings out truth from each individual not artificiality, "Sitôt qu'un homme fut reconnu par un autre pour un être sentant, pensant et semblable à lui, le désir ou le besoin de lui communiquer ses sentiments et ses pensées lui en fit chercher les moyens. Ces moyens ne peuvent se tirer que des sens, les seuls instruments par lesquels un homme puisse agir sur un

works further define these sides and the resolution between them which the manuscript studies in depth through film adaptations, creating a Rousseauian legacy that in some instances began before his philosophy was even in existence. In the following quotation in Émile he demonstrates a natural instinctual response of an innocent child juxtaposed the established opinion of the way in which he is expected to and taught to unnaturally respond to natural individual fundamental sensation that moves him:

I see an eight-year old child served ice cream. He brings the spoon to his mouth without knowing what it is, and, surprised by the cold, shouts, “Oh it’s burning me!” He experiences a very lively sensation. He knows of none livelier than the heat of fire, and he believes he feels that one. However he is mistaken. Then chill of the cold hurts him, but it does not burn him, and these tow sensations are not similar, since those who have experienced both do not confound them. It is not, therefore, the sensation which deceives him but the judgment he makes about it (354).

It is this emphasis on the natural or fundamental individual versus that which is imposed upon him and the tragedy in losing the innate nature of the fundamental nature to outside imposition that Rousseau further defines in his *The Social Contract* by stating that the individual is fundamental to any State constructed around it including the Civil State of legislation:

autre. Voilà donc l’institution des signes sensibles pour exprimer la pensée. Les inventeurs du langage ne firent pas ce raisonnement, mais l’instinct leur en suggéra la conséquence » (Banda 5).

Each of us puts his will, his goods, his force, and his person in common, under the direction of the general will, and in body we all receive each member as an inalienable part of the whole (83).⁵⁶

The importance of the Rousseauian compact between the fundamental individual nature of man and any established State outside of this fundamental nature including defining the two and exhibiting the consequences of the two sides not having an equitable contract is the legacy that this manuscript claims as a necessity and is the legacy and framework that the film adaptations addressed in this manuscript can illuminate and educate through.⁵⁷ This is a legacy of the vitality found by embracing and giving re-birth to the fundamental individual nature of man through the structure to which that man consents.

56. Aristotle points out the a seeming root of the Civil State as existing within the fundamental, individual nature of man, “As for the origin of the poietic art altogether, it would seem that two causes account for it, both of them deep-rooted in the very nature of man. (and man is different from the other animals in that he is extremely imitative and makes his first steps in learning through imitation); and so is the pleasure we all take in copies of things” (qtd. in Baxter 57).

57. Rousseau proclaimed a framework of “philosophy and morality” in many of his works, including *Lettre à d’Alembert sur les spectacles*: “This lengthy epistle belongs to the category of philosophy and morality rather than to dramatic criticism proper, but it throws light upon a by no means uncommon attitude” (Barrett 272).

This Rousseauian vital legacy is evident across the centuries in both French and Francophone novels and plays and their adaptations. His philosophy of equality, acceptance, and coexistence between the individual human being and the Civil State has served as a construct leading to the production of the modern film interpretations addressed in this manuscript. The film interpretations, in my discussion, address opposition to what should rest as an essential and continually functioning part of the foundation of civil structure, man's fundamental individual nature in a stance not based on conformity to an order that is outside the realm of a God-created mankind. Dayan's Edmond Dantes' fundamental individual nature stands in seemingly total opposition to civil and socially constructed characters while at the same time guiding the structure as a captain would guide a ship. Rappeneau's Cyrano possesses a physique that represents the separation his fundamental individual nature has from the pretentious societal established thought of acceptable appearance surrounding him. Neither Dantes nor Cyrano totally conform to the societal constraints surrounding them. However, their exaggerated efforts to protect the self create an imbalance between the Civil State and man's fundamental individual state of being. The frequent denial of their fundamental existence also creates an imbalance which perpetually imprisons and kills essential innocence and a vicious triangle of conflict and tragedy ensues.⁵⁸ Doillon's *Ponette*, Truffaut's characters in *Small Change*, and Éxupéry's pilot

58. Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound provides an excellent early example of this Rousseauian concept, "The first rulers of the Universe when Chaos came to an end were Earth and Heaven. Earth and Heaven had many children, one of whom, Cronos, rose up in rebellion against his parents, seized their throne, and reigned. But rebellion against him soon followed, headed by his son Zeus, who was resolved to dethrone him and take his place. In the conflict which ensued with the Titans, who opposed Zeus and sided with Cronos, Prometheus, the son of

experience the totalitarian denial of their fundamental, individual nature and innocence by the opposing civil, adult state of being. Conformity is forced upon them by the adult worlds surrounding them. Swann, in *Swann in Love*, battles so furiously against conformity that he becomes totally unbalanced in his relationship with the Civil State and is totally self obsessed just as Cocteau's poet/artist becomes often overly consumed with the glory of his fundamental, individual nature. For him the fundamental is turned into a vain self glorification. In fighting conformity to the deadly socially built triangle and in his own self obsession and movement away from the foundation of life, Berri's Jean de Florette loses his life. The fundamental, individual nature of man is obliterated in its total rather than mutual conformity to and acceptance by what has become without the fundamental a tyrannical Civil State:

Whatever is good and in accordance with order is so by the nature of things, independently of human conventions. All justice comes from God; He alone is its source. But if we knew how to receive it from on high, we would need neither government nor laws. There is without doubt a universal justice emanating from reason alone; but to be acknowledged among us (*Contract* 152).

In the Dayan, Rappeneau, Doillon, Berri, Truffaut, and Cocteau films of this manuscript, the clear consequences of a Civil State not inclusive of an ethical responsibility to and re-birth of the individual fundamental nature of man are depicted through a Rousseauian framework. Rousseau confirms the consequences of this exclusion depicted throughout the above directors' film interpretations of society that existing without equilibrium and with a loss of human stewardship

the Titan Iapetus and the goddess, Themis, had foreknowledge of the future, and told her son that Zeus could never be conquered by brute force" (xxi; II).

and enslavement of individual rights to a ‘brutish’ un-Godly hand based solely on the pleasure of and not the purpose of “commanding”:

The pleasure of commanding takes the place of the love which the chief cannot have for the peoples under him....

Rousseau’s illuminating effects on French and Francophone film interpretations can transcend into many facets of today’s and future societies. Society can benefit by the Rousseauian embrace of man’s individual fundamental nature with its enshrinement of the human rights and liberties and so avoid the tragedy of renouncing fundamental truth.

To renounce liberty is to renounce being a man, to surrender the rights of humanity and even its duties. For him who renounces everything no indemnity is possible. Such a renunciation is incompatible with man's nature; to remove all liberty from his will is to remove all morality from his acts. Finally, it is an empty and contradictory convention that sets up, on the one side, absolute authority, and, on the other, unlimited obedience.

Through the characters individual struggles, each film interpretation has become this Rousseauian voice of reason purposed to teach society as a whole how to avoid failure through the preservation of this essential nature.

REFERENCES

- Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907. Google Book Search.
- Alfred, Fred. *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Greek Tragedy*. Michigan: Yale University, 1992. Google Book Search.
- Andrews, Ian. *Children's Films: History, Ideology, Pedagogy, Theory*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 2000. Google Book Search.
- Arcand, Denys. "La vraie nature du cinéaste." Trans. Michel Coulombe. *Canada's Best Features: Critical Essays on 15 Canadian Films*. Ed. Eugene Walz. Montreal: Boreal, 1993. 202. Print.
- Aristotle, *Aristotle's Poetics*. Trans. George Baxter. Montreal: McGill – Queen's University Press, 1997. Print.
- Armes, Roy. *African Filmmaking North and South of the Sahara*. IN: Indian University Press, 2006. Print.
- Auster, Paul. *The Poems, Short Fiction, and Criticism of Samuel Beckett Volume IV*. U.S: First Grove Press Edition, 2006. Print.
- Banda, Daniel. *Essai sur l'origine des langues*. Paris: Flammarion, 2008. Print.
- Blé, Germain. "Communication and Collective Memory: The Plight of Oral traditions in Côte d'Ivoire." *Journal of African Media Studies* 3.1 (2011): 89-108. Print.
- Blood of a Poet*. Dir. Jean Cocteau. Perf. Enrique Rivero, Elizabeth Lee Miller, Pauline Carton, and Odette Talazac. Canal + Image, 1930. Film
- Bluhm, William. "Freedom in 'The Social Contract' :Rousseau's 'Legitimate Chains.'" *Polity* 16.3 (1984): 359-383. Print.
- Books, Sue. *Invisible Children in the Society and its Schools, Second Edition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003. Print.
- Boyd, Richard. "Pity's Pathologies Portrayed: Rousseau and the Limits of Democratic Compassion." *Political Theory* 32.4 (2004): 519-546. Print.
- Cladis, Mark. "Rousseau's Soteriology: Deliverance at the Crossroads." *The Journal of Religious Studies* 32.1 (1996): 79-91. Print.

- Cranston, Maurice. *Jean Jacques: The Early Life and Work of Jean Jacques Rousseau*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. Google Book Search.
- Coates, Paul. *Cinema, Religion, and the Romantic Legacy*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, 2002. Google Book Church.
- Cocteau, Jean. *Five Plays*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. Print.
- . *Theatre*. Paris: Gallimard, 1948. Print.
- Cyrano de Bergerac. Dir. Jean- Paul Rappeneau. Perf. Gérard Depardieu, Anne Brochet, Vincent Perez. TF1, 1990. Film
- De Maistre, Joseph. *Against Rousseau "On the State of Nature" and "On the Sovereignty of the People*. Trans. Richard Lebrun. Montreal: McGill's-Queen's University Press, 1996. Print.
- Descartes, René. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Vol 1. Trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Print.
- Dobel, J. "The Role of Languages in Rousseau's Political Thought." *Polity* 18.4 (1986): 638-658. Print.
- Dunning, Wm. "The Political Theories of Jean Jacques Rousseau." *Political Science Quarterly* 24.3 (1909): 377-408. Print.
- Gabriel, Barbara and Suzan Ilcan. *Postmodernism and the Ethical Subject*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004. Print.
- Gautier, David. *Rousseau: The Sentiment of Existence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.
- Géruzez, Eugène. *Histoire de la littérature française depuis ses origines jusqu'à la révolution*. Paris: Didier, 1861. Google Book Search.
- Grant, Ruth. *Hypocrisy and Integrity: Machiavelli, Rousseau, and the Ethics of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. Print.
- Greuze, Jean Baptiste. *Girl Mourning Bird*. National Gallery of Scotland.
- Greuze, Jean Baptiste. *A Lady Reading the letters of Heloise and Abelard*. The Art Institute of Chicago. Print.

- .. *Deux putti jouant avec un oiseau*. Galerie de Loes.
- .. *The Well Beloved Mother*. National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.
- Hadrai, Saguiv. "Persuader sans convaincre": A Rousseauian Approach to the Insoluble Problem of the Social Contract." *The Western Political Quarterly* 39.3 (1986): 504-519. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time a Joan Strambaugh Translation*. Albany: State of New York Press, 1996. Google Book Search.
- Hill, Greg. *Rousseau's theory of Human Association*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.
- Huysmans, Joris-Karl. *Against Nature*. Trans. Margaret Mauldon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.
- Janin, Jules. *Histoire de la littérature dramatique*. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1853-1858. Print.
- Jean de Florette*. Dir. Claude Berri. Perf. Yves Montand and Gérard Depardieu. MGM, 1986. Film
- Kelly, Christopher. *Rousseau as Author: Consecrating One's Life to the Truth*. Chicago: Chicago Press, 2003. Google Book Search.
- Kemediio, Cilas. "Founding – Ancestors and Intertextuality in Francophone Caribbean Literature and Criticism." *Research in African Literatures* 33.2 (2002-07): 210-229. Print.
- Kleiner, Fred. *Garner's Art Through the Ages: A Global History, International Student's 13th Edition*. U.S: Clark Baxter, 2011. Print.
- Knippenberg, Joseph. "Moving Beyond Fear: Rousseau and Kant on Cosmopolitan Education." *The Journal of Politics* 51.4 (1989): 809-827. Print.
- Knusten, Torbjorn. "Re-reading Rousseau in the Post Cold War World." *The Journal of Peace Research* 31.3 (1994): 247-262. Print.
- Laclos, Choderlos. *Les Liaisons dangereuses*. London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd, 1924. Google Book Search.
- Lafayette. *Romans et Nouvelles*. Paris: Dunod, 1997. Print.
- Landy, Joshua. "Les Moi en Moi": The Proustian Self in Philosophical Perspective." *New Literary History* 32.1 (2001): 91-132. Print.

- Lloyd, Rosemary. *Mallarmé, The Poet and His Life*. US: Cornell University, 1999. Google Book Search.
- Melzer, Arthur. "Rousseau and the Problem of Bourgeois Society." *The American Political Science Review* 74.4 (1980): 1018-1033. Print.
- Müller, Anja. *Fashioning Childhood in the Eighteenth Century: Age and Identity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006. Google Book Search.
- Norton, James. *Jean Jacques Rousseau: Advocate of Government by Consent*. New York: Group first Edition, 2006. Google Book Search.
- Odgers, Blake. "Professor Vaughn on Jean Jacques Rousseau." *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation* 16.2 (1916): 394- 395. Print.
- O'Neal, John. "Language, and Perception in Rousseau's, 'Narcisse' ." *Theatre Journal* 37 (1985): 192-202. Print.
- Orwin, cliff. "Rousseau's Socratism." *Journal of Politics* 60.1 (1998): 174-187. Print.
- Ponette*. Dir. Jacques Doillon. Perf. Victoire Thivisol and Delphine Schiltz. Canal Production, 1996. Film
- Proust, Marcel. *In Search of Lost Time*. Trans. C.K. Moncreiff and Terence Kilmartin. London: Chatto and Windus, 1992. Print.
- Robert, Paul. *Le Petit Robert*. Paris: Rey Alain, 1993. Print.
- Rostand, Edmond. *Cyrano de Bergerac*. Paris: GF Flammarion, 1989. Print.
- Robert, Paul. Le Petit Robert. 1993. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality. The Collected Writings of Rousseau*. Vol. 3. Trans. Christopher Kelly and Allan Bloom. Ed. Roger D. Masters and Christopher Kelly. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 1992. Print.
- . *Emile: or on Education. The Collected Writings of Rousseau*. Vol. 13. Trans. Christopher Kelly and Allan Bloom. Ed. Roger D. Masters and Christopher Kelly. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 2010. Print.
- . *Social Contract. The Collected Writings of Rousseau*. Vol. 4. Trans. Christopher Kelly and Allan Bloom. Ed. Roger D. Masters and Christopher Kelly. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 1994. Print.
- Saint-Exupéry. *Le Petit prince*. London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1971. Print.

- Scher, Steven. "The German Lied: A Genre and Its European Reception." *European Romanticism: Literary Cross Currents, Modes, and Models*. Ed. Gerhart Hoffenmeister. Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1990. Google Book Search.
- Scott, John. *Jean Jacques Rousseau: Critical Assessments of Leading Political Philosophers*. UK: Routledge, 2006. Google Book Search.
- Simpson, Matthew. *Rousseau's Theory of Freedom*. New York: Continuum, 2006.
- Small Change*. Dir. François Truffaut. Perf. Georges Desmouceaux and Philippe Goldmann. MGM, 1976. Film
- Swann in Love*. Dir. Volker Schlöndorff. Perf. Jeremy Irons. Gaumont, 1984. Film
- Temmer, Mark. "Art and Love in the Confessions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau." *PMLA* 73.3 (1958): 215-220. Print.
- The Count of Monte Cristo*. Dir. Josée Dayan. Perf. Gérard Depardieu and Ornella Muti. TF1, 1998. Film
- Tresch, John. "The Order of the Prophets: Series in Early French Social Science and Socialism." *History of Science* 48.3/4 (2010): 315-342. Print.
- Webster, Robert. "A Note on the Films of Jacques Doillon." *The French Review* 75.6 (2002): 1334-1335. Print.
- Wingrove, Elizabeth. *Rousseau's Republican Romance*. Ewing: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.
- Zeigler, Robert. *The Mirror Divinity: the World and Creation in J.K. Huysmans*. Massachusetts: Rosemont Publishing and Printing, 2004. Google Book Search.